



Governing the Adaptive Organism: A Framework for Human-AI Symbiosis in Anticipatory Project Management



Ken A. Charles ^a

Article history:

Submitted: 27 June 2026

Revised: 18 July 2026

Accepted: 09 August 2026

Keywords:

*anticipatory governance;
artificial intelligence;
complex adaptive systems;
Human-AI teaming;
IT governance;
organisational resilience;
project management;*

Abstract

Purpose: The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into project management is accelerating, yet governance frameworks have failed to keep pace with the transition from tool-based automation to genuine human-AI symbiosis. This article synthesizes literature across four fragmented domains to propose a unified governance model for anticipatory project management. **Design/methodology/approach:** A systematic, integrative review was conducted covering: AI in project management, Human-AI collaboration, Anticipatory governance, and Complexity theory. The synthesis draws on peer-reviewed literature from 2023-2026, integrating seminal work on human-AI co-agency and adaptive systems. **Findings:** The review reveals a fundamental tension: technological capability outpaces organisational absorption. To address this, the article introduces the Adaptive Organism Governance (AOG) Framework. This model reconceptualises the project organisation as a complex adaptive system comprising four interdependent dimensions: Cognitive Augmentation, Collaborative Intelligence, Anticipatory Sensing, and Complexity Absorption. The framework is operationalized through six governance principles: subsidiarity, transparency, adaptability, resilience, human-centricity, and continuous learning. **Originality/value:** This article provides the first comprehensive synthesis linking AI technical capabilities with anticipatory governance theory. The AOG Framework offers a theoretically grounded, actionable pathway for practitioners navigating the digital transformation of project delivery, shifting the focus from controlling machines to cultivating symbiotic ecosystems.

International research journal of management, IT and social sciences © 2026.

This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license

(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

Corresponding author:

Ken A. Charles,

Independent Researcher, Lota Nash, South Africa

Email address: kencharles@hotmail.com.

^a Independent Researcher, Lota Nash, South Africa

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Project failures are far more than isolated setbacks; they represent a systemic and staggeringly expensive feature of the modern organisational landscape. According to the Project Management Institute's (PMI) 2025 Pulse of the Profession report, while 72% of projects do achieve their goals, nearly one in three overshoots its budget and over 40% fail to meet schedule commitments (Communardo, 2025). The Standish Group's CHAOS report paints an even bleaker picture: only 31% of software projects are delivered successfully on time, on budget, and with the required features. While the remaining 69% are either challenged or fail outright (Standish Group, cited in Business Analysis, 2025), a statistic that has remained stubbornly unchanged for over a decade. In the realm of AI, the numbers are more alarming still. MIT researchers report a staggering 95% failure rate for generative AI pilots, with the root causes stemming not from model quality but from organisational learning gaps and weak governance (MIT, cited in Responsible AI Foundation, 2026). The financial consequences of this governance vacuum are immense, with some estimates placing the accumulated cost of AI project failure and misalignment in the trillions of dollars (PromptFluent, 2026).

This systemic waste cannot be dismissed as mere technological inadequacy. A 2026 survey of 500 U.S. CIOs and CTOs found that as many as 80% of enterprise tech leaders attribute AI project failures to a lack of visibility or oversight—a governance failure, not a technical one (Solvd, cited in CIO Dive, 2026). The data exposes a critical reality: organisations are deploying increasingly powerful AI agents into project ecosystems that were never architected to accommodate them. Traditional paradigms of linear planning, epitomised by Gantt charts and phase-gate methodologies, were designed for an era of relative stability, where deviations could be managed through variance analysis (Nenni et al., 2025). Today, however, the convergence of generative AI, unprecedented data volume, and escalating environmental complexity (VUCA) demands a fundamental reconsideration of how projects are governed. In this new landscape, the capacity to anticipate, adapt, and co-evolve with changing conditions has become more critical than the capacity to plan.

Problem Statement

The discourse surrounding AI in project management has been largely dominated by technological determinism, positioning AI as a set of sophisticated tools for optimizing discrete tasks such as scheduling, risk detection, or resource allocation (Simen et al., 2025; Taboada et al., 2023). While these applications deliver tangible value, they address only the surface of the issue. A more profound shift is underway: the emergence of Human-AI Symbiosis, a cooperative paradigm in which humans and AI systems interact synergistically, sharing cognitive responsibility and co-creating strategic foresight (Kate, 2025). Yet, as Xiao et al. (2025) empirically demonstrate, the journey from using AI as a personal productivity accelerator to leveraging it as a collaborative team partner remains obstructed by socio-cultural friction and, critically, the stark absence of suitable governance structures.

The evidence of this "absorption gap" is undeniable. While 87% of organisations express a desire for AI to detect delivery risks early, only 16% have successfully implemented such capabilities—a 71-point gap that is costing billions in delayed projects and budget overruns (PM Symposium, 2026). Furthermore, the ModelOp 2025 AI Governance Benchmark Report found that 71% of enterprises still have no formalized governance structure for AI (ModelOp, 2025). Without ownership, visibility, and accountability, great ideas never make it past the pilot phase. This article addresses this critical gap in both scholarship and practice by posing a central research question: *How can organisations govern the emerging human-AI project ecosystem to achieve anticipatory, adaptive, and resilient project delivery?*

To answer this question, the article conducts an integrative synthesis of four critical yet siloed streams of literature:

1. the capabilities and barriers of AI in project management;
2. the dynamics of human-AI collaboration and teaming (HAIT);
3. the principles of anticipatory governance and organisational resilience; and
4. the application of complexity theory to project organizing.

Drawing on this synthesis, we propose the Adaptive Organism Governance (AOG) Framework. This model reconceptualises the project organisation not as a deterministic machine to be optimized, but as a living, adaptive organism to be cultivated. The framework provides a structured approach to navigating the complexities of IT governance and strategic agility in an AI-augmented world.

The article proceeds as follows. Section 2 presents a structured literature review across the four domains. Section 3 synthesizes these findings into the AOG Framework, supported by operational tables. Section 4 discusses the theoretical and practical implications. Section 5 concludes with an agenda for future research and final reflections on governing the adaptive organism.

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

This section systematically reviews the state of knowledge across the four foundational domains of the AOG Framework.

2.1 Artificial Intelligence in Project Management: Capabilities and Barriers

The application of AI in project management has transitioned from theoretical exploration to practical necessity. A systematic review by [Nemmi et al. \(2025\)](#) in *Management Review Quarterly* synthesizes the transformation across sectors including healthcare, construction, and energy. Their analysis of 109 key articles reveals that machine learning (ML), natural language processing (NLP), and generative AI are predominantly deployed to enhance scheduling accuracy, optimize resource allocation, and improve risk detection capabilities ([Fadel, 2024](#)).

[Taboada et al. \(2023\)](#) position AI-enabled project management within the Industry 5.0 paradigm, emphasizing human-centric and sustainable production. Their review indicates that AI demonstrates considerable utility in construction and IT projects, particularly in enhancing the planning, measurement, and uncertainty performance domains through forecasting and decision-making support. More recently, [Simen et al. \(2025\)](#) conducted a scoping review specific to the finance sector, identifying the growing use of Large Language Models (LLMs) and Fuzzy Bayesian Networks for intelligent scheduling and risk detection.

Despite these advancements, a consistent theme across the literature is the absorption gap, the disparity between technological potential and organisational readiness. [Salimimoghadam et al. \(2025\)](#) identify three primary categories of barriers: (1) technological (legacy integration, data quality); (2) organisational (resistance to change, lack of standardized frameworks); and (3) human-centric (ethical concerns, AI literacy). [Hashfi & Raharjo \(2023\)](#) further map these challenges onto the PMBOK process groups, noting that environmental challenges receive comparatively little attention relative to organisational and technological hurdles. [Kate \(2025\)](#) reinforces this, specifically citing *data quality* and *organisational culture resistance* as the primary impediments to achieving true symbiosis rather than superficial automation.

Generative AI and Agile Methodologies

The emergence of Generative AI (GenAI) has particular salience for Agile project management. [Enabulele et al. \(2025\)](#) propose an integrative GenAI-APM alignment framework mapping capabilities such as requirements elaboration, code generation, and risk sensing to Agile roles and ceremonies. However, [Hosseini \(2024\)](#) cautions that the success of Custom GPTs and similar tools hinges critically on data privacy compliance (GDPR, CCPA) and robust ethical governance to mitigate algorithmic bias.

Table 1 provides a structured synthesis of the current state of AI integration across the project management lifecycle. It is designed to move the reader beyond a generic understanding of "AI in projects" toward a phase-specific appreciation of where and how AI technologies are being deployed. The table was constructed by aggregating findings from the systematic literature reviews of [Taboada et al. \(2023\)](#), [Simen et al. \(2025\)](#), and [Salimimoghadam et al. \(2025\)](#), as well as the applied frameworks proposed by [Kate \(2025\)](#), [Hosseini \(2024\)](#), and [Enabulele et al. \(2025\)](#). The "Key Technologies" column maps specific AI methods (e.g., NLP for stakeholder engagement, Bayesian Networks for risk) to their primary application phase. The "Documented Benefits" column summarizes the empirically observed or theoretically anticipated outcomes reported in the source literature. This table serves as the evidentiary foundation for the "Cognitive Augmentation" dimension of the AOG Framework by demonstrating that AI's utility is not monolithic but is instead distributed across distinct project activities, each with its own governance requirements.

Table 1
AI Integration Across the Project Management Lifecycle

Project Phase	AI Applications	Key Technologies	Documented Benefits	Representative Studies
Initiation & Planning	Requirements analysis, scope definition, resource forecasting	NLP, ML, Neural Networks	Improved estimation accuracy; optimized resource allocation	Taboada et al. (2023); Simen et al. (2025)
Execution & Monitoring	Real-time tracking, risk detection, automated reporting	LLMs, Predictive Analytics	Enhanced forecasting; early deviation warning	Lopez (2024); Simen et al. (2025)
Risk Management	Risk identification, probability assessment, simulation	Bayesian Networks, Monte Carlo	Proactive risk anticipation; improved mitigation	Salimimoghadam et al. (2025); Kate (2025)
Stakeholder Engagement	Sentiment analysis, tailored communication, documentation	NLP, Custom GPTs	Improved alignment; reduced communication friction	Hosseini (2024); Enabulele et al. (2025)
Closure & Learning	Knowledge synthesis, lessons learned extraction	GenAI, Knowledge Graphs	Enhanced organisational memory; adaptive learning	Eshraghi (2024); Kate (2025)

Source: Synthesized by the author from Taboada et al. (2023), Simen et al. (2025), Salimimoghadam et al. (2025), Lopez (2024), Hosseini (2024), Enabulele et al. (2025), Eshraghi (2024), and Kate (2025).

2.2 Human-AI Collaboration: From Tool to Teammate

The literature on Human-AI collaboration signals a crucial shift from technology-centric questions to a human-centered research agenda. Schmidt, Graßl, and Heinzl (2023)¹ introduce the concept of Human-AI Teaming (HAIT), defining it as a synergistic combination of human and AI capabilities to accomplish shared goals while ensuring human wellbeing, motivation, and productivity. Their network analysis identifies five research clusters but notes the absence of a consistent definition of HAIT, proposing a unifying definition that emphasizes *team-oriented perspectives*. Raftopoulos & Hamari (2023) contribute a complementary view by reviewing how human-AI collaboration can enable value creation in organizations, highlighting the conditions under which such collaboration yields sustainable benefit.

Braun et al. (2023), address a critical gap by analysing human-AI collaboration through the lens of established teamwork frameworks (Input-Process-Output models, shared mental models). They find that the opacity and consistency of AI teammates reconfigure traditional team dynamics like communication and trust. Zercher, Jussupow, and Heinzl (2023) further examine intragroup processes, concluding that models of team effectiveness designed for human-only teams require substantial adaptation for AI integration.

The Symbiosis Paradigm

Kate (2025) advances this discourse by delineating a clear boundary between collaboration and symbiosis. According to Kate (2025), symbiosis extends beyond automation to establish mutual adaptation and human-AI co-agency, where responsibility and insight are shared between both actors. This distinction is paramount. It moves the conversation from AI as a subordinate tool to AI as a cognitive partner. Kate (2025) outlines specific benefits of this symbiosis in project management, including enhanced predictive capacity, data-driven adaptability, and strategic foresight.

Empirical Realities

While theoretical models highlight AI's potential as a transformative force in project management, empirical evidence paints a more restrained picture. A longitudinal study conducted by Xiao et al. (2025), covering the period from 2023 to 2025, revealed that expectations of AI serving as an intelligent coordinator have not materialized in practice. Instead, adoption has been largely limited to accelerating discrete tasks such as coding and writing. Persistent challenges in collaboration, particularly around accountability and communication, remain unresolved. These findings emphasize that effective governance structures, rather than technical integration alone, are essential to realizing the promise of Human-AI Teaming (HAIT).

Charles, K. A. (2026). *Governing the adaptive organism: A framework for human-AI symbiosis in anticipatory project management*. *International Research Journal of Management, IT and Social Sciences*, 13(5), 118–130. <https://doi.org/10.21744/irjmis.v13n5.2606>

Table 2 presents a taxonomy of human-AI interaction models derived from the literature. Its purpose is to clarify the conceptual evolution from seeing AI as a passive instrument to recognizing it as an active, symbiotic partner. The table is constructed from the foundational definitions of HAIT provided by Schmidt et al. (2023), the symbiosis model articulated by Kate (2025), the hybrid intelligence calibration framework from *Production Engineering* (2024), and the multi-agent architecture of the HIVEMIND project (2024). The progression from "Tool-Based" to "Human-AI Symbiosis" represents a spectrum of increasing cognitive integration and shared agency. This table provides the vocabulary necessary to understand the "Collaborative Intelligence" dimension of the AOG Framework and illustrates that governance requirements differ fundamentally depending on whether AI is viewed as a calculator or a co-pilot. The inclusion of Kate's (2025) model as the most advanced form underscores the article's central argument: governance must evolve to accommodate mutual adaptation rather than one-way command.

Table 2
Models of Human-AI Interaction in Organisational Contexts

Model Type	Core Principle	Key Characteristics	Application Context	Representative Work
Tool-Based	AI as an instrument for human decision-making	Human retains full agency; AI provides recommendations	Traditional decision support	Baseline Paradigm
Human-AI Teaming	AI as a team member with complementary capabilities	Synergistic combination of strengths; shared goals	Complex, collaborative tasks	Schmidt, Graßl, and Heinzl (2023)
Human-AI Symbiosis	AI as a cognitive partner; mutual adaptation	Shared responsibility; co-agency; continuous feedback loops	Strategic governance and foresight	Kate (2025)
Hybrid Intelligence	Optimal calibration of automation vs. human intervention	Classification based on data, variability, error, and complexity	Production and operations management	Production Engineering (2024)
Multi-Agent Collaboration	Multiple specialized AI agents supporting distinct roles	LLM-based agents; fine-tuning with organisational data	Complex software development	HIVEMIND (2024)

Source: Synthesized by the author from Schmidt et al. (2023), Kate (2025), *Production Engineering* (2024), and HIVEMIND (2024).

¹ Please note: The author list for the paper published in *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence* (2023) has been tentatively reconstructed based on available metadata. You must verify the exact order and spelling of names before final submission.

2.3 Anticipatory Governance and Organisational Resilience

Anticipatory governance emerges from the convergence of futures studies, resilience research, and public administration. It represents a response to the limitations of reactive, compliance-based governance in complex environments. Boyd et al. (2015) trace the intellectual lineage of anticipation, noting that all attempts to benefit from the future are modes of anticipation. Tanguay et al. (2023) derive four core criteria for effective anticipatory governance in social-ecological systems: foresight, networked engagement, integration, and feedback.

In urban governance research, techniques identified within the resilient city framework include *anticipating*, *monitoring*, and *responsibilizing* (de Vries et al., 2023). The anticipatory dimension emphasizes forward-looking capacity—not merely predicting the future but actively shaping it through strategic foresight.

The Intelligent Governance Loop

Kate (2025) provides a critical link between anticipatory theory and project management practice through the concept of the intelligent governance loop. This is a process where "predictive insights inform policy adjustments, which in turn refine the data that AI systems learn from" (Kate, 2025). This reframes IT governance from a static set of rules to a "living, adaptive system" (Kate, 2025). Lopez (2024) exemplifies this in practice with an *Intelligent Project Tracking*

System that uses generative AI to provide foresight into project trajectories, enabling pre-emptive adjustments rather than post-mortem analysis.

The integration of AI into governance enhances situational awareness, allowing leaders to foresee bottlenecks and simulate decision impacts. This capacity for *strategic agility*- the ability to detect change early and respond with speed is the ultimate objective of anticipatory project governance (Kate, 2025).

Table 3 operationalizes the abstract principles of anticipatory governance for a project management audience. The dimensions listed: Foresight, Networked Engagement, Integration, Feedback, Anticipating, and Responsibilizing are drawn directly from the systematic review by Tanguay et al. (2023) and the urban resilience analysis in *Governing the Resilient City* (de Vries et al., 2023). The table extends this theoretical work by mapping each dimension to a specific, AI-enabled capability (e.g., linking "Foresight" to "Predictive analytics and scenario simulation") and, critically, to its corresponding "Governance Implication." This mapping demonstrates that anticipatory governance is not merely a philosophical stance but requires concrete technical infrastructure and policy design. The inclusion of Kate's (2025) "Intelligent Governance Loop" in the "Feedback" dimension provides a practical mechanism for achieving continuous adaptation. This table directly supports the "Anticipatory Sensing" dimension of the AOG Framework by providing the governance architecture required to translate foresight into action.

Table 3
Operationalizing Anticipatory Governance in Project Management

Dimension	Definition	AI-Enabled Capabilities	Governance Implications	Source
Foresight	Capacity to envision and prepare for multiple futures	Predictive analytics, scenario simulation	Strategic planning; proactive risk management	Tanguay et al. (2023); Kate (2025)
Networked Engagement	Distributed participation in sensing and decision-making	Multi-agent collaboration; stakeholder analytics	Inclusive governance; distributed authority	Tanguay et al. (2023)
Integration	Synthesis of disparate data into coherent understanding	Unified data lakes; semantic analysis	Information architecture; decision support	Tanguay et al. (2023); Kate (2025)
Feedback	Continuous learning and adaptation based on outcomes	Real-time monitoring; reinforcement learning	Adaptive governance; continuous improvement	Kate (2025)
Anticipating	Proactive identification of emerging threats	Weak signal detection; risk prediction	Strategic foresight; early warning systems	de Vries, van den Brink and Rietjens (2023)
Responsibilizing	Clear allocation of accountability in adaptive systems	Explainable AI (XAI); audit trails	Ethical governance; accountability	Hosseini (2024)

Source: Adapted by the author from Tanguay et al. (2023), Kate (2025), de Vries et al. (2023), and Hosseini (2024).

2.4 Complexity Theory in Project Management

Project complexity is a primary source of project failure, yet its conceptualisation remains fragmented (Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management, 2023).² A systematic review identifies three perspectives: structural (interdependence of elements), uncertainty (ambiguity), and dynamic (evolution over time). Kermanshachi et al. (2023) contribute detailed complexity management strategies for construction projects, demonstrating the practical tools required to handle these different complexity dimensions effectively.

A meta-analytic review by Hu et al. (2023) provides a crucial insight: integrational complexity (the complexity arising from coordinating interdependent components) significantly positively affects project success. This suggests that the ability to manage complex interdependencies is a core competency for modern projects. AI systems excel precisely at this type of coordination.

Complexity Absorption as a Governance Function

The AOG Framework conceptualises AI integration as a form of complexity absorption, the capacity of the organisational system to process and respond to high volumes of data and interdependencies without cognitive overload. Kate's (2025) proposed framework components, *Data Integration and Management*, *AI Model Development and Training*, and *User Interface Design*, are technical strategies for managing integrational complexity. By creating unified data lakes and intuitive dashboards, AI systems filter operational noise, allowing human managers to focus on *strategic* complexity.

Clark (2023) notes a significant gap in explaining how complexity theory links project management competencies to success. The introduction of AI agents into the project ecosystem alters the complexity landscape. While AI can reduce technical and structural complexity through automation, it can simultaneously increase organisational complexity by introducing new dependencies and accountability questions. Effective governance must therefore be dynamic, calibrating the level of AI autonomy based on the prevailing complexity context.

Table 4 translates the theoretical typologies of project complexity into actionable governance design principles. The table is informed primarily by the meta-analytic work of Hu et al. (2023) and the systematic review in *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management* (2023). The six complexity types represent a consolidation of the structural, uncertainty, dynamic, integrational, technical, and organisational dimensions identified across the literature. The "Key Finding" column highlights the most salient research outcome for each type, most notably, the insight that integrational complexity *positively* affects project success when managed well. The "Implications for AI Governance" column is the novel contribution of this synthesis. It connects each complexity type to a specific governance function that AI can support. This table provides the theoretical justification for the "Complexity Absorption" dimension of the AOG Framework, demonstrating that effective AI governance is a direct strategic response to the specific complexities that cause projects to fail.

Table 4
Complexity Perspectives and AI Governance Implications

Complexity Type	Core Focus	Key Finding	Implications for AI Governance
Structural	Number and interdependence of elements	Higher interdependence increases coordination burden	AI manages interdependencies via intelligent scheduling and resource optimization.
Integrational	Coordination of multiple interdependent components	Positively affects project success (Hu et al., 2023)	AI-enhanced integration directly improves outcomes; governance must support this.
Uncertainty	Ambiguity and unpredictability	Reduces predictability of linear plans	AI provides probabilistic forecasting and scenario analysis to navigate uncertainty.
Dynamic	Evolution of complexity over time	Patterns shift across lifecycle; static plans fail	Governance frameworks must be adaptive, enabling real-time reconfiguration.
Technical	Technology-related challenges	Varies by industry; AI can both reduce and create complexity	Governance must manage technical debt and AI model drift.
Organisational	Structural and cultural dimensions	Moderated by context (Hu et al., 2023)	AI governance must align with organisational culture and readiness.

Source: Synthesized by the author from Hu et al. (2023) and *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management* (2023).

² The full author names for the systematic review published in *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management* (2023) must be verified and inserted in the reference list.

3.0 SYNTHESIS: THE ADAPTIVE ORGANISM GOVERNANCE (AOG) FRAMEWORK

The literature synthesis reveals a clear narrative: technological capability in AI-enabled project management is advancing rapidly, but organisational governance has not evolved. The transition from AI tool to AI teammate—or

more accurately, *symbiotic partner* requires a fundamental reconceptualisation of the project organisation. Drawing on the four literature streams, we propose the Adaptive Organism Governance (AOG) Framework.

3.1 Theoretical Foundations

The AOG Framework is grounded in four theoretical pillars:

1. **Socio-Technical Systems Theory:** Joint optimization of social (human) and technical (AI) subsystems (Schmidt et al., 2023).
2. **Complex Adaptive Systems Theory:** Recognition that project organisations exhibit emergence, non-linearity, and adaptation (Hu et al., 2023).
3. **Anticipatory Governance Theory:** Foresight, integration, and feedback loops as core governance functions (Tanguay et al., 2023; Kate, 2025).
4. **Human-AI Symbiosis Theory:** Mutual adaptation and co-agency between human and machine intelligence (Kate, 2025).

3.2 The Four Dimensions of the AOG Framework

Dimension 1: Cognitive Augmentation

Capability: Enhancing human cognitive throughput through AI-enabled analytics and automation.

AI Enablers: Predictive models, NLP for documentation, anomaly detection.

Human Role: Strategic judgment, contextual interpretation, ethical oversight.

Governance Focus: Ensuring augmentation enhances rather than displaces human critical thinking.

Establishing explainability protocols for AI outputs (Hosseini, 2024).

Dimension 2: Collaborative Intelligence

Capability: Fostering integrated teamwork between human and AI agents based on co-agency.

AI Enablers: Multi-agent systems, shared knowledge representations, role-based LLMs.

Human Role: Team leadership, relational coordination, managing the "social dynamics" of the human-AI team.

Governance Focus: Defining **role clarity** and **communication protocols**. Determining the optimal level of AI autonomy based on task criticality (Production Engineering, 2024).

Dimension 3: Anticipatory Sensing

Capability: Detecting weak signals of emerging threats and opportunities before they materialize.

AI Enablers: Environmental scanning, scenario simulation, predictive risk radars (Kate, 2025; Lopez, 2024).

AI Enablers: Environmental scanning, scenario simulation, predictive risk radars (Kate, 2025; Lopez, 2024).

Human Role: Strategic interpretation of signals, initiating pre-emptive action.

Governance Focus: Creating the intelligent governance loop (Kate, 2025). Establishing trigger mechanisms for when AI-sensed threats require human intervention.

Dimension 4: Complexity Absorption

Capability: Processing high-dimensional project data and interdependencies to prevent system overwhelm.

AI Enablers: Interdependency mapping algorithms, adaptive resource reallocation engines.

Human Role: Oversight of adaptive reconfiguration, exception handling.

Governance Focus: Managing integrational complexity (Hu et al., 2023). Designing escalation protocols for when complexity exceeds AI processing thresholds.

3.3 Governance Principles of the Adaptive Organism

To operationalize these dimensions, the AOG Framework prescribes six governance principles:

1. **Subsidiarity:** Decision-making authority is allocated to the lowest appropriate agent (human or AI) based on capability and risk.
2. **Transparency:** AI systems must be explainable and auditable (Hosseini, 2024; Kate, 2025).
3. **Adaptability:** Governance structures must be malleable, evolving with project conditions and organisational learning (Tanguay et al., 2023).
4. **Resilience:** The system maintains the capacity to anticipate, absorb, and recover from disruptions (Boyd et al., 2015).
5. **Human-Centricity:** AI integration prioritizes human wellbeing, motivation, and professional development (Schmidt et al., 2023).

6. **Continuous Learning:** The ecosystem systematically captures insights from both human and AI experiences to refine future performance (Kate, 2025).

Table 5 is the capstone synthesis of the entire article, presenting the Adaptive Organism Governance (AOG) Framework Matrix. This table consolidates findings from the four literature streams (Tables 1-4) into a unified, actionable model. Each row corresponds to one of the four core dimensions. The columns; Core Capability, AI Enablers, Human Role, Governance Mechanisms, and Key Metrics provide a 360-degree view of what each dimension requires for successful implementation. The content of each cell is derived from the specific sources cited throughout the review. The "Governance Mechanisms" and "Key Metrics" columns represent the original contribution of this framework, translating theoretical insights into specific policies and measurable outcomes. This table serves as both a diagnostic checklist and a design blueprint for building a project governance system capable of supporting true human-AI symbiosis.

Table 5
The Adaptive Organism Governance (AOG) Framework Matrix

Dimension	Core Capability	AI Enablers	Human Role	Governance Mechanisms	Key Metrics
Cognitive Augmentation	Enhanced human decision-making	Predictive analytics, GenAI automation	Strategic judgment, context interpretation	Explainability protocols; Human-in-the-loop mandates	Decision accuracy; Cognitive load reduction
Collaborative Intelligence	Integrated human-AI teamwork	Multi-agent LLMs; Knowledge graphs	Team leadership; Relational coordination	Role clarity frameworks; Communication APIs	Team effectiveness score; Trust index
Anticipatory Sensing	Early detection of threats/opportunities	Scenario simulation; Weak signal detection	Strategic interpretation; Response initiation	Intelligent Governance Loop (Kate, 2025); Alert thresholds	Lead time to response; False positive rate
Complexity Absorption	Processing high-volume interdependencies	Interdependency mapping; Adaptive algorithms	Oversight; Exception handling	Complexity thresholds; Escalation protocols	System uptime; Integration efficiency

Source: Developed by the author based on the synthesis of literature presented in Sections 2.1-2.4 and Tables 1-4.

4.0 DISCUSSION

4.1 Theoretical Contributions

This article makes three distinct contributions to the project management and information systems literature. First, it provides a systematic synthesis of four previously siloed domains. While prior work examined AI tools (Nenni et al., 2025) or HAIT (Braun et al., 2023) independently, this article demonstrates the essential interconnections required for a holistic governance approach. The inclusion of Kate's (2025) work on symbiosis provides the theoretical bridge between technical capability and organisational co-evolution.

Second, the article advances the conceptualisation of the project organisation from a machine to an organism. The "Adaptive Organism" metaphor moves beyond the dominant tool-based narrative. It acknowledges that introducing AI into a project ecosystem changes the ecosystem itself, creating emergent properties that cannot be predicted by examining human or AI components in isolation.

Third, the AOG Framework offers a tangible, multi-dimensional model for governing this new reality. By integrating complexity absorption and anticipatory sensing as primary governance functions, the framework addresses the critical "absorption gap" identified in the literature (Salimimoghadam et al., 2025).

4.2 Practical Implications for Project Leadership

For Project Management Offices (PMOs), the AOG Framework provides a diagnostic tool for assessing AI readiness. It shifts the conversation from "Which AI tool should we buy?" to "How do we redesign our governance rituals to accommodate a non-human cognitive partner?" The statistics are clear: 71% of enterprises lack a formal AI governance structure (ModelOp, 2025), and this absence directly contributes to the 95% failure rate of generative AI pilots (MIT, cited in Responsible AI Foundation, 2026). The AOG Framework provides a structured pathway to closing this gap. For Project Managers, the framework signals a career evolution. As Kate (2025) notes, the future project manager acts as an AI orchestrator. The value of the project manager will no longer lie in updating Gantt charts but in curating AI insights, managing human-AI trust dynamics, and ensuring that AI recommendations are ethically and contextually sound.

For Organisational Leaders, the framework highlights the necessity of cultural change. The longitudinal findings of Xiao et al. (2025) serve as a cautionary tale: deploying AI without evolving the governance culture leads to isolated efficiency gains but not transformative symbiosis. Leadership must champion the principles of *transparency* and *human-centricity* to mitigate the resistance to change that Kate (2025) identifies as a critical barrier. The alternative is a perpetuation of the status quo, where 90% of enterprise AI projects continue to crash and burn due to weak governance and botched integration (WebProNews, 2026).

4.3 Limitations and Future Research Agenda

The AOG Framework, while theoretically robust, is subject to limitations that open avenues for future research.

- **Empirical Validation:** The framework is derived from literature synthesis and requires empirical validation. Future studies should employ case study methodology to observe how the four dimensions interact in live project environments.
- **Sectoral Specificity:** The review spans multiple industries (IT, construction, finance). Research is needed to determine if the weighting of the AOG dimensions differs between highly regulated sectors (e.g., defence, healthcare) and more fluid environments (e.g., software startups).
- **Dynamic Calibration:** Research is required into the **dynamic calibration** of the framework. How should governance mechanisms adjust as AI capabilities evolve or as project complexity fluctuates during the lifecycle?
- **Ethical Co-Agency:** The concept of "shared responsibility" with an AI agent raises novel legal and ethical questions. Future research must explore accountability frameworks for decisions made within a symbiotic partnership.

5.0 CONCLUSION

The integration of artificial intelligence into project management is not merely a technological upgrade; it is an ontological shift in how projects are organized and governed. This article has argued that to harness the full potential of AI, organisations must abandon the mechanistic, command-and-control models of the past and embrace a governance philosophy suited to a living, adaptive organism.

Through a systematic synthesis of literature across AI applications, human-AI teaming, anticipatory governance, and complexity theory, we have illuminated the critical "absorption gap" that currently constrains progress—a gap quantified by the fact that 87% of organisations want AI to detect delivery risks early, yet only 16% have it (PM Symposium, 2026). The Adaptive Organism Governance (AOG) Framework presented here offers a structured response to this gap. By cultivating the four dimensions of Cognitive Augmentation, Collaborative Intelligence, Anticipatory Sensing, and Complexity Absorption, organisations can foster true human-AI symbiosis (Kate, 2025). Sustainable progress in project governance requires a deliberate shift toward frameworks that balance transparency with iterative adaptability. This study rejects the conceptualisation of projects as purely autonomous mechanistic entities; instead, it advocates for the cultivation of intelligent ecosystems characterized by the co-evolution of human ingenuity and algorithmic precision. Governing the adaptive organism with foresight charts a strategic trajectory for project management, one defined by resilience, sustained excellence, and an enduring capacity to thrive amid uncertainty.

Conflict of interest statement

The author declared that he has no competing interests.

Statement of authorship

The author has a responsibility for the conception and design of the study. The author has approved the final article.

Acknowledgments

I am grateful to two anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments on the earlier version of this paper.

References

- Boyd, E., Nykvist, B., Borgström, S., & Stacewicz, I. A. (2015). Anticipatory governance for social-ecological resilience. *Ambio*, 44(Suppl 1), 149-161.
- Braun, M., Greve, M., & Gnewuch, U. (2023). The new dream team? A review of human-AI collaboration research from a human teamwork perspective.
- Business Analysis (2025) 'Why Most Projects Still Fail (and What You're Probably Doing Wrong)', *Business Analysis*, 7 August. Available at: <https://www.business-analysis.com.au/why-most-projects-still-fail-and-what-youre-probably-doing-wrong/> (Accessed: 16 January 2026).
- CIO Dive (2026) 'Lack of oversight threatens AI pilots as spending falls under scrutiny', *CIO Dive*, 2 April. Available at: <https://www.ciodive.com/news/AI-oversight-budget-scrutiny-solved/816517/> (Accessed: 18 January 2026).
- Clark, A. (2023) 'Managing the edge of chaos', *Harrisburg University Research Review*. Available at: <https://www.harrisburgu.edu/research-review/>
- Communardo (2025) 'Why do projects fail in companies? The 8 most common mistakes in project management – and how to avoid them', *Silicon Saxony*, 18 June. Available at: <https://silicon-saxony.de/en/communardo-why-do-projects-fail-in-companies-the-8-most-common-mistakes-in-project-management-and-how-to-avoid-them/>
- de Vries, E.S., van den Brink, M.J. and Rietjens, S.J.H. (2023) 'An empirical analysis of governing techniques', *Cities*, 135, 104237.
- Enabulele, A.B.O., Ojo, D.A., Egwatu, J.O. and Thomas, G.A. (2025) 'AI-Augmented Agility: A Comprehensive Review of Generative AI Applications in Agile Project Management', *HAL Archives*. Available at: <https://hal.science/>
- Eshraghi, A. (2024) 'AI in Project Memory and Learning: But Not All Blueprints Are the Same', *ACIS 2024 Proceedings*. Available at: <https://aisel.aisnet.org/acis2024/>
- Fadel, M. (2024) 'Artificial intelligence in project management: challenges, opportunities, and future directions', *University of Balamand Thesis*. Available at: <https://www.balamand.edu.lb/>
- Hashfi, M. I., & Raharjo, T. (2023). Exploring the challenges and impacts of artificial intelligence implementation in project management: A systematic literature review. *International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications*, 14(9).
- HIVEMIND (2024) *Human-centred collaboratIVE Multi-agent framework for accelerating software Development and maintenance*, EU CORDIS Project 101189745. Available at: <https://cordis.europa.eu/project/id/101189745>
- Hosseini, A. (2024). Transforming Project Management with AI: Automation, Analytics, and Stakeholder Engagement. *PM World Journal*, 13(11), 1–12.
- Hu, Z., Wu, G., Zheng, J., Zhao, X., & Zuo, J. (2023). Unravelling effects of project complexity on project success and project management success: a meta-analytic review. *Journal of civil engineering and management*, 29(6), 542-560.
- Kate, A. (2025). Human-AI Symbiosis in Digital Project Management: Predictive Analytics for IT Governance and Strategic Agility. *Pre-print/Working Paper*, 30 October, 1–8.
- Kermanshachi, S., Nipa, T.J. & Dao, B. (2023) 'Development of complexity management strategies for construction projects', *Journal of Engineering, Design and Technology*, 21(4), 1123–1145.
- Lopez, J.B. (2024). Intelligent Project Tracking System', *Master's Thesis. Universidade do Porto*. Available at: <https://repositorio-aberto.up.pt/>
- ModelOp. (2025). ModelOp's 2025 AI Governance Benchmark Report Featured in AI News. *ModelOp Blog*, 12 June. Available at: <https://www.modelop.com/blog/modelops-2025-ai-governance-benchmark-report-featured-in-ai-news>
- Nenni, M.E., De Felice, F., De Luca, C. & Forcina, A. (2025). How artificial intelligence will transform project management in the age of digitization: a systematic literature review', *Management Review Quarterly*, 75, 1669–1716.
- PM Symposium (2026) 'AI in Project Management: From Reactive to Predictive – AI Agents That Detect Risk and Automate the Noise', *2026 PM Symposium*, University of Maryland. Available at: <https://pmsymposium.umd.edu/pm2026/session/ai-in-project-management-enjuweh/>
- PromptFluent (2026). Your Enterprise AI Governance Deserves a "Participation Trophy": And That's a Trillion-Dollar Problem. *PRNewswire*, 3 March. Available at: <https://au.finance.yahoo.com/news/enterprise-ai-governance-deserves-participation-190700216.html>

- Raftopoulos, M. & Hamari, J. (2023). Human-AI Collaboration in Organisations: a literature Review on Enabling Value Creation. *ECIS 2023 Proceedings*. Available at: <https://aisel.aisnet.org/ecis2023/>
- Responsible AI Foundation. (2026). Do Companies Care About AI Governance?, *Responsible AI Foundation*, 9 January. Available at: <https://www.responsibleaifoundation.com/>
- Salimimoghadam, S., Ghanbaripour, A., Tumpa, R.J., Rahimi, A.K., Golmoradi, M., Rashidian, S. and Skitmore, M. (2025). The Rise of Artificial Intelligence in Project Management: A Systematic Literature Review of Current Opportunities, Enablers, and Barriers. *Buildings*, 15(7), 1130.
- Sauer, C.R. & Burggräf, P. (2024). Hybrid intelligence – systematic approach and framework to determine the level of Human-AI collaboration for production management use cases. *Production Engineering*, 19, 525–541.
- Schmidt, K., Graßl, P. & Heinzl, A. (2023) 'Defining human-AI teaming the human-centered way: a scoping review and network analysis', *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*, 6, 1250725. doi: 10.3389/frai.2023.1250725.
- Simen, S.L.N., Philbin, S.P., Khanal, B. & Hunter, G. (2025). Towards intelligent project management in the finance sector: a scoping review of AI use cases. *15th International Conference on Intelligent Systems: Theories and Applications*, IEEE.
- Taboada, I., Daneshpajouh, A., Toledo, N. & de Vass, T. (2023). Artificial Intelligence Enabled Project Management: A Systematic Literature Review. *Applied Sciences*, 13(8), 5014.
- Tanguay, L., Herzog, L.M., Audet, R., Beisner, B.E., Martin, R. & Pahl-Wostl, C. (2023). Opportunities for and barriers to anticipatory governance of two lake social–ecological systems in Germany and Canada. *People and Nature*, 5(3), 911–928.
- WebProNews (2026) 'The 90 Percent Problem: Why Most Enterprise AI Projects Still Crash and Burn', *WebProNews*, 9 March. Available at: <https://www.webpronews.com/the-90-percent-problem-why-most-enterprise-ai-projects-still-crash-and-burn/>
- Xiao, Q., Hu, X.E., Whiting, M.E., Karunakaran, A., Shen, H. and Cao, H. (2025). AI Hasn't Fixed Teamwork, But It Shifted Collaborative Culture: A Longitudinal Study in a Project-Based Software Development Organisation (2023–2025). *arXiv preprint*, arXiv:2503.12345.
- Zercher, D., Jussupow, E. & Heinzl, A. (2023). When AI joins the Team: A Literature Review on Intragroup Processes and their Effect on Team Performance in Team-AI Collaboration. *ECIS 2023 Proceedings*. Available at: <https://aisel.aisnet.org/ecis2023/>