Minnesota Journal of Business Law and Entrepreneurship
Volume 2026, No. 1
ISSN: 1540-3270

Beyond Predictive Models: Adaptive Frameworks for Sustainable AI–Cloud Implementation

Abhinav Kishore Ghosh[1], S. Shyam Prasad[2]

1 Research Scholar at International School of Management Excellence, Bangalore, India

2 Professor, at International School of Management Excellence, Bangalore, India

Abstract

This review assesses the efficacy of various project management frameworks for integrating AI within cloud ecosystems. By contrasting the constraints of traditional predictive methods with adaptive models like Agile, DevOps, MLOps, and Kanban, the study highlights critical design pillars and persistent governance gaps. The analysis culminates in a recommendation for principle-based, hybrid frameworks that balance rapid experimentation with long-term operational risk management.

Keywords: recommendation, experimentation, frameworks

1.0 Introduction

1.1 The Convergence of AI and Cloud Computing

Cloud-based platforms have become the new reality of the modern AI: they offer elastic compute, data services, and a channel of global deployment that are the reasons why large models and data-intensive pipelines are now a viable part of enterprise-scale AI (Velaga et al., 2025). This convergence makes it possible to run experiments to production faster, deploy hybrids, and pay-as-you-go model inference - changing AI to more than a research artefact, or a series of research artefacts into in-service delivery of business capabilities.

1.2 The Unique Challenge of Integrated Implementation

The gap between models and cloud services induces technical and organisational tension: data gravity and its governance (who owns, moves, and secures datasets), heterogeneity of cloud services (portability), as well as model reproducibility remain a constant challenge. Multi-cloud solutions and hybrid environments add complexity to interoperability and put cost-optimisation and compliance concerns beyond the capabilities of simple lift-and-shift solutions (Kumar, 2024). Such technical limitations are augmented with new issues of observability, traceability, and lifecycle management of the models after they are deployed.

1.3 The Project Management Imperative: Beyond Technical Deployment

The management of the successful AI-cloud delivery will involve the transition of the project management beyond milestone monitoring to the continuing governance: the integration of the MLOps practices, cross-functional stakeholders (data engineers, security, legal, product) alignment, and model lifecycle, ethical risk, and cost governance as the first-class project deliverables. Project leads will need to strike a balance between an adaptive delivery (rapid experimentation) and sound production controls (SLAs, auditability, rollback) (Amrit & Narayanappa, 2024). The emerging literature suggests that PM functions are going to develop to organise these interdisciplinary functions instead of being just supervisors in passing along technical handovers.

1.4 Objectives and Scope of this Review

- To critically evaluate the limitations of traditional project management frameworks when applied to integrated AI–cloud implementation projects.
- To analyse emerging and hybrid project management approaches (including Agile, DevOps, and MLOps) that address the dynamic and uncertain nature of AI–cloud systems.

- To propose key principles and recommendations for designing adaptive project management frameworks that support effective, scalable, and sustainable AI–cloud integration.

Scope

This review examines and synthesises project management frameworks and hybrid approaches used for the integrated implementation of artificial intelligence systems within cloud computing environments, with a focus on governance, delivery, and organisational alignment.

2.0 The Complex Terrain: Why Traditional Frameworks Stumble

2.1 The Nature of AI Development: Experimentation, Uncertainty, and Data Dependencies

The nature of AI projects is strictly experimental: results are discovered through hypothesis testing (model architectures, features, labels) instead of a specific engineering procedure, which introduces the nature of scope, schedule, and outcome predictions with inherent uncertainty (Eken et al., 2024). This experimental nature presents two feasible project management issues. First, since the performance of a model is an unknown unknown, there is a high probability that more time and resource-intensive data engineering processes are necessary to support data collection, cleaning, augmentation, and labelling pipeline, which has become a crucial path activity, which is often longer and more resource-intensive than training the model itself (Fakour et al., 2024). Second, due to the heavy reliance of modern AI on high-quality, well-labelled, and representative datasets, data engineering has become a critical path process: data collection, cleaning, augmentation, and labelling pipelines can be more time-consuming and resource-intensive (N, 2024). Project managers should then measure the progress not just by the code commits or sprint velocity but by indices of data quality, statistics on the coverage of datasets and the model-level uncertainty (calibration, confidence intervals). By integrating such metrics as stage-gates, it is possible to make forecasts more realistic and terminate unproductive experiments earlier to allocate the budget to more valuable work.

2.2 The Dynamic Cloud Environment: Elasticity, Services, and Continuous Evolution

Cloud services offer elastic compute, managed storage, and specialised services (e.g., managed model hosting, feature stores, inference accelerators) that enable AI to be economically viable at scale; although, it also comes with variability in the cost, latency, and behaviour across environments (Hasan et al., 2025). The cloud ecosystem is changing very quickly - there are new types of instances, accelerators (A100-H100 style steps), managed databases and serverless services becoming commonplace - so the architecture adopted by a project can become functionally obsolete in a few months. This is a source of procurement and technical-debt risk: by becoming locked-in to certain cloud vendor service offerings, one can develop faster, but less portable, and adopting a multi-cloud strategy results in more complexity in integration and orchestration (and in most cases, operational overhead) (Hays, 2026). Project governance therefore, has to plan a constant change of the platform: encompass cloud-cost prediction, delimited portability layers (abstraction or containerisation), and legal rollback/upgrade directions of runtime environments (Karuppiah, 2026). Viewing cloud configuration, infra-as-code, and cost engineering as continuous deliverables rather than a one-off activity can be used to balance between short-term delivery and medium-term maintainability.

2.3 The Integration Quagmire: Connecting AI Models to Enterprise Systems and Workflows

The implementation of AI into the enterprise processes is hardly a drop-in thing. Actual systems reveal non-homogeneous data structures, old-fashioned APIs, occasional frameworks, and administration boundaries (privacy, conformity). The output of the AI has to be interpretable, auditable, and must be mapped into the pre-existing SLAs and transactional flows; otherwise, the solutions will simply provide brittle points that can never be sustained (Mhaskey, 2024). In practice, the work of integration provides insights into the dependencies that were hidden: identity and access patterns, latency tolerances of data, semantics of error handling and human-in-the-loop boundaries of decision making (Giuliani, 2025). Proposals in the industry (e.g. Model Context Protocols / standardised context layers) are trying to establish composable interfaces between AI agents and enterprise tools to avoid burnt glue code and enhance auditability, foreshadowing that interface-level standardisation is an increasingly plausible mitigation strategy.

2.4 Contrasting Philosophies: Predictive versus Adaptive Project Governance

Conventional predictive governance (waterfall, fixed scope, contractually obligated deliverables) presupposes predictable requirements and minimal uncertainty, which is hardly a reality in AI-cloud projects. Between adaptive governance (Agile, Lean, hypothesis-driven development) and a more traditional approach to project development, the latter is more suited to the iterative experimentation and platform volatility inherent to such projects, through the focus on short feedback loops, regular stakeholder validation and quick reprioritisation (Kadenic & Tambo, 2023). Adaptive approaches, however, are not enough: predictive modelling focuses on production-grade controls (versioning, audit trails, reproducibility, security) that are necessary in AI in production. The working proposal revealed in the literature and practice is hybrid governance: predictively (data governance, SLAs, regulatory requirements) structure strategic, compliance, and architectural constraints, and implement delivery and research work in an adaptive way (sprints, experiments, retraining schedules) (Leon, 2026). This bifurcated mode of governance sees both stability and innovation as complementary objectives and institutionalises handoffs (and artefacts they share) between the two.

3.0 Evolving Frameworks and Hybrid Approaches_750

3.1 Agile and Scrum Adaptations

The use of Agile and Scrum models in AI-cloud projects has become very popular because of their ability to cope with uncertainty, frequent development, and fast change. Development of AI is experimental in nature, and the results obtained rely on the quality of data, the choice of the model, and continuous tuning. Consequently, there is a growing adoption of Agile practices in the sense that the goals of sprints are based on learning outcomes, e.g., validating datasets or measuring model viability, as opposed to delivering fixed features. It has been determined that regular sprint reviews and retrospectives promote the ongoing review of the assumptions and facilitate quick reprioritisation due to the empirical findings (Geraldi et al., 2025). Nevertheless, classical Scrum artefacts usually need to be changed. Product backlogs should contain the data acquisition, data preparation, and data validation tasks, and the definitions of the done should be expanded to contain the model accuracy, model robustness, model explainability, and adherence to ethics (Balagopalan et al., 2023). Devoid of these adaptations, Agile will turn into unregulated experimentation. As such, the Agile-Scrum methodologies in the context of AI-cloud need governance overlays to support traceability, accountability, and alignment with organisational goals.

3.2 DevOps and MLOps Integration

DevOps has been adopted as a core model to operate AI systems in the cloud through the encouragement of automation, continuous integration, and close cooperation of the development team and operations team. Having been expanded into MLOps, these principles directly deal with the entire AI lifecycle, like data versioning, model training, deployment, monitoring, and retraining. Empirical research also suggests that MLOps can be used to mitigate the deviation between the development and deployment of a model, as it guarantees reproducibility and operational safety (John et al., 2026). DevOps and MLOps change the governance system of a project management approach whereby stage-gate control gives way to continuous oversight, which is achieved through automated testing, monitoring, and performance measures. Quality assurance gets fixed in pipelines and does not depend on manual approvals. However, organisations are often faced with the issues of disjointed tool setting, a lack of skills, and cross-data science, cloud engineering, and security coordination (Pantiris et al., 2025). These results imply that, to successfully manage AI-cloud projects, project managers need to acquire technical fluency and coordination skills.

3.3 The Kanban Application for Continuous Flow

Kanban has become relevant to AI-cloud projects due to its interest in visualising of workflow, limiting work-in-progress, and streamlining delivery. Activities of the AI system, including cleaning the data, engineering features, and optimising models, are highly variable in terms of their duration and predictability; the time-boxed methods fail to be effective. The pull-based system of Kanban enables the teams to dynamically prioritise the work and react swiftly to the emergent bottlenecks (Salkoski et al., 2023). The recent research shows that Kanban can be effective in post-deployment AI operations, where the constant monitoring, retraining, and optimisation of performance are needed. Kanban aids gradual enhancement and stability in the operational processes through the visualization of bottlenecks in lines of data and implementation activities. Nevertheless, Kanban offers less support in terms of long-term planning and stakeholder involvement, which makes it less suitable in the case of large-scale or heavily regulated AI programmes (Saklamaeva & Pavlič, 2023). As a result, Kanban is best suited for a more sophisticated level of governance or planning.

3.4 Hybrid Framework Constructs

The shortcomings of single-framework models prompt the application of hybrid project management models to promote the implementation of AI-cloud as a hybrid. Hybrid systems consist of predictive components: upfront architectural design, data governance, and regulatory compliance, and adaptive delivery mechanisms inspired by Agile, DevOps, MLOps, and Kanban (Reda et al., 2025). This multi-layered solution can allow organisations to balance the risks and compliance, as well as ensure the flexibility of AI experiments. According to the recent literature, hybrid frameworks improve the scalability of the framework because they standardise governance at the strategic level and permit contextual adaptation at the team level (Bozkurt et al., 2025). Coordination complexity, role ambiguity, and more capability are also, however, brought about by hybrid models. These difficulties demonstrate the necessity of specialised training and organisational maturity to achieve successful adoption. Hybrid and evolving structures are a realistic answer to the challenge of AI-cloud projects that allow organisations to balance experiments, continuous delivery, and governance in a single project management strategy.

4.0 Core Pillars for Effective Framework Design

4.1 Stakeholder Alignment and Communication

Stakeholder Group	Primary Interests & Expectations	Key Risks if Misaligned	Recommended Communication Mechanisms
Data Scientists	Model accuracy, data quality, experimentation freedom	Poor model performance, rework due to unclear objectives	Sprint reviews, model performance dashboards, experimentation logs
Cloud Architects	Scalability, reliability, cost optimisation, security	Inefficient infrastructure, cost overruns, vendor lock-in	Architecture review boards, infrastructure roadmaps
Business Leaders	Strategic value, ROI, competitive advantage	Low adoption, unclear value proposition	Executive briefings, value-based KPIs, decision dashboards
Compliance & Legal Officers	Regulatory compliance, data privacy, ethical AI	Legal exposure, reputational damage	Governance checkpoints, compliance reports, audit trails
End Users / Operational Teams	Usability, trust, system reliability	Resistance to adoption, workarounds	User testing sessions, feedback loops, training workshops
Project Managers	Schedule, coordination, risk control, alignment	Fragmented delivery, decision delays	Integrated project dashboards, cross-functional stand-ups

Table 1: Stakeholder Alignment and Communication in AI–Cloud Projects

The ability to align the stakeholders effectively is one of the key pillars of AI-cloud project frameworks because the interdisciplinary and cross-organisational character of these initiatives makes that necessity. In comparison to conventional IT projects, AI-cloud projects have a wide range of stakeholders, such as data scientists, cloud architects, business leaders, compliance officers, and end users. All group has varying expectations on performance, risk, ethics, and value creation. According to research, the main reason for the failure of AI projects is the misalignment of stakeholders, which in most cases leads to a poor definition of objectives or poor organisational adoption (Westenberger et al., 2022). There should be continuous and open communication systems, including regular review forums, shared artefacts, and data-feeding dashboards, thus being imperative. Adaptive frameworks focus on continuous feedback loops that allow stakeholders to re-assess priorities as technical insights are generated so that AI capabilities can stay in touch with strategic and operational objectives.

4.2 Risk Management in a Novel Landscape

The AI-cloud projects have not only the common risk concerns (cost, schedule, and scope) but also bear the risk of data, model bias, ethical, cybersecurity, and regulatory compliance. The probability of the AI output and the dynamical structure of the cloud setup create new types of unpredictable situations that cannot be predicted with the help of traditional risk registers. Recent research emphasises the necessity of continuous risk identification and reduction instead of a single initial evaluation (Iversen et al., 2023). Good structures inculcate risk management processes within delivery pipelines by the use of automated testing, monitoring, and governance controls. Validation of models, bias audits, and detection of performance drift can be used to identify risks as they happen and solve them in a series of iterative methods (Davis et al., 2020). This embedded risk governance is a transition to a reactive control over a proactive assurance in the AI-cloud project settings.

4.3 Team Structure and Capability Development

The AI-cloud projects need a hybrid team structure that includes experts in technical, analytical, and managerial skills. The cross-functional teams of data scientists, machine learning engineers, cloud experts, security experts, and project managers are replacing the conventional functional silos. According to literature, this kind of integrated team improves coordination, decreasing the time of handover and decision-making in complicated environments of delivery (Dietl et al., 2023).

4.4 Measurement of Progress and Success

However, there are still capability gaps that are a great obstacle. Project managers will not have enough knowledge about AI lifecycles or cloud architecture, whereas technical specialists will be exposed to little governance and stakeholder management. Good structures, thus, focus more on the ongoing development of capabilities as a result of training, role ambiguity, and shared responsibility paradigms (Prasetyo et al., 2024). The importance of investing in interdisciplinary capabilities is becoming an important facilitator of sustainable AI-cloud delivery. The fourth step in the PRINCE2 method seeks to help the project team determine the milestones that have been achieved. The metrics used in the measurement of progress in AI-cloud projects must go beyond the traditional schedule metrics and budget metrics. Since the development of AI is experimental, the advancement can be evaluated based on the learning velocity, data preparedness, and model performance, which include the parameters of accuracy, robustness, and reliability. Scalability, cost efficiency, and system availability are also cloud-specific metrics that focus on the measurement of success (Alharthi et al., 2024). Recent studies support multi-dimensional performance models that are based on technical, operational, and business indicators. These are return on AI investment, user adoption rates, and compliance outcomes in addition to traditional project KPIs. Having measurement systems aligned with experimentation as well as production goals can enable organisations to gain more transparency and informed decision-making across the AI-cloud lifecycle.

5.0 Persistent Challenges and Emerging Gaps

5.1 Governing the Entire AI Model Lifecycle within Project Boundaries

One of the ongoing issues in AI-cloud projects is the control of the entire AI model lifecycle that falls within the traditional project scope. Conventional project management presupposes an apparent final point of delivery, whereas AI models are upgraded at the post-deployment stage by retraining, monitoring, and optimisation. This introduces confusion on accountability, ownership, and the criteria of success to a project when the project has officially ended. Recent research notes that poor lifecycle governance causes uncontrolled model drift, ethical risks, and poor performance over time (Patchipala, 2023). Lack of clear statement transition mechanisms between project delivery and operational stewardship is a major gap in current frameworks.

5.2 Balancing Innovation Velocity with Robust Production Stability

The AI-cloud projects will have to strike a balance between fast experimentation and the necessity of stable and reliable production systems. The high velocity of innovation is essential to the improvement of the model and the competitive advantage, but changes that are made too often raise operational risks and diminish user confidence. The studies have shown that companies tend to focus on rapid development and underestimate the complexity of AI systems stabilisation in the production setting (Khogali & Mekid, 2023). Such tension reveals weaknesses of both predictive and adaptive frameworks. Agile and MLOps practices encourage experimentation and might not offer enough protection to mission-critical deployments. On the other hand, strict systems of governance are capable of depressing innovation. The issue is to develop mechanisms of governance that will permit controlled experimentation and implement reliability, auditability, and compliance requirements.

5.3 The Tooling Ecosystem: Integration of Disparate Platforms

The ecosystem of AI-cloud tooling is very fragmented and consists of different data management platforms, model development platforms, deployment platforms, monitoring platforms, and governance. The technicality and the organisational necessity of integrating these tools into a coherent delivery pipeline is always a demanding problem. Literature identifies the presence of inadequate interoperability between tools as a common cause of duplication of work, technical debts, and a lack of transparency throughout the project lifecycle (Moreschini et al., 2025). Although there has been an advancement in automation and standard interfaces, most organisations still have custom integrations, which are not easy to scale or reuse. Current project management paradigms often fail to acknowledge this complexity, and there is a discrepancy between theory and the realities of implementation.

5.4 Standardisation and Knowledge Transfer Across the Organisation

The other gap that is emerging is related to standardisation and knowledge transfer among AI-cloud projects. The novelty of AI technologies and their rapid evolution often result in localised practices that the teams produce, which are not well documented and cannot be replicated. This restricts the learning in organisations and causes repetitive inefficiency within projects (Beste, 2021). There are no specific ways of integrating and disseminating lessons learned, which limits the development of capabilities, especially among project managers and non-technical stakeholders. The effective frameworks should, therefore, incorporate standardisation, documentation, and cross-project learning into the governance structures instead of considering it as an optional activity.

6.0 Recommendations and Future Directions_200

6.1 Towards a Principle-Based, Not Prescriptive, Approach

The structure of project management on AI-cloud implementation in the future must shift towards principle-driven approaches, rather than strict prescriptive approaches. Due to the uncertainty, experimentation, and high rate of technological change in AI systems, prescriptions of the process become too detailed and usually outdated or limiting. Recent studies promote guiding principles, which include transparency, adaptability, accountability, and continuous learning, which enable the teams to adapt the practices to the context and still retain the integrity of governance (Balasubramaniam et al., 2023). A principle-oriented model allows the consistency of projects without restricting innovation or responsiveness.

6.2 The Need for Adaptive Governance Models

To achieve a trade-off between experimentation and control in AI-cloud projects, adaptive governance models are crucial. The conventional stage-gate governance is poorly adapted to AI strategies, which are typified by repetitive model refinement and changing data relationships. Modern research proposes the hybrid models of governance, which incorporate adaptive delivery systems with a clear oversight of ethics, security, and compliance

(McKinsey & Company, 2024). These models enable the governance intensity to be different at the development, deployment, and operational stages, enhancing agility and risk management.

6.3 Investing in Integrated Toolchains and Platforms

The organisations are advised to invest more in integrated AI-cloud toolchains, which will help in end-to-end lifecycle management, such as data handling, model development, deployment, monitoring, and governance. Tools environments that are fragmented are composed of complexity, technical debt, and the costs of coordination. Studies indicate that those platforms that are integrated enhance traceability, reproducibility, and cross-team working, thus boosting predictability and scaling of the project (Khan et al., 2022). Interoperable platforms' strategic investments are thus a fundamental facilitator of sustainable AI implementations.

6.4 Developing Specialised Project Management Training and Certification

Specialisation training and certification of project managers in AI-cloud situations is also a requirement. Traditional project management education tends not to cover AI lifecycles, data governance, MLOps, and ethical risk management. As per the recent literature, the development of capability in the mentioned areas can enhance the outcomes of delivery and the confidence of stakeholders significantly.

7.0 Conclusion

The review has explored the increasing complexity of integrated AI-cloud implementation and constraints of classical project management models to its experimental, data-driven, and ever-changing character. It has demonstrated that even Agile, DevOps, MLOps, and Kanban provide useful processes to adaptability and continuous delivery, no one is effective enough on its own. The analysis points to the necessity of hybrid and principle-based frameworks that are sustained by adaptive governance, built-in toolchains, and special capabilities. These strategies are key to balancing innovation, risk, and long-term operational sustainability of the AI-cloud project.

References

[1] Alharthi, S., Alshamsi, A., Alseiari, A., & Alwarafy, A. (2024). Auto-Scaling Techniques in Cloud Computing: Issues and Research Directions. *Sensors*, *24*(17), 5551. https://doi.org/10.3390/s24175551

[2] Amrit, C., & Narayanappa, A. K. (2024). An analysis of the challenges in the adoption of MLOps. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, *10*(1), 100637. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2024.100637

[3] Balagopalan, A., Madras, D., Yang, D., Hadfield-Menell, D., Hadfield, G. K., & Ghassemi, M. (2023). Judging facts, judging norms: Training machine learning models to judge humans requires a modified approach to labeling data. *Science Advances*, *9*(19). https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.abq0701

[4] Balasubramaniam, N., Kauppinen, M., Rannisto, A., Hiekkanen, K., & Kujala, S. (2023). Transparency and Explainability of AI Systems: From Ethical Guidelines to Requirements. *Information and Software Technology*, *159*(159), 107197. Sciencedirect. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0950584923000514

[5] Beste, T. (2021). Knowledge Transfer in a Project-Based Organization Through Microlearning on Cost-Efficiency. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *59*(2), 002188632110330. https://doi.org/10.1177/00218863211033096

[6] Bozkurt, Y., Rossmann, A., Pervez, Z., & Ramzan, N. (2025). Assessing data governance models for smart cities: Benchmarking data governance models on the basis of European urban requirements. *Sustainable Cities and Society*, *130*, 106528. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2025.106528

[7] Davis, S. E., Greevy, R. A., Lasko, T. A., Walsh, C. G., & Matheny, M. E. (2020). Detection of calibration drift in clinical prediction models to inform model updating. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*, *112*, 103611. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbi.2020.103611

[8] Dietl, J. E., Derksen, C., Keller, F. M., & Lippke, S. (2023). Interdisciplinary and Interprofessional Communication intervention: How Psychological Safety Fosters Communication and Increases Patient Safety. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *14*(14). https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1164288

[9] Eken, B., Pallewatta, S., Tran, N. K., Tosun, A., & Babar, M. A. (2024). A Multivocal Review of MLOps Practices, Challenges and Open Issues. *ArXiv (Cornell University)*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2406.09737

[10] Fakour, F., Mosleh, A., & Ramezani, R. (2024). *A Structured Review of Literature on Uncertainty in Machine Learning & Deep Learning*. ArXiv.org. https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.00332

[11] Geraldi, J., Stjerne, I., & Wenzel, M. (2025). Projectification without projects? Theorizing temporal structures of agile-based organizing. *International Journal of Project Management*, *43*(8), 102786. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2025.102786

[12] Giuliani, F. (2025, September 23). *The 4 most critical aspects of model context protocol (MCP) for developers building AI-native architectures*. TechRadar. https://www.techradar.com/pro/the-4-most-critical-aspects-of-model-context-protocol-mcp-for-developers-building-ai-native-architectures

[13] Hasan, Md. M., Sultana, T., Hossain, Md. D., Mandal, A. K., Ngo, T.-T., Lee, G.-W., & Huh, E.-N. (2025). The journey to cloud as a continuum: Opportunities, challenges, and research directions. *ICT Express*, *11*(4). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.icte.2025.04.015

[14] Hays, H. (2026). Encyclopedia of Large Language Models and Foundation Models. *ResearchGate*. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18261143

[15] Iversen, I., Flage, R., & Aven, T. (2023). Extending and improving current frameworks for risk management and decision-making: A new approach for incorporating dynamic aspects of risk and uncertainty. *Safety Science*, *168*, 106317. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2023.106317

[16] John, stephen, ntentos, evangelos, & zdun, uwe. (2026). MLOps Pipeline Generation for Reinforcement Learning: A Low-Code Approach Using Large Language Models. *Journal of Systems and Software*, *235*, 112760–112760. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jss.2025.112760

[17] Kadenic, M. D., & Tambo, T. (2023). Resilience of Operating models: Exploring the Potential of Agile Project Management as Enabler. *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business*, *16*(3). https://doi.org/10.1108/ijmpb-05-2022-0122

[18] Karuppiah, S. (2026, January 16). *Strategic Program Management in API-Driven Enterprises for Agile Delivery and Cloud Transformation V Strategic Program Management in API- Driven Enterprises for Agile Delivery and Cloud Transformation*. ResearchGate. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/399832370_Strategic_Program_Management_in_API-Driven_Enterprises_for_Agile_Delivery_and_Cloud_Transformation_V_Strategic_Program_Management_in_API-_Driven_Enterprises_for_Agile_Delivery_and_Cloud_Transformation

[19] Khan, M., Parvaiz, G. S., Dedahanov, A. T., Abdurazzakov, O. S., & Rakhmonov, D. A. (2022). The Impact of Technologies of Traceability and Transparency in Supply Chains. *Sustainability*, *14*(24), 16336. https://doi.org/10.3390/su142416336

[20] Khogali, H. O., & Mekid, S. (2023). The blended future of automation and AI: Examining some long-term societal and ethical impact features. *Technology in Society*, *73*(1). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2023.102232

[21] Kumar, B. (2024, September 30). *Challenges and Solutions for Integrating AI with Multi-Cloud Architectures*. ResearchGate. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/384467392_Challenges_and_Solutions_for_Integrating_AI_with_Multi-Cloud_Architectures

[22] Leon, M. (2026). Lifecycle-Based Governance to Build Reliable Ethical AI Systems. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science*. https://doi.org/10.1002/sres.70014

[23] McKinsey & Company. (2024). *Beyond the hype: Capturing the potential of AI and gen AI in tech, media, and telecom*. https://www.mckinsey.com/~/media/mckinsey/industries/technology%20media%20and%20telecommunications/high%20tech/our%20insights/beyond%20the%20hype%20capturing%20the%20potential%20of%20ai%20and%20gen%20ai%20in%20tmt/beyond-the-hype-capturing-the-potential-of-ai-and-gen-ai-in-tmt.pdf

[24] Mhaskey, S. V. (2024). Integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Systems: Opportunities, Challenges, and Implications. *International Journal of Computer Engineering in Research Trends*, *11*(12). https://doi.org/10.22362/ijcert/2024/v11/i12/v11i1201

[25] Moreschini, S., Arvanitou, E., Kanidou, E.-P., Nikolaidis, N., Su, R., Ampatzoglou, A., Chatzigeorgiou, A., & Lenarduzzi, V. (2025). The Evolution of Technical Debt from DevOps to Generative AI: A multivocal literature review. *Journal of Systems and Software*, *231*, 112599–112599. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jss.2025.112599

[26] N, N. (2024). A COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF AI'S DEPENDENCE ON DATA. *ResearchGate*, *1*(1). https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.27033.63840

[27] Pantiris, P., Pallis, P. L., T, C., Panos, & Dasaklis, T. K. (2025). Enhancing Coordination and Decision Making in Humanitarian Logistics Through Artificial Intelligence: A Grounded Theory Approach. *Logistics*, *9*(3), 113. https://doi.org/10.3390/logistics9030113

[28] Patchipala, S. G. (2023). Tackling data and model drift in AI: Strategies for maintaining accuracy during ML model inference. *International Journal of Science and Research Archive*, *10*(2), 1198–1209. https://doi.org/10.30574/ijsra.2023.10.2.0855

[29] Prasetyo, M. L., Peranginangin, R. A., Martinovic, N., Ichsan, M., & Wicaksono, H. (2024). Artificial intelligence in open innovation project management: A systematic literature review on technologies, applications, and integration requirements. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, *11*(1), 100445. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joitmc.2024.100445

[30] Reda, A., Taie, S. A., & Shaheen, M. E. (2025). Hybrid MLOps framework for automated lifecycle management of adaptive phishing detection models. *Scientific Reports*, *15*(1). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-025-23600-z

[31] Saklamaeva, V., & Pavlič, L. (2023). The Potential of AI-Driven Assistants in Scaled Agile Software Development. *Applied Sciences*, *14*(1), 319–319. https://doi.org/10.3390/app14010319

[32] Salkoski, R., Shikoski, B., & Kanevche, J. (2023). Differences in Productivity with Scrum and Kanban: A Comparative Study. *International Congress on Natural, Health Sciences and Technology*. https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.24201654

[33] Velaga, K. S., Guo, Y., & Yu, W. (2025). Edge AI for Smart Cities: Foundations, Challenges, and Opportunities. *Smart Cities*, *8*(6), 211. https://doi.org/10.3390/smartcities8060211

[34] Westenberger, J., Schuler, K., & Schlegel, D. (2022). Failure of AI projects: understanding the critical factors. *Procedia Computer Science*, *196*(1), 69–76. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2021.11.074