From Critical Path Volatility to AI-Augmented Earned Value Forecasting: Practical Lessons from Complex Projects [1]

Tauseef Naz Arshad

Abstract

Earned Value Management (EVM) and the Critical Path Method (CPM) remain central to project control practice. In complex engineering, procurement, and construction (EPC) and infrastructure projects, however, practitioners often observe that EVM-based forecasts remain optimistic well into execution, even as delivery risk continues to increase. This article argues that a key contributor to this behavior is critical path volatility, which is frequently present but rarely treated explicitly in forecasting logic. Based on practical industry experience, the article explains how repeated changes in critical path structure undermine core EVM assumptions. It then outlines how AI-augmented forecasting approaches can improve predictive reliability by incorporating schedule volatility signals alongside traditional performance metrics. The emphasis is practical, with the objective of improving forecast credibility, decision timing, and management confidence in live project control environments.

1. Introduction

Earned Value Management (EVM) and the Critical Path Method (CPM) have long formed the foundation of project performance monitoring. In relatively stable project environments, these techniques can provide reasonable visibility into cost and schedule outcomes. In large EPC and infrastructure programs, however, project control teams frequently encounter a different reality.

It is common for EVM indicators to remain stable for extended periods, creating an impression that delivery is broadly under control. Later in execution, forecasts can deteriorate rapidly, often at a point where schedule flexibility has already reduced, and recovery options are limited. This pattern is not always the result of optimistic reporting or weak controls. In many cases, it reflects a deeper structural issue within the schedule itself.

[1] How to cite this article: Arshad, T. N. (2026). From Critical Path Volatility to AI-Augmented Earned Value Forecasting: Practical Lessons from Complex Projects, *PM World Journal*, Vol. XV, Issue III, March.

One of the most significant contributing factors is critical path volatility. As execution progresses, the activities driving project completion can change repeatedly due to resequencing, late engineering information, procurement delays, or recovery actions. Traditional EVM forecasting methods, however, assume that schedule structure remains broadly stable and that past performance can be projected forward with limited adjustment. When these assumptions no longer hold, forecast accuracy degrades in a systematic way.

This article draws on practitioner experience to explain why critical path volatility undermines EVM forecasts and how AI-augmented approaches can help address this limitation in complex project environments.

2. Critical Path Volatility in Practice

In practical project control environments, critical path volatility is typically observed through a combination of factors, including:

- Frequent changes in the identity of the critical path between schedule updates
- Rapid expansion or contraction of near-critical activities
- Regular revisions to logic relationships
- The addition, removal, or reinterpretation of schedule constraints

From a planning perspective, these changes are often treated as routine replanning activities and may not be escalated as indicators of forecast risk. From a forecasting perspective, however, they signal that historical performance trends may be losing relevance.

When the critical path is unstable, progress achieved on activities that were previously critical may have limited influence on future delivery outcomes. Despite this, traditional EVM calculations continue to extrapolate past performance as if the underlying schedule logic were unchanged. Over time, this disconnect weakens the relationship between reported performance metrics and actual delivery risk.

3. Why Traditional EVM Forecasts Break Down in Complex Projects

Most deterministic Earned Value Management (EVM) forecasting approaches rely—either explicitly or implicitly—on a small set of foundational assumptions. In practice, these assumptions are often violated in complex EPC and infrastructure projects.

The three most critical assumptions are:

1. **The critical path remains relatively stable**
   EVM forecasts assume that the activities controlling project completion today will broadly remain the same in future reporting periods.
2. **Performance trends continue linearly**
   Metrics such as SPI, CPI, and derived forecasts assume that recent performance is a reliable predictor of future performance.
3. **Past progress remains representative of future delivery**
   Work completed to date is assumed to reflect the difficulty, sequencing, and risk profile of the remaining work.

In volatile schedules, **none of these assumptions consistently hold**.

In real project environments, the critical path frequently shifts due to resequencing, constructability changes, late engineering, procurement delays, or recovery-driven logic adjustments. When this happens, performance achieved on previously critical activities may no longer be relevant to the activities now driving completion risk.

As a result:

- **SPI and SPI(t) lose predictive strength**, because progress is measured against a moving structural baseline.
- **EAC projections become increasingly optimistic**, as historical trends are extrapolated onto a fundamentally different future workload.
- **Forecast confidence increases just as structural risk rises**, creating a dangerous illusion of control.

This explains a familiar pattern in many large projects: EVM indicators remain “on track” for months, only to deteriorate rapidly later in execution when recovery options are limited. The issue is not a failure of EVM as a concept, but the **absence of schedule-structure awareness** in how traditional forecasts are generated.

4. AI-Augmented EVM Forecasting: A Practitioner View

Artificial intelligence does not replace EVM. It **augments EVM by adding structural awareness**.

In applied project control environments, AI models can learn from historical project data how delivery outcomes were influenced not only by performance metrics, but also by **schedule instability**. Specifically, AI can identify recurring patterns linking forecast failure to indicators such as:

- **Critical path churn** (how often the controlling path changes)
- **Float erosion rates** across critical and near-critical activities
- **Resequencing frequency** driven by recovery or late information
- **Growth or contraction of near-critical activity sets**

These factors are well understood by experienced planners, but difficult to quantify consistently across large schedules and long execution periods. AI excels at detecting such multi-variable interactions across hundreds of updates and thousands of activities.

By combining these volatility indicators with traditional EVM metrics—such as SPI, CPI, SPI(t), and trend-based EAC calculations—AI-augmented models generate **adaptive, volatility-aware forecasts**. Instead of assuming structural stability, the forecast dynamically adjusts as the schedule logic evolves.

Importantly, this does not result in more complex reporting for management. The output remains familiar—completion dates, EAC ranges, confidence levels—but the underlying logic is more realistic. Forecasts become **less optimistic under high volatility** and **more reliable when stability improves**.

The outcome is not a sophisticated algorithm for its own sake, but a **forecast that better reflects delivery reality and supports earlier, more effective decision-making**.

5. Practical Benefits Observed in Live Project Control Environments

When volatility-aware forecasting is applied in live project environments, the most noticeable change is how early emerging problems become visible. In traditional settings, forecast discussions often focus on explaining why earlier projections were inaccurate. With volatility-aware approaches, the discussion shifts toward identifying risk while corrective options are still available.

One clear benefit is earlier identification of forecast bias. In unstable schedules, traditional EVM indicators can remain positive even as delivery risk increases. By recognising when structural instability is increasing faster than performance metrics can explain, AI-augmented forecasting allows project control teams to challenge optimistic projections earlier, before they become embedded in management expectations.

Another benefit is the reduction of false confidence associated with stable “green” indicators. Stable SPI and CPI values can mask repeated resequencing and logic changes. Explicitly accounting for critical path churn and float erosion provides a more balanced view of performance and helps distinguish genuine stability from temporary optimism.

From a governance perspective, forecast credibility improves. Executives and sponsors are often less concerned with precision than with reliability. Fewer late surprises strengthen confidence in the project control function and support more constructive engagement. Improved forecast timing also increases the likelihood that recovery actions are both feasible and cost-effective.

6. Key Lessons for Practitioners and Organizations

Experience from applying AI-augmented EVM forecasting highlights several important lessons.

Critical path stability deserves the same level of attention as traditional performance metrics. While planners understand the implications of resequencing and float erosion, these factors are rarely treated as direct inputs to forecasting models. Making volatility measurable is a necessary step toward improving forecast reliability.

EVM should be viewed as part of a broader forecasting system rather than a standalone solution. It provides valuable insight, but without structural context its predictive capability is limited in volatile environments. AI can augment, rather than replace, established practices.

The value of AI lies in integrating multiple weak signals rather than overriding professional judgement. Successful implementations support experienced practitioners by highlighting patterns that are difficult to identify manually. Finally, improving forecast quality also requires cultural change. Predictive control depends on a willingness to question optimistic trends and act earlier than traditional reporting cycles may encourage.

7. Conclusion

Critical path volatility is one of the most influential yet least explicitly managed factors affecting forecast reliability in complex projects. In large EPC and infrastructure environments, schedules rarely remain stable long enough for traditional EVM forecasting assumptions to hold. When critical paths shift repeatedly and near-critical activity sets expand, deterministic forecasts lose their connection to delivery reality, even when performance indicators appear positive.

This pattern does not reflect a failure of Earned Value Management, but a limitation in how it is commonly applied. EVM was not designed to interpret evolving schedule structures. When volatility is ignored, forecasts can become increasingly optimistic at the same time that risk is rising.

Integrating schedule volatility awareness through applied AI offers a practical way forward. By learning how structural instability has influenced outcomes in the past, AI-augmented forecasting restores context to performance metrics and produces forecasts that adapt as execution reality changes. The required data already exists within schedules and performance reports. What is needed is a shift in mindset, from static extrapolation to responsive forecasting.

For organizations seeking better decision support, the objective is not perfect prediction, but earlier and more reliable insight. When volatility is recognised and incorporated into forecasting logic, management gains time to intervene, re-sequence intelligently, and protect project value before options disappear.

References

1. Project Management Institute (PMI). *Practice Standard for Scheduling*. Second Edition. Project Management Institute, Newtown Square, Pennsylvania, USA, 2019.
2. Project Management Institute (PMI). *Practice Standard for Earned Value Management*. Second Edition. Project Management Institute, Newtown Square, Pennsylvania, USA, 2011.
3. Vanhoucke, M. *Measuring Time: Improving Project Performance through Earned Value Management*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Germany, 2014.
4. Fleming, Q. W., and Koppelman, J. M. *Earned Value Project Management*. Fourth Edition. Project Management Institute, Newtown Square, Pennsylvania, USA, 2016.

5. Williams, T. *Modeling Complex Projects*. John Wiley & Sons, Chichester, United Kingdom, 2002.
6. Geraldi, J., Maylor, H., and Williams, T. "Understanding and managing complexity in projects." *International Journal of Project Management*, Vol. 29, No. 7, pp. 966–981, 2011.
7. Flyvbjerg, B. "Survival of the unfittest: Why major infrastructure projects fail." *Harvard Business Review*, September 2014.
8. Kim, S., Kang, L., and Hwang, B. "Predicting project performance under uncertainty using machine learning techniques." *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, ASCE, Vol. 146, No. 3, 2020.
9. Chou, J. S., and Yang, J. G. "Development of an early-warning system for construction project cost and schedule control using machine learning." *Automation in Construction*, Vol. 21, pp. 130–139, 2012.
10. Cheng, M. Y., and Wu, Y. W. "Forecasting construction project performance using evolutionary support vector machines." *Automation in Construction*, Vol. 18, No. 5, pp. 597–604, 2009.
11. Lee, J., Kao, H. A., and Yang, S. "Service innovation and intelligent analytics in the era of Industry 4.0." *Procedia CIRP*, Vol. 16, pp. 3–8, 2014.
12. Jardine, A. K. S., Lin, D., and Banjevic, D. "A review of machinery condition monitoring and prognostics." *Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing*, Vol. 20, No. 7, pp. 1483–1510, 2006.
13. Kerzner, H. *Project Management: A Systems Approach to Planning, Scheduling, and Controlling*. Twelfth Edition. John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken, New Jersey, USA, 2017.
14. Christensen, C. M. *The Innovator's Dilemma: When New Technologies Cause Great Firms to Fail*. Harvard Business School Press, Boston, Massachusetts, USA, 1997.
15. Arshad, T. N. "From deterministic schedules to AI-enabled forecasting: Practical insights from large EPC projects." *PM World Journal*, advisory article, under review / submitted.

Statement on use of AI

The technical concepts, ideas, analysis, and professional viewpoints presented in the article are entirely the author's own and based on his engineering and project controls experience. The author made limited use of AI tools purely for drafting support, such as improving language clarity and grammar.

About the Author

Tauseef Naz Arshad

Reading- United Kingdom

Tauseef Naz Arshad (PMP, RMP, PMI-SP, ACP, PgMP, PfMP) is a senior project planning and project controls professional with over twenty years of experience delivering large-scale Engineering, Procurement, and Construction (EPC) programs across complex industrial and infrastructure environments. His work focuses on the practical integration of advanced analytics, artificial intelligence, and digital technologies into project scheduling, forecasting, and executive decision support. He has led planning and project controls functions on major EPC projects and continues to explore data-driven approaches that bridge established industry practices with emerging digital capabilities. Mr. Arshad can be contacted at tauseefnaz@gmail.com