

www.pipelinepub.com
Volume 22, Issue 12

AI Infrastructure's Biggest Bottleneck Isn't Power - It’s Delivery

By: Dr. Atif Ansar

If you ask almost anyone what is holding back AI infrastructure, the answer is immediate: power.



Grid capacity. Utility connections. Transmission. Permitting.

These challenges have come to dominate conversations about AI infrastructure, shaping investment decisions, development strategies, and public policy alike. Yet an important question often goes unasked. What happens after a project secures power?

Across the industry, projects with financing in place, planning approvals secured, customers committed, and power allocated are still failing to come online when expected. For AI data center leaders, the biggest risk today is not getting power, but failing to convert approved, powered projects into revenue-generating capacity on time.

As investment in AI infrastructure accelerates, delivery itself is emerging as one of the industry's biggest constraints. Understanding why requires looking at AI infrastructure through a different lens.

The Two Phases of AI Infrastructure: Securing Power vs Delivering Capacity

The AI infrastructure challenge is no longer defined by a single constraint. It can be understood in two distinct phases. The first is securing the conditions to build. That includes obtaining power, financing,

Not for distribution or reproduction.

© Pipeline Publishing, L.L.C. All Rights Reserved.

planning approvals, land, supply chain commitments, and customer demand.

These are the constraints that have dominated industry attention over the past several years. The second is delivering capacity. Once construction begins, success depends on coordinating thousands of activities, managing complex interdependencies, identifying emerging risks early, and bringing facilities online as planned.

The industry has made enormous progress in addressing the first phase. Increasingly, however, competitive advantage will be determined by the second. Securing power gets projects started. Delivering capacity on time is what creates value.

The Execution Gap

Every month an AI data center remains unfinished, it delays capacity, defers revenue, and leaves critical infrastructure unavailable to the market. That matters because AI infrastructure investment is now measured in hundreds of billions of dollars, with spending expected to continue accelerating as organizations expand AI capabilities.

Yet investment has accelerated faster than delivery performance. According to research, nearly 90 percent of data center projects experience schedule overruns, with average delays of 20 to 30 percent. An 18-month construction schedule can quickly extend by several months.

For owners and operators, those extra months mean lost time, delayed revenue, and lower returns on invested capital. Power shortages dominate headlines because they are visible. Delivery problems are different. They accumulate quietly inside projects, often long before executives recognize that a schedule is beginning to slip.

The more revealing question is not why projects encounter obstacles, but why organizations so often discover them too late to respond effectively.

Why Approved Projects Still Fall Behind

Uncertainty has always been part of infrastructure delivery. What has changed is the scale at which uncertainty now compounds across modern AI data center developments.

Modern programs involve thousands of interconnected activities across engineering, procurement, manufacturing, logistics, construction, commissioning, and customer readiness. Every decision creates downstream consequences. Emergent issues rarely remain isolated; they ripple through the schedule in ways that are difficult to predict using traditional reporting methods. A small disruption rarely remains small for long.

Most organizations still manage this complexity through periodic status updates, spreadsheets, and reporting that explains yesterday rather than predicts tomorrow. By the time executive teams receive information indicating a schedule has slipped, the underlying issues may have been developing for weeks or even months. Delays rarely occur suddenly. They simply become visible suddenly.

Power shortages, supply chain disruptions, permitting delays, and labor availability certainly influence project performance. However, research into major infrastructure delivery suggests these are often the triggers that expose deeper organizational weaknesses.

More fundamental issues often include fragmented governance and accountability, unrealistic delivery assumptions baked into the business case, disconnected project data across systems, poor

© Pipeline Publishing, L.L.C. All Rights Reserved.

sequencing, and slow recognition of emerging risks. For service providers, hyperscalers, and their ecosystem partners, these hidden weaknesses make external shocks, such as supply chain disruptions or labor constraints, far more damaging than they need to be.

Complexity Has Outgrown Traditional Management

AI infrastructure has reached an important inflection point. Complexity is now growing faster than our ability to manage it using traditional project delivery methods.

Developers are delivering larger campuses, shorter schedules, higher power densities, and more demanding customer expectations simultaneously. Many organizations are managing multiple large-scale projects across different regions, each with its own contractors, suppliers, regulatory requirements, and delivery risks.

Human expertise remains indispensable. But no leadership team can process thousands of schedule interactions quickly enough to see how today's minor decision becomes tomorrows major delay.

Project teams today must interpret thousands of schedule activities and dependencies while responding to continual change. The competitive advantage is no longer collecting more project data; most organizations already have plenty. It lies in recognizing meaningful change sooner than everyone else.

Earlier visibility is becoming a competitive advantage because it gives leaders time to intervene before small issues become major delays.

Learning From High-Performing Organizations

High-performing organizations tend to share three characteristics. First, they standardize one source of truth for delivery performance. Second, they prioritize early warning indicators over retrospective reporting. Third, they use executive reviews to decide interventions, not reconcile conflicting reports.

Underpinning each of these characteristics is a shift in mindset. High-performing organizations recognize that project delivery is not simply an operational discipline but a strategic capability. Rather than treating schedules as static plans to be monitored, they view them as dynamic systems that require continuous attention and informed decision-making.

This allows leadership teams to intervene earlier, allocate resources more effectively, and adapt to changing conditions before risks escalate into delays. In an environment where AI infrastructure is being delivered at unprecedented scale and speed, that ability to anticipate and respond is becoming a defining source of competitive advantage.

In one global data center portfolio, replacing fragmented reporting with unified schedule intelligence transformed executive oversight. It changed the conversations that leadership teams of large-scale infrastructure programs were having.

Review meetings became more frequent, reporting effort was dramatically reduced, and leadership gained earlier visibility into emerging schedule risks. Most importantly, discussions shifted from reconciling conflicting information to making decisions that improved project outcomes.

These organizations are not necessarily avoiding uncertainty. Rather, they are reducing the time between a problem emerging and leadership becoming aware of it.

Not for distribution or reproduction.

© Pipeline Publishing, L.L.C. All Rights Reserved.

In an industry where every month matters, that difference becomes a competitive advantage.

Governing Time With the Same Discipline as Capital

Organizations devote enormous attention to financial governance. Budgets are reviewed continuously. Variances are investigated. Few organizations would accept discovering a major financial problem three months after it first emerged. Yet many discover schedule problems exactly that way.

Time, despite being equally critical to project success, often receives far less structured governance. This gap points to the need for a Chief Time Officer mindset: bringing the same rigor, accountability, forecasting, and executive oversight to time that organizations already apply to capital. Bringing time under the same governance discipline as capital turns delivery performance into a board-level metric, not just an operational KPI.

Schedule management frequently remains operational rather than strategic, with responsibility distributed across project teams instead of receiving consistent executive attention. As AI infrastructure investment continues to accelerate, this imbalance becomes increasingly difficult to ignore.

In markets where AI demand outpaces available capacity, even a one-month delay does more than extend a construction schedule. It postpones revenue, slows customer deployment, reduces capital efficiency, and can affect competitive positioning. For that reason, governing time is becoming as important as governing cost.

Looking Beyond Power

Power will remain essential. Without it, projects cannot begin.

But once power has been secured, execution determines everything that follows. The organizations that lead the next decade of AI infrastructure will not simply be those that secure the most megawatts. They will be those that consistently convert approved projects into operational capacity faster, more predictably, and with greater confidence than their competitors.

In the years ahead, the organizations that consistently deliver AI infrastructure on time will create an advantage that extends far beyond construction. They will recognize revenue sooner, meet customer demand faster, and deploy capital more efficiently than their competitors.

For AI infrastructure leaders, the question is no longer only “How much power can we secure?” but “How confidently can we turn that power into live capacity on schedule?”

The first race in AI infrastructure was for power. The next and more decisive race is for time.

Not for distribution or reproduction.

© Pipeline Publishing, L.L.C. All Rights Reserved.