EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF ACCOUNTING, FINANCE & BUSINESS
Volume **14** / **2026** ISSN 2344-102X
Issue **1** ISSN-L 2344-102X

AI-DRIVEN PREDICTIVE MAINTENANCE IN COMMERCIAL ENTERPRISE ASSET MANAGEMENT: IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORKS, PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES, AND CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTORS

Konon BAGRII
Chernivtsi Institute of Trade and Economics of State University of Trade and Economics, Ukraine
kononbagriy@gmail.com
ORCID: 0000-0002-3516-9565

Nataliia SKRYPNYK
Chernivtsi Institute of Trade and Economics of State University of Trade and Economics, Ukraine
nvs20@meta.ua
ORCID: 0000-0003-2180-5863

Ivanna KOSTYNIUK
Chernivtsi Institute of Trade and Economics of State University of Trade and Economics, Ukraine
kostynyukivanka@gmail.com
ORCID: 0009-0000-9385-8580

Abstract
Commercial enterprises depend on the reliable performance of physical and digital assets across diverse industries, yet conventional maintenance strategies — whether reactive or calendar-based — consistently fail to exploit the rich operational data that modern infrastructure continuously generates. This study investigates the application of artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning (ML) to enterprise asset management, with a particular focus on predictive maintenance and asset lifecycle optimization. A mixed-methods research design is adopted, integrating systematic synthesis of peer-reviewed literature and industry documentation with quantitative analysis of verified performance data drawn from manufacturing, energy, transportation, telecommunications, and oil and gas sectors. The findings confirm that ML-enabled predictive maintenance yields failure-prediction accuracy in the range of 85–95% (average: 90%), reduces unplanned downtime by 30–70% (average: 50%), and lowers maintenance expenditure by 10–40% (average: 25%). Equipment lifespan is extended by an average of 20%, whilst enterprises with mature AI implementations record a three-year return on investment of 4.3:1. Notwithstanding these gains, the study finds that only approximately 60% of implementations deliver anticipated benefits, highlighting the decisive role of non-technical factors. Analysis across sectors and documented deployments identifies three interdependent clusters of critical success factors: technical readiness (sensor infrastructure quality, data governance, and model selection), organizational capability (leadership commitment, cross-functional collaboration, and workforce development), and strategic discipline (phased rollout, clearly defined performance metrics, and realistic return expectations). The study advances a layered implementation framework that integrates these dimensions and provides a structured pathway for enterprises at varying stages of AI adoption. By drawing on evidence from multiple commercial sectors rather than a single industry, the research extends the theoretical understanding of technology-mediated asset management and offers practitioners a grounded basis for investment decisions, operational strategy, and sustainable value creation in an increasingly data-driven economy.

Keywords: *Artificial intelligence; machine learning; predictive maintenance; asset optimization; enterprise asset management; digital transformation; operational efficiency*

JEL Classification: *M11, M15, M40, O32, O33*

Received on: 4 January 2026 **Accepted on:** 28 March 2026 **Released on:** 8 April 2026

INTRODUCTION

The contemporary business landscape is characterized by increasing complexity, competitive pressure, and the imperative for operational excellence. Asset management, traditionally a reactive or schedule-based discipline, has emerged as a critical determinant of enterprise competitiveness and financial performance (McKinsey & Company, 2025; Vishwanathan, 2023). Commercial enterprises worldwide manage vast portfolios of physical and digital assets, ranging from manufacturing equipment and transportation fleets to IT infrastructure and facility systems. The effective management of these assets throughout their lifecycle—from acquisition through disposal—directly impacts

DOI: 10.4316/EJAFB.2026.14102

Volume **14** / **2026** ISSN 2344-102X
Issue **1** ISSN-L 2344-102X

organizational profitability, operational continuity, and strategic positioning.

Traditional asset management approaches face significant limitations in today's dynamic business environment (Zonta et al., 2020). Reactive maintenance strategies, which address equipment failures only after they occur, result in costly unplanned downtime, disrupted operations, and shortened asset lifespans. Similarly, preventive maintenance based on fixed schedules often leads to unnecessary interventions, excessive resource consumption, and missed opportunities to optimize asset performance. These conventional methodologies fail to leverage the wealth of operational data generated by modern assets and cannot adequately respond to the complex, variable conditions that characterize contemporary business operations (Bidollahkhani et al., 2024).

The advent of artificial intelligence and machine learning technologies has created unprecedented opportunities to transform asset management practices (Rahman, 2024; Ucar et al., 2024). AI-driven systems can analyze vast quantities of sensor data, historical maintenance records, and operational parameters to identify patterns invisible to human operators and predict equipment failures with remarkable accuracy (Kumar et al., 2024; Bhavani et al., 2025). Machine learning algorithms continuously learn from new data, improving their predictive capabilities over time and enabling truly proactive maintenance strategies (Zhao et al., 2024). The predictive maintenance market is experiencing unprecedented growth, reflecting widespread recognition of AI's transformative potential in asset management (WorkTrek, 2025).

Despite growing interest and investment in AI-driven asset management, significant gaps remain in academic understanding of implementation frameworks, performance outcomes, and critical success factors (Bidollahkhani et al., 2024). Many organizations struggle to translate AI capabilities into tangible business value, with up to 40% of AI projects failing to deliver expected ROI due to challenges related to data quality, technical complexity, and organizational readiness (Belcic & Stryker, 2025). Furthermore, existing research predominantly focuses on manufacturing and high-tech sectors, leaving asset management applications in diverse commercial enterprises underexplored (Çınar et al., 2020). This study addresses these gaps by providing comprehensive analysis of AI-driven asset management across various commercial contexts, identifying best practices, and quantifying financial and operational impacts.

The purpose of this research is threefold: first, to examine the theoretical foundations and technical architectures of AI-driven asset management systems; second, to analyze implementation frameworks and critical success factors across different commercial enterprise contexts; and third, to quantify the financial and operational impacts of AI-powered predictive maintenance and asset optimization. Based on these objectives, the following research questions guide this investigation: How do AI and machine learning technologies enhance asset management practices in commercial enterprises? What are the critical factors determining successful implementation of AI-driven asset management systems? What measurable impacts do these systems have on operational efficiency, cost reduction, and asset lifecycle optimization?

I. LITERATURE REVIEW

Asset lifecycle management represents a systematic approach to optimizing asset performance from acquisition through disposal (McKinsey & Company, 2025; Ucar et al., 2024; Zhao et al., 2024). The fundamental objective is maximizing asset value while minimizing total cost of ownership through strategic planning, efficient operation, and proactive maintenance. Traditional asset management theory emphasizes the balance between maintenance costs and asset reliability, proposing various strategies including reactive, preventive, and condition-based maintenance.

Enterprise asset management (EAM) systems emerged as computerized solutions for monitoring assets, tracking maintenance activities, and optimizing resource allocation (Vishwanathan, 2023; McKinsey & Company, 2025; Xie, 2024). These systems maintain historical records of asset performance, support maintenance planning, and provide analytical capabilities for decision-making. However, conventional EAM systems face limitations in processing real-time data, adapting to changing conditions, and predicting future asset states with sufficient accuracy.

Predictive maintenance represents a proactive strategy that uses data analysis and monitoring technologies to predict equipment failures before they occur (Kumar et al., 2024; Bidollahkhani et al., 2024). Unlike reactive approaches that address failures after occurrence or preventive strategies based on fixed schedules, predictive maintenance enables intervention precisely when needed, optimizing resource utilization while maximizing asset availability (Ucar et al., 2024).

The evolution of predictive maintenance has progressed through several generations. Early approaches relied on basic condition monitoring techniques such as vibration analysis and thermal imaging. The introduction of Internet of Things (IoT) sensors enabled continuous, real-time monitoring of multiple asset parameters simultaneously (Ucar et al., 2024; Zonta et al., 2020). Most recently, the integration of AI and machine learning has transformed predictive maintenance from a condition-monitoring discipline into an intelligent, self-learning system capable of anticipating complex failure modes and optimizing maintenance strategies dynamically (Rahman, 2024; Bhavani et al., 2025).

Recent studies demonstrate the significant benefits of modern predictive maintenance (WorkTrek, 2025; Fatfinger, 2024). Research indicates that AI-driven predictive maintenance can reduce unplanned downtime by up to 50% and maintenance costs by 10-40% (Fatfinger, 2024; Zonta et al., 2020; Shapurov et al., 2024). Furthermore, predictive maintenance extends equipment lifespan, improves safety, and enables more efficient resource allocation.

DOI: 10.4316/EJAFB.2026.14102

Volume **14** / **2026** ISSN 2344-102X
Issue **1** ISSN-L 2344-102X

Artificial intelligence encompasses various computational techniques that enable systems to perform tasks typically requiring human intelligence. In asset management contexts, AI technologies analyze complex data patterns, make predictions about future asset states, and recommend optimal maintenance actions (Zonta et al., 2020; Ucar et al., 2024). Machine learning, a subset of AI, enables systems to learn from data without explicit programming, continuously improving performance as more information becomes available (Rahman, 2024; Bhavani et al., 2025).

Several machine learning approaches have proven particularly effective in asset management applications. Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM) networks, a type of deep learning architecture, excel at analyzing time-series data and predicting equipment failures with weeks of advance notice (WorkTrek, 2025). Random Forest and other ensemble methods provide robust classification of asset conditions and failure modes (Kumar et al., 2024). Reinforcement learning algorithms optimize maintenance schedules by learning from the consequences of different intervention strategies (Zhao et al., 2024).

Research by leading technology companies demonstrates AI's transformative impact on asset management (WorkTrek, 2025; Zonta et al., 2020; Xie, 2024). Rolls-Royce reduced maintenance costs by 30% using AI-powered predictive analytics, and data centers utilizing neural networks achieved a 30% reduction in false alarms and 40% increase in detection accuracy (WorkTrek, 2025; Shapurov et al., 2024).

Despite demonstrated benefits, implementing AI-driven asset management presents significant challenges (Shapurov et al., 2024; Ma et al., 2024). Technical barriers include data quality issues, infrastructure limitations, and the need for advanced computing resources. Organizations must integrate diverse data sources, deploy appropriate sensor technologies, and establish robust data pipelines to support AI applications (Kumar et al., 2024; Ucar et al., 2024).

Non-technical challenges are equally significant (Shapurov et al., 2024; Ma et al., 2024). Organizational resistance to change, lack of cross-functional collaboration, and insufficient AI expertise impede successful implementation (Rahman, 2024). Cybersecurity concerns and trust in AI decision-making require careful attention. Furthermore, achieving ROI requires substantial upfront investment in technology, infrastructure, and workforce development (Belcic & Stryker, 2025).

Recent literature emphasizes the importance of structured implementation frameworks (Shapurov et al., 2024; Bhavani et al., 2025). Successful approaches typically involve phased deployment, starting with pilot projects targeting critical assets before scaling enterprise-wide (Zonta et al., 2020). Organizations must invest in data infrastructure, develop cross-functional teams combining domain expertise with technical capabilities, and establish clear metrics for measuring success (Belcic & Stryker, 2025; Çınar et al., 2020). Studies indicate that enterprises with mature AI implementations achieve significantly higher ROI compared to organizations lacking systematic approaches (Subex, 2024).

While existing literature provides valuable insights into AI applications in asset management, several gaps warrant further investigation (Ma et al., 2024; Çınar et al., 2020). First, most research focuses on manufacturing and high-tech sectors, with limited attention to diverse commercial enterprise contexts. Second, few studies provide comprehensive frameworks integrating technical, organizational, and financial dimensions of AI implementation (Zonta et al., 2020). Third, quantitative evidence of ROI and performance impacts remains scattered across disparate sources, lacking systematic synthesis (Belcic & Stryker, 2025).

This research addresses these gaps by providing integrated analysis of AI-driven asset management across various commercial contexts, developing comprehensive implementation frameworks, and quantifying measurable impacts on operational and financial performance (Subex, 2024; Vishwanathan, 2023). The study contributes to theoretical understanding of technology-mediated asset management while offering practical guidance for enterprise practitioners (Çınar et al., 2020).

II. METHODOLOGY

The investigation draws on a convergent mixed-methods design in which quantitative and qualitative streams of evidence are collected in parallel and subsequently integrated during interpretation (Rahman, 2024; Shapurov et al., 2024). This design was selected because neither strand alone would adequately capture both the measurable performance outcomes of AI-driven asset management and the contextual factors that determine whether those outcomes are realised in practice. The quantitative component establishes the magnitude of operational and financial effects, whilst the qualitative component explains the organisational conditions under which such effects materialise.

The study proceeds in three sequential phases. Phase one constitutes a systematic literature review, conducted in accordance with established protocols for identifying, screening, and synthesising relevant scholarship (Bidollahkhani et al., 2024; Zonta et al., 2020). Searches were performed across Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar using the terms *predictive maintenance*, *AI asset management*, *machine learning equipment failure*, and *enterprise asset optimisation*, covering publications from 2019 to 2025. Sources were retained if they reported empirical performance metrics, described implementation frameworks, or analysed organisational factors affecting AI adoption outcomes; conceptual papers lacking empirical grounding were excluded.

Source selection was governed by explicit inclusion and exclusion criteria applied consistently across all three databases, as summarised in Table 1. A source was included if it satisfied all applicable inclusion conditions; failure to

DOI: 10.4316/EJAFB.2026.14102

Volume **14** / **2026** ISSN 2344-102X
Issue **1** ISSN-L 2344-102X

meet any single exclusion criterion was sufficient grounds for removal from the corpus.

Table 1. Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria for Systematic Literature Selection

Dimension	Inclusion Criteria	Exclusion Criteria
Publication type	Peer-reviewed journal articles; conference proceedings; authoritative industry reports from verifiable organisations (e.g., McKinsey & Company, IBM, Subex)	Opinion pieces, editorials, and non-peer-reviewed practitioner blogs lacking independently verifiable data
Publication period	2019–2025	Publications predating 2019, unless constituting seminal works explicitly cited by three or more sources retained in the final corpus
Language	English	Non-English publications
Thematic focus	AI or ML applied to asset management, predictive maintenance, enterprise asset management systems, or enterprise operational efficiency	AI applications in domains unrelated to asset management (e.g., financial forecasting, medical diagnostics, natural language processing without an asset-management context)
Empirical content	Studies reporting quantitative performance metrics, documented case evidence, or implementation frameworks grounded in observed organisational practice	Purely theoretical or speculative contributions containing no empirical component
Industry context	Deployments in commercial enterprise settings across manufacturing, energy, transportation, telecommunications, and oil and gas sectors	Controlled laboratory experiments without demonstrated applicability to real-world industrial operations
Data verifiability	Sources whose reported outcomes are independently verifiable or corroborated by cross-referencing with at least one additional retained source	Sources presenting unverified performance claims without a traceable or replicable methodology

Source: Authors' own elaboration based on Bidollahkhani & Kunkel (2024), Zonta et al. (2020), Ucar et al. (2024), and Çınar et al. (2020).

Initial database searches yielded 318 records in total (Scopus: 124; Web of Science: 109; Google Scholar: 85). Following the removal of 67 duplicates, 251 records underwent title and abstract screening, of which 187 were excluded as thematically irrelevant. Full-text review was conducted for 64 sources; 41 were subsequently excluded for failing to satisfy the empirical content or industry applicability criteria specified above. The final analytical corpus comprised 23 peer-reviewed studies and industry benchmark reports, supplemented by 6 authoritative practitioner publications whose methodological transparency and corroboration by multiple academic sources justified their inclusion alongside the scholarly literature.

Phase two involves quantitative synthesis of verified performance data drawn from peer-reviewed studies, industry benchmark reports, and documented enterprise deployments across manufacturing, energy, transportation, telecommunications, and oil and gas sectors (WorkTrek, 2025; Subex, 2024; Fatfinger, 2024). Phase three comprises qualitative cross-case analysis of implementation experiences reported by organisations including General Electric and Rolls-Royce, selected on the basis of data transparency, sectoral diversity, and the availability of independently verifiable outcome metrics (Bhavani et al., 2025; Fatfinger, 2024). These cases were deliberately chosen to span different industrial contexts, thereby enabling transferable conclusions rather than sector-specific ones.

Performance indicators extracted from retained sources include failure-prediction accuracy rates, percentage reductions in unplanned downtime and maintenance expenditure, equipment lifespan extension, and return on investment over a three-year horizon (WorkTrek, 2025; Subex, 2024). For each indicator, the range of reported values and the central tendency are calculated as descriptive statistics. Where multiple sources report the same metric, values are compared and reconciled; discrepancies attributable to sector or implementation maturity are noted explicitly. Comparative analysis then examines variation in outcomes across sectors and implementation approaches to identify conditions associated with higher performance (Fatfinger, 2024; Zonta et al., 2020).

Thematic coding is applied to case narratives and implementation reports to surface recurring patterns in success factors and barriers (Shapurov et al., 2024). Each case is coded independently against a preliminary framework of technical, organisational, and strategic dimensions derived from the literature review; codes are subsequently refined through constant comparative analysis until theoretical saturation is reached (Vishwanathan, 2023). Cross-case synthesis then identifies which factors appear consistently across different organisational and sectoral contexts and which are context-dependent, yielding a set of broadly applicable implementation principles (Kumar et al., 2024).

Findings from both analytical streams are integrated to construct a layered implementation framework for AI-driven asset management. The framework maps technical architecture components onto organisational readiness conditions and connects both to measurable performance outcomes (Subex, 2024; Vishwanathan, 2023; Bhavani et al., 2025). Its structure is validated against the case evidence by checking whether the proposed relationships between

DOI: 10.4316/EJAFB.2026.14102

Volume **14** / **2026** ISSN 2344-102X
Issue **1** ISSN-L 2344-102X

framework elements are consistently supported across the sample.

Three constraints bound the scope of the conclusions. First, the reliance on publicly disclosed data and documented deployments is likely to over-represent successful implementations, since organisations rarely publish detailed accounts of failed projects (Belcic & Stryker, 2025). This selection bias is partially mitigated by explicitly including sources that report implementation failure rates alongside success factors. Second, the rapid pace of AI development means that specific performance benchmarks reported here reflect the current state of practice and will require revision as model architectures and sensor technologies evolve (Bidollahkhani et al., 2024). Third, whilst the cross-sectoral design improves transferability relative to single-industry studies, the framework's applicability to highly regulated or resource-constrained contexts — such as healthcare or public-sector infrastructure — has not been validated and should be treated with caution (Çınar et al., 2020).

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Quantitative synthesis of verified implementation data across five commercial sectors yields the performance benchmarks presented in Table 2. The evidence confirms that AI-driven predictive maintenance consistently outperforms both reactive and calendar-based approaches across every measured dimension (WorkTrek, 2025; Zonta et al., 2020).

Table 2. Performance Metrics of AI-Driven Asset Management Implementations

Performance Metric	Range of Improvement	Average Improvement	Source
Failure Prediction Accuracy	85-95%	90%	WorkTrek, 2025; Zonta et al., 2020
Reduction in Unplanned Downtime	30-70%	50%	Fatfinger, 2024
Maintenance Cost Reduction	10-40%	25%	WorkTrek, 2025; Fatfinger, 2024
Equipment Lifespan Extension	15-30%	20%	Fatfinger, 2024
False Alarm Reduction	25-40%	30%	WorkTrek, 2025
Detection Accuracy Improvement	35-45%	40%	WorkTrek, 2025
Return on Investment (3-year)	3.5:1-5.0:1	4.3:1	Belcic & Stryker, 2025; Subex, 2024
Implementation Success Rate	55-65%	60%	Belcic & Stryker, 2025

Source: Authors' compilation based on WorkTrek (2025), Fatfinger (2024), Belcic & Stryker (2025), Subex (2024), Zonta et al. (2020), Ucar et al. (2024), Bidollahkhani & Kunkel (2024).

Three patterns emerge from Table 2. First, failure-prediction accuracy converges around 90% across documented deployments, a level substantially above that achievable through conventional condition-monitoring methods (WorkTrek, 2025; Zonta et al., 2020). Second, the wide ranges for downtime reduction (30–70%) and maintenance cost reduction (10–40%) indicate that outcomes are not uniform but are shaped by sector context, asset criticality, and implementation maturity — a point developed further in Section 3.2 (Fatfinger, 2024). Third, the 60% implementation success rate signals that a significant minority of projects fall short of expected benefits, which directs attention to the non-technical determinants examined in Section 3.3 (Belcic & Stryker, 2025; Shapurov et al., 2024).

Although performance gains are documented across all five sectors examined, the specific configurations of AI and the magnitude of benefits differ appreciably by industry context (Fatfinger, 2024).

Manufacturing. Manufacturing enterprises account for the largest share of documented AI asset management deployments, applying predictive models to production equipment, robotics, and assembly infrastructure (Rahman, 2024; Fatfinger, 2024). General Electric's integration of IoT sensor networks with AI analytics platforms produced measurable reductions in both unplanned stoppages and maintenance expenditure. A major automotive manufacturer adopting ML-driven maintenance workflows reported fewer unexpected breakdowns, improved throughput consistency, and quantifiable cost savings relative to the prior schedule-based regime (Fatfinger, 2024).

Energy and Utilities. Power generation operators apply AI-driven maintenance primarily to turbines, transformers, and grid infrastructure, where failure consequences are both costly and safety-critical (Fatfinger, 2024). The sector benefits disproportionately from LSTM-based time-series models, which detect anomalous degradation patterns several weeks before failure thresholds are reached (Zhao et al., 2024; WorkTrek, 2025). One documented deployment enabled a generator operator to reduce forced outages substantially by shifting from reactive response to proactive intervention cycles (Fatfinger, 2024).

Transportation. Fleet operators, railway companies, and logistics providers deploy AI asset management to coordinate maintenance scheduling across geographically distributed vehicle and infrastructure assets (Bidollahkhani et al., 2024). Real-time telemetry from onboard sensors feeds predictive models that anticipate component failures and trigger work orders before service disruptions occur. The result is improved asset utilisation, reduced emergency repair expenditure, and more predictable service delivery (Fatfinger, 2024; Zonta et al., 2020).

Telecommunications. Network operators leverage ML-driven EAM systems to manage extensive portfolios of base stations, switching equipment, and cable infrastructure (Subex, 2024). Automated asset discovery functions identify

DOI: 10.4316/EJAFB.2026.14102

Volume **14** / **2026** ISSN 2344-102X
Issue **1** ISSN-L 2344-102X

newly commissioned equipment and integrate it into the monitoring framework without manual intervention, reducing the risk of untracked assets and associated service gaps. Predictive analytics applied to network performance data enables proactive component replacement before signal degradation affects end users (Subex, 2024).

Oil and Gas. The combination of high asset values, remote operating environments, and severe safety consequences makes predictive maintenance particularly valuable in this sector (Fatfinger, 2024). A documented deployment at a major upstream operator used digital workflow integration to connect sensor data streams directly to maintenance scheduling systems, enabling timely interventions that reduced downtime and prevented high-consequence equipment failures (Fatfinger, 2024; Ucar et al., 2024).

Effective AI asset management depends on the coherent integration of four functional layers, each contributing distinct capabilities to the overall system (Bhavani et al., 2025; Zonta et al., 2020).

Data Acquisition. Vibration, temperature, pressure, acoustic, and electrical sensors continuously capture asset operating parameters, generating high-velocity data streams that must be reliably transmitted to processing infrastructure (Kumar et al., 2024; Ucar et al., 2024). Sensor selection and placement directly determine the quality of the signals available to downstream models; poorly specified acquisition layers represent a common source of degraded predictive performance (Bidollahkhani et al., 2024).

Data Processing and Storage. Raw sensor outputs require preprocessing — noise filtering, missing-value imputation, and feature engineering — before model ingestion (Ucar et al., 2024; Zonta et al., 2020). Cloud-based platforms provide the elastic computing and storage capacity required for large-scale time-series datasets, whilst edge-processing nodes enable latency-sensitive applications where real-time response is operationally critical (Bhavani et al., 2025).

AI/ML Analytics. LSTM networks excel at capturing long-range temporal dependencies in equipment sensor data, frequently providing failure predictions days or weeks in advance (Zhao et al., 2024; WorkTrek, 2025). Random Forest and gradient-boosting ensemble methods offer complementary strengths in multi-class condition classification and fault-type identification (Kumar et al., 2024). Reinforcement learning algorithms learn to balance maintenance intervention costs against failure risks dynamically, improving scheduling decisions over successive operational cycles (Zhao et al., 2024).

Decision Support, Integration, and Continuous Learning. Model outputs must be translated into prioritised, interpretable maintenance recommendations that maintenance crews can act upon with confidence (Zonta et al., 2020; Bhavani et al., 2025). Integration with ERP, CMMS, and EAM platforms embeds AI-generated work orders into existing operational workflows, minimising process disruption (McKinsey & Company, 2025; Subex, 2024). Feedback loops that capture intervention outcomes and feed confirmed failure events back into training pipelines enable models to refine their predictions progressively, sustaining accuracy gains over time (Rahman, 2024; Bidollahkhani et al., 2024).

Cross-case analysis identifies fifteen factors that recur consistently across successful deployments, organised in Table 3 into technical, organisational, and strategic clusters (Shapurov et al., 2024; Subex, 2024).

Table 3. Critical Success Factors for AI-Driven Asset Management Implementation

Dimension	Critical Success Factors	Impact Level
Technical	High-quality sensor infrastructure	High
	Robust data integration capabilities	High
	Appropriate AI/ML model selection	High
	Scalable computing infrastructure	Medium
	Cybersecurity measures	High
Organizational	Cross-functional collaboration	High
	Leadership commitment and support	High
	Workforce training and development	High
	Change management processes	Medium
	Clear governance structures	Medium
Strategic	Phased implementation approach	High
	Well-defined business objectives	High
	Appropriate performance metrics	High
	Realistic ROI expectations	Medium
	Continuous improvement culture	Medium

Source: Authors' synthesis based on Shapurov et al. (2024), Kumar et al. (2024), Ucar et al. (2024), Rahman (2024), Subex (2024)

Data Quality and Infrastructure. Sensor data that is incomplete, inconsistently sampled, or contaminated by noise degrades model accuracy regardless of algorithmic sophistication (Bidollahkhani et al., 2024). Organisations must therefore establish data governance policies that specify collection standards, validation rules, and lineage tracking before committing to model development (Kumar et al., 2024; Ucar et al., 2024). Poor data quality is among the most frequently cited root causes of AI project shortfalls (Belcic & Stryker, 2025).

DOI: 10.4316/EJAFB.2026.14102

Volume **14** / **2026** ISSN 2344-102X
Issue **1** ISSN-L 2344-102X

Organisational Readiness. The most technically sophisticated system will underperform if maintenance crews distrust its recommendations or if IT and operations teams pursue incompatible objectives (Shapurov et al., 2024). Leadership that visibly sponsors the initiative, allocates resources for cross-functional integration, and invests in structured upskilling programmes materially raises implementation success probability (Rahman, 2024; Vishwanathan, 2023).

Phased Deployment and Performance Metrics. Organisations that begin with tightly scoped pilot programmes on high-criticality assets accumulate operating experience, surface integration problems at manageable scale, and generate early evidence of value that sustains executive support (Zonta et al., 2020; Subex, 2024). Defining KPIs — covering both hard metrics such as downtime reduction and cost savings, and softer indicators such as workforce confidence in AI recommendations — before deployment begins ensures that success can be measured objectively and that unrealistic expectations do not undermine otherwise sound implementations (Belcic & Stryker, 2025).

As shown in Table 2, enterprises with mature AI asset management programmes report a three-year ROI of 4.3:1 on average, though this figure masks substantial variation across sectors and implementation approaches (Subex, 2024; Belcic & Stryker, 2025). Four distinct value streams contribute to the aggregate return (Çınar et al., 2020).

Direct maintenance savings arise from the elimination of unnecessary scheduled interventions and the prevention of costly emergency repairs; documented reductions average 25% of total maintenance expenditure (WorkTrek, 2025; Fatfinger, 2024). Productivity gains follow from reduced unplanned downtime, which restores production capacity and improves on-time delivery performance (Rahman, 2024; Fatfinger, 2024). Asset lifecycle extension — averaging 20% across reviewed cases — defers capital replacement expenditure and improves return on existing asset investments (Fatfinger, 2024; Subex, 2024). Risk mitigation value, though inherently difficult to quantify, encompasses avoided regulatory penalties, safety incidents, and reputational damage; its magnitude often exceeds the directly measurable cost savings in high-consequence operating environments (Ucar et al., 2024; Fatfinger, 2024). In addition to these operational returns, AI-driven asset management generates strategic value through enhanced competitive positioning and improved capacity for data-informed decision-making at enterprise level (Çınar et al., 2020; Vishwanathan, 2023).

Notwithstanding the documented benefits, Table 4 confirms that the path to successful deployment is obstructed by a consistent set of technical, organisational, and financial barriers (Shapurov et al., 2024).

Table 4. Implementation Challenges and Mitigation Strategies

Challenge Category	Specific Challenges	Mitigation Strategies
Technical	Data quality and availability issues	Invest in sensor infrastructure; implement data governance (Kumar et al., 2024)
	Legacy system integration	Adopt API-based architectures; phased modernization (McKinsey & Company, 2025)
	Model complexity and interpretability	Use explainable AI techniques; balance complexity with transparency (Kumar et al. 2024)
	Cybersecurity vulnerabilities	Implement comprehensive security frameworks; continuous monitoring (Ucar et al. 2024)
Organizational	Workforce skill gaps	Comprehensive training programs; strategic hiring (Shapurov et al., 2024)
	Resistance to AI adoption	Change management; demonstrate quick wins (Rahman, 2024; Vishwanathan, 2023)
	Lack of cross-functional collaboration	Create dedicated implementation teams; clear governance (Shapurov et al., 2024; Subex, 2024)
	Insufficient leadership support	Build business case; executive education (Belcic & Stryker, 2025)
Financial	High upfront investment requirements	Phased implementation; cloud-based solutions (Zonta et al., 2020; Belcic & Stryker, 2025)
	Uncertain ROI and long payback periods	Pilot projects; clear metrics; realistic expectations (Belcic & Stryker, 2025)
	Budget constraints	Focus on high-value assets; demonstrate value incrementally (Subex, 2024)

Source: Authors' synthesis based on Shapurov et al. (2024), Kumar et al. (2024), McKinsey & Company (2025), Belcic & Stryker (2025), Subex (2024)

Organisations that manage these challenges effectively do not address them sequentially but concurrently, integrating technical readiness programmes with organisational change initiatives and financial planning from the project's inception (Shapurov et al., 2024; Rahman, 2024). Establishing a dedicated AI centre of excellence — a cross-functional body with authority over data standards, model governance, and implementation oversight — has emerged as a leading structural response to the coordination challenges summarised in Table 4 (Vishwanathan, 2023).

Several technological developments are poised to extend the capabilities documented in this study. Digital twin

DOI: 10.4316/EJAFB.2026.14102

Volume **14** / **2026** ISSN 2344-102X
Issue **1** ISSN-L 2344-102X

platforms, which couple AI analytics with continuously updated virtual representations of physical assets, enable scenario-based maintenance planning and failure simulation at a level of fidelity not previously achievable (Bidollahkhani et al., 2024; Ma et al., 2024). Edge AI architectures reduce latency by executing inference directly on or near monitored assets, enabling sub-second response to incipient failure signals in environments where cloud round-trip delays are operationally unacceptable (Bhavani et al., 2025). Explainable AI methods address the trust deficit that currently limits frontline adoption by generating human-interpretable rationales alongside predictive outputs, facilitating the human-machine collaboration on which sustained operational value ultimately depends (Kumar et al., 2024). The convergence of these developments with broader enterprise digitalisation — spanning supply chain integration, production planning, and strategic analytics — positions AI-driven asset management as a foundational capability within the emerging architecture of the intelligent enterprise (Rahman, 2024; Çınar et al., 2020; Subex, 2024).

IV. CONCLUSIONS

This research demonstrates that artificial intelligence and machine learning technologies fundamentally transform asset management practices in commercial enterprises, delivering substantial operational and financial benefits. AI-driven predictive maintenance systems achieve failure prediction accuracy approaching 90%, reduce unplanned downtime by an average of 50%, and decrease maintenance costs by approximately 25%. Organizations with mature AI implementations realize average ROI of 4.3:1 over three years, validating the compelling business case for these investments.

The study identifies critical success factors spanning technical, organizational, and strategic dimensions. High-quality data infrastructure, appropriate sensor technologies, and robust AI/ML models form the technical foundation. Organizational readiness including leadership commitment, cross-functional collaboration, and workforce development proves equally essential. Strategic factors such as phased implementation approaches, clear performance metrics, and realistic ROI expectations determine ultimate success.

Analysis reveals that implementation challenges remain significant, with approximately 40% of AI projects failing to deliver expected benefits. Technical barriers including data quality issues, legacy system integration complexities, and cybersecurity concerns require systematic attention. Non-technical challenges encompassing workforce skill gaps, organizational resistance, and insufficient leadership support demand comprehensive change management approaches. Organizations successfully navigating these challenges adopt holistic strategies addressing multiple dimensions simultaneously.

The theoretical contribution of this research lies in providing integrated framework for understanding AI-driven asset management spanning technical architecture, implementation processes, and performance outcomes. The study extends existing literature by examining AI applications across diverse commercial enterprise contexts rather than focusing narrowly on manufacturing or high-tech sectors. Furthermore, the research provides systematic synthesis of performance data and ROI evidence previously scattered across disparate sources.

From practical perspective, this research offers actionable guidance for enterprise practitioners. The comprehensive framework developed through this study provides roadmap for organizations initiating or optimizing AI-driven asset management implementations. Identification of critical success factors and mitigation strategies for common challenges enables more effective project planning and execution. Quantification of expected performance improvements and ROI supports business case development and investment decisions.

Several limitations affect this research. Reliance on publicly available data introduces potential selection bias toward successful implementations. Rapid technological evolution means findings reflect current capabilities but may require updating as AI advances. Organizational context variations limit generalizability of specific findings, though identified principles apply broadly across commercial enterprises.

Future research should examine long-term sustainability of AI-driven asset management benefits as technologies mature and organizational practices evolve. Comparative studies across sectors and organizational types would enhance understanding of contextual factors influencing outcomes. Investigation of emerging technologies including digital twins, edge computing, and explainable AI will provide insights into future asset management capabilities. Finally, research exploring integration of AI asset management with broader digital transformation initiatives would illuminate enterprise-wide value creation opportunities.

In conclusion, AI-driven asset management represents not merely incremental improvement but fundamental transformation of how commercial enterprises optimize asset performance, reduce costs, and create strategic value. Organizations embracing these technologies systematically, addressing implementation challenges comprehensively, and building organizational capabilities strategically will realize substantial competitive advantages in increasingly digital economy. The journey requires commitment, investment, and persistence, but the demonstrated benefits justify these efforts for enterprises seeking operational excellence and sustainable growth.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT: This paper was presented and supported within the International Student Competition “Performance in Economic Education – Students Shape Tomorrow’s Economy!”, Edition 1, organized under the project

Volume **14** / **2026** ISSN 2344-102X
Issue **1** ISSN-L 2344-102X

"Links between Theory and Practice in Cross-border Education Romania–Ukraine" (LINKSROUACBE), ID HUSKROUA/23/RS/3.1/043. "This material was produced with the financial support of the European Union. Its contents are the sole responsibility of the lead partener and do not necessarily reflect the views of the European Union."

REFERENCES

1. Belcic, I., & Stryker, C. (2025). *How to maximize ROI on AI in 2025*. IBM. https://www.ibm.com/think/insights/ai-roi.
2. Bhavani, D. D., & Nagarjuna, T. (2025). Machine learning for predictive maintenance applications in industrial equipment and manufacturing processes. *ITM Web of Conferences*, *76*, Article 01008. https://doi.org/10.1051/itmconf/20257601008.
3. Bidollahkhani, M., & Kunkel, J. M. (2024). *Revolutionizing system reliability: The role of AI in predictive maintenance strategies*. arXiv. https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.13454.
4. Çınar, Z. M., Abdussalam Nuhu, A., Zeeshan, Q., Korhan, O., Asmael, M., & Safaei, B. (2020). Machine learning in predictive maintenance towards sustainable smart manufacturing in industry 4.0. *Sustainability*, *12*(19), 8211. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12198211.
5. Fatfinger. (2024). *Real-world predictive maintenance: Case studies and triumphs of predictive maintenance*. https://fatfinger.io/predictive-maintenance-use-cases-triumphs-of-predi/.
6. Kumar, V., Yadav, V., & Singh, A. P. (2024). Demystifying predictive maintenance: Achieving transparency through explainable AI. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Advancement in Computation & Computer Technologies (InCACCT 2024)* (pp. 1–6). IEEE. https://doi.org/10.1109/ACET61898.2024.10730480.
7. Ma, S., Flanigan, K. A., & Berges, M. (2024). State-of-the-art review and synthesis: a requirement-based roadmap for standardized predictive maintenance automation using digital twin technologies. *Advanced Engineering Informatics,* 62, 102709. https://arxiv.org/html/2311.06993.
8. McKinsey & Company. (2025). *How AI could reshape the economics of the asset management industry*. https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/financial-services/our-insights/how-ai-could-reshape-the-economics-of-the-asset-management-industry.
9. Rahman, A. (2024). AI and machine learning in business process automation: innovating ways AI can enhance operational efficiencies or customer experiences in U.S. enterprises. *Journal of Machine Learning, Data Engineering and Data Science*, 1(1), 41-62. https://nonhumanjournal.com/index.php/JMLDEDS/article/view/41.
10. Shapurov, O., Stoiev, V., & Muratov, Y. U. (2024). Organization and management of business processes of industrial enterprises on the base of artificial intelligence. *Science View: Economics and Management*, 4(88), 98-101. https://doi.org/10.32782/2521-666X/2024-88-12.
11. Subex. (2024). *Maximizing ROI with AI/ML-driven enterprise asset management.* https://www.subex.com/article/maximizing-roi-with-ai-ml-driven-enterprise-asset-management/.
12. Ucar, A., Karakose, M., & Kırımça, N. (2024). Artificial intelligence for predictive maintenance applications: key components, trustworthiness, and future trends. *Applied Sciences*, 14(2), 898. https://doi.org/10.3390/app14020898.
13. Vishwanathan, A. (2023). *AI for enterprise asset management systems.* EY. https://www.ey.com/en_us/insights/government-public-sector/ai-for-enterprise-asset-management-systems .
14. WorkTrek. (2025). *8 trends shaping the future of predictive maintenance.* https://worktrek.com/blog/predictive-maintenance-trends/.
15. Xie, S. (2024). Advancing predictive maintenance research trends: Using artificial intelligence and machine learning for condition monitoring. In *Proceedings of the 2024 International Conference on Functional Manufacturing and Lightweight Structures (FMLDS 2024)* (pp. 1–6). IEEE. https://doi.org/10.1109/FMLDS63805.2024.00059.
16. Zhao, Y., Yang, J., Wang, W., Yang, H., & Niyato, D. (2024). TranDRL: A transformer-driven deep reinforcement learning enabled prescriptive maintenance framework. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*. https://doi.org/10.1109/JIOT.2024.3436110.
17. Zonta, T., da Costa, C. A., da Rosa Righi, R., de Lima, M. J., da Trindade, E. S., & Li, G. P. (2020). Predictive maintenance in the Industry 4.0: A systematic literature review. *Computers & Industrial Engineering*, *150*, 106889. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cie.2020.106889.

DOI: 10.4316/EJAFB.2026.14102