

BEYOND THE PLANNING CYCLE

Portfolio Rebalancing in Real Time — When AI Outpaces the Quarterly Review Cycle

A Practitioner's Perspective on the Collision Between Continuous Optimisation and Organisational Decision-Making Cadence

Giovanni Leonardi

January 2026



Portfolio Rebalancing in Real Time — When AI Outpaces the Quarterly Review Cycle

Portfolio · No. 114
January 2026

“The quarterly portfolio review is not a decision-making event — it is a ceremony that ratifies decisions the organisation made weeks ago, or should have made weeks ago and did not.”

1. The Cadence Problem

Portfolio management, as practised in most large organisations, operates on a cadence that was designed for a world of stable assumptions and slow-moving change. The annual planning cycle sets the portfolio's shape. Quarterly reviews assess performance against plan. Monthly reporting tracks progress. The rhythm is familiar, well-understood, and deeply embedded in how organisations allocate capital, deploy resources, and measure success.

It is also, increasingly, inadequate.

The inadequacy is not new. Practitioners have long recognised that the quarterly review cycle introduces a structural lag between the moment a portfolio's composition becomes suboptimal and the moment the organisation acts on that knowledge. A programme that should be accelerated waits until the next review. An investment that should be paused continues burning resource until the governance calendar permits a reassessment. The cost of this lag has always existed; what has changed is that we now have the means to eliminate it.

AI-driven portfolio analytics — systems that ingest performance data, market signals, resource utilisation, dependency maps, and risk indicators in near real time — are making it possible to detect portfolio imbalances as they emerge rather than after they have persisted for weeks or months. The technology is maturing rapidly. The organisational question it poses is more difficult: if we can rebalance continuously, should we? And if we should, what happens to the governance architecture that was built around the assumption that portfolio decisions are periodic?

2. What Continuous Visibility Reveals

The first effect of AI-driven portfolio analytics is diagnostic rather than prescriptive. Before an organisation can rebalance in real time, it must see in real time — and what it

sees is often uncomfortable.

Traditional portfolio reporting aggregates. It smooths. It presents a view of portfolio health that is filtered through layers of human judgement, each of which has an incentive to present progress in the most favourable light. The programme director reports that the programme is amber, when a dispassionate assessment of the data would say red. The portfolio office aggregates the amber into a portfolio dashboard that shows most programmes on track, with a handful requiring attention. The quarterly review examines the handful. The rest continue.

AI-driven analytics bypass these layers. They work from the underlying data — resource burn rates, milestone completion patterns, dependency status, risk event frequency — and they surface patterns that human reporting is structurally incentivised to obscure. The programme that has been amber for three consecutive quarters, consuming resource at a rate that exceeds its benefit trajectory, becomes visible not as a governance concern to be discussed at the next review but as a quantifiable drag on portfolio value that the organisation is choosing to sustain.

In my experience, organisations that deploy these capabilities for the first time are struck less by what the technology can predict than by what it reveals about their current portfolio. The number of programmes that are consuming resource without a credible path to benefits delivery. The dependencies that connect nominally independent initiatives in ways that neither the portfolio office nor the programme teams fully understood. The concentration of delivery risk in a small number of individuals whose departure would cascade across multiple programmes.

This diagnostic capability alone would justify the investment. But it is the prescriptive capability — the ability to recommend, in near real time, specific rebalancing actions — that challenges the governance architecture.

3. The Case for Continuous Rebalancing

The economic argument for continuous portfolio rebalancing is straightforward: every day that an organisation sustains a suboptimal portfolio composition is a day of avoidable value destruction. If a programme should be stopped, every additional day of expenditure is waste. If a programme should be accelerated, every additional day at its current pace is deferred benefit. If resource should be reallocated from one initiative to another, every day of misallocation is an opportunity cost.

The quarterly review cycle tolerates these costs because the alternative — continuous rebalancing — has historically been impractical. The information needed to make rebalancing decisions was not available in real time. The analytical capability to synthesise that information into actionable recommendations did not exist. The governance structures through which rebalancing decisions were authorised operated on a fixed cadence. The transaction costs of rebalancing — the disruption to programme teams, the renegotiation of commitments, the cascade effects through dependencies — were high enough that frequent rebalancing would have consumed more value than it created.

AI changes the first three of these constraints. The information is available. The analytical capability exists. The governance structures can, in principle, be redesigned. The fourth constraint — transaction costs — remains real, and it is the factor that determines how far continuous rebalancing can practically be taken.

The promise of AI-driven portfolio management is not that every decision becomes instantaneous. It is that the delay between insight and action becomes a deliberate choice rather than a structural default.

4. The Governance Challenge

The governance architecture around portfolio management was designed for periodic decision-making. Annual planning sets the portfolio. Quarterly reviews adjust it. The cadence creates natural decision points at which the organisation's leadership comes together, reviews performance, and authorises changes.

Continuous rebalancing does not fit this architecture. If the AI system recommends, on a Tuesday in February, that Programme X should be paused and its resources redirected to Programme Y, who authorises that decision? The portfolio board does not meet until March. The sponsoring executive is engaged in operational matters. The governance framework has no mechanism for a rebalancing decision that arises outside the review cycle.

Three approaches are emerging, each with different implications.

4.1 Delegated Authority with Guardrails

The portfolio director or a designated portfolio management function is given standing authority to execute rebalancing decisions within defined parameters. The parameters might include: maximum resource reallocation per decision, maximum cumulative reallocation between reviews, programme categories that require escalation regardless of size. The AI system recommends; the delegated authority decides; the quarterly review ratifies or adjusts.

This approach preserves human judgement at the decision point while removing the cadence constraint. Its weakness is that it concentrates authority in a single role and depends heavily on the judgement and courage of the individual in that role. A portfolio director who is temperamentally cautious will use the delegated authority sparingly, defaulting to the quarterly cycle for any decision that carries political complexity. A portfolio director who is temperamentally aggressive will use it extensively, potentially creating disruption that the governance framework was designed to prevent.

4.2 Tiered Decision Framework

Rebalancing decisions are categorised by impact and reversibility. Low-impact, reversible decisions — reallocating a small number of resources between programmes in the same portfolio segment, adjusting timelines by small increments — are delegated to the

portfolio management function and can be executed on AI recommendation with minimal review. High-impact or irreversible decisions — pausing a programme, redirecting a significant budget allocation, changing a programme's scope or strategic alignment — require governance approval, potentially through an expedited process rather than the standard quarterly cycle.

This approach is more nuanced than simple delegation and better reflects the reality that not all rebalancing decisions carry the same risk. Its weakness is complexity: defining the tiers, maintaining the boundaries, and handling decisions that sit at the boundary between categories creates governance overhead that partially offsets the speed advantage.

4.3 Advisory Mode

The AI system operates in advisory mode only: it surfaces recommendations, but all decisions continue to flow through the existing governance cycle. The value of the AI is in the quality and timeliness of its analysis, not in the speed of the response. The quarterly review is better informed, because the AI has been tracking portfolio health continuously and can present a richer, more current picture than traditional reporting. But the cadence does not change.

This is the approach most organisations are taking today, because it requires the least disruption to existing governance structures. It is also the approach that captures the least value, because it does not address the structural lag that continuous analytics were designed to eliminate.

5. The Human Dimension

The governance challenge is structural. The human challenge is cultural, and it may be more difficult.

Portfolio management has historically been a political process as much as an analytical one. Programme sponsors compete for resource. Business units negotiate for priority. The quarterly review is a forum in which these negotiations play out, mediated by data but shaped by relationships, organisational power, and strategic narrative.

AI-driven rebalancing threatens to depoliticise portfolio decisions — or at least to make the political dimension more visible and harder to sustain. When the AI system recommends pausing a programme because the data shows declining benefit trajectory and increasing delivery risk, the programme's sponsor can no longer rely on a persuasive quarterly presentation to maintain support. The data is visible to everyone, continuously, and the recommendation is algorithmically derived rather than politically negotiated.

This is not a problem that technology can solve. It is a leadership challenge: the organisation's senior executives must decide whether they want portfolio decisions to be data-driven, and if so, they must be willing to accept the consequences when the data conflicts with the political consensus.

“The quarterly portfolio review is not a decision-making event — it is a ceremony that ratifies decisions the organisation made weeks ago, or should have made weeks ago and did not.”

6. The Maturity Path

Organisations will not move from quarterly reviews to continuous rebalancing in a single step. The maturity path is gradual and, in my assessment, will follow a recognisable progression.

The first stage — where most organisations currently sit — is enhanced visibility: AI-driven analytics provide a richer, more current picture of portfolio health, but the decision cadence remains unchanged. This stage builds confidence in the technology and in the quality of its recommendations.

The second stage is accelerated response: the organisation supplements the quarterly cycle with the ability to convene governance on demand when the AI system flags a material portfolio imbalance. The cadence becomes event-driven rather than calendar-driven, but every decision still flows through a governance body.

The third stage is delegated optimisation: routine rebalancing decisions are delegated to the portfolio management function, operating within guardrails set by the governance body. The quarterly review shifts from decision-making to oversight: reviewing the decisions that were made between reviews, adjusting the guardrails, and handling the strategic and political dimensions that delegated authority cannot resolve.

The fourth stage — and the one that remains largely theoretical — is autonomous optimisation: the AI system executes rebalancing decisions within defined parameters without human intervention. This stage raises governance, accountability, and ethical questions that the profession has not yet resolved and that deserve treatment in their own right.

7. What This Means for Portfolio Practitioners

The shift towards continuous portfolio analytics does not eliminate the portfolio management function. It transforms it. The skills that defined portfolio management in the annual-planning era — the ability to build a compelling benefits case, to negotiate resource allocation, to present portfolio performance in a governance forum — remain relevant but are no longer sufficient.

The skills that will define portfolio management in the continuous-optimisation era are different: the ability to interpret AI-generated recommendations and assess their validity; the judgement to distinguish between rebalancing actions that should be taken immediately and those that should wait for governance review; the political acumen to

navigate an environment in which data-driven recommendations conflict with established organisational interests; and the ethical awareness to recognise when an algorithmically optimal portfolio decision produces human consequences that the algorithm does not weigh.

The quarterly review will not disappear. But its role will change from the primary decision-making forum to a strategic oversight mechanism: setting the guardrails within which continuous optimisation operates, reviewing exceptions, and addressing the questions that data alone cannot answer. The practitioners who thrive in this environment will be those who understand both what the technology can do and what it cannot — and who build the governance structures that make the difference visible.