AI for Project Managers – Case 2

"Technically Right, Practically Wrong"

Dr. Marc Bara

Quick recap

01

Case 1

You learned that how you structure and feed information to the AI fundamentally changes what it can do for you.

02

Now — Case 2

We go one step further.

New project: Can Rigalt

You have a new project: the full rehabilitation of a 1923 residential building in Barcelona's Eixample district. Twelve apartments across six floors, a ground floor commercial space, and a rooftop terrace. The client, a private property company, wants the apartments market-ready by Q2 2027.

> 🗒 Read the scope statement.

The task

Your deliverable

Your first planning deliverable is a WBS decomposed to the activity level. Detailed enough to load into scheduling software and build a Gantt chart. That means estimated durations, responsible parties, and milestones.

Instructions

You have a professional megaprompt designed for exactly this. **Use it with your AI tool and generate the WBS**. Each group will walk us through their result.

⏱ 15 MINUTES

Review

I am Jordi Mestre, your site manager. I have been doing rehabilitation work in Barcelona for 25 years, most of it in the Eixample.

You just sent me the WBS. Let me tell you what I think.

What just happened?

What the AI delivered

Your AI produced a WBS that is structurally impeccable: correct hierarchy, consistent numbering, solid PMI logic. It looks like something a senior consultant would deliver.

The problem

And it cannot be executed in Barcelona. The AI followed PMI standards flawlessly, but it had no idea about the local regulations, permitting sequences, and technical requirements that determine how work actually gets done in this city.

What was missing? The AI had no knowledge of the local regulatory context that shapes every phase of this project.

Regulation	What Barcelona actually requires
Asbestos (Royal Decree 396/2006)	Mandatory pre-demolition survey for pre-1990 buildings. RERA-registered contractor. Containment, removal, air testing. Adds 4–6 weeks before any interior work.
Waste management (PROGROC, Decret 89/2010)	Approved waste management plan before site mobilization. Segregated streams (inert, hazardous, recyclable). Disposal certificates.
Building permit (IIT + Ajuntament)	IIT review by COAC first, then corrections, then submit to Ajuntament, then municipal review. 2–3 months, not one activity.
Building inspection (ITE)	Formal ITE mandatory for buildings over 45 years. Filed with Generalitat. Can mandate additional scope if serious deficiencies found.
Fire safety (Decret 241/1994 + CTE DB-SI)	Full sectorization: fire-rated walls, doors, sealed penetrations. Catalan decree is stricter than national code. Design must precede partition construction.
Accessibility (Decret 209/2023)	Cognitive accessibility, wayfinding, signage, accessible emergency communication. In force since 2024. Goes well beyond ramps and elevators.
Ecoefficiency (Decret 21/2006)	Window solar factor max 35% (south-facing), tap flow limiters 9–12 l/min, dual-flush toilets. Material verification before procurement.
Noise (Barcelona municipal ordinance)	Construction: 8AM–9PM weekdays, 9AM–9PM Saturdays. Special permits for high-impact noise. Truck access restrictions on narrow streets.
Habitability certificate (Decret 141/2012)	Specific cèdula d'habitabilitat. Checks room dimensions, lighting, ventilation. Prerequisite for rental or sale. Stricter for major rehabilitation.
Heritage (Special Protection Plan)	Heritage catalog check. If listed: Servei de Patrimoni approval required before any facade work. May restrict materials and techniques.

Why did this happen?

Not because the AI is bad. It did exactly what you asked: build a PMI-compliant WBS from the scope statement you provided.

A WBS is not a solo exercise

It is a team deliverable. Your architect knows the permitting sequence. Your site manager knows the regulatory constraints. Your specialists know how the work actually decomposes in this specific context. None of them were in the room when the AI built your plan.

🗋   **The AI gave you the structure. Your team is what makes it buildable.**

Now try again

What's different this time

I am sharing a document with the regulatory context that Jordi and the team would have brought to the table. Feed it to your AI and ask it to update the WBS.

Same AI, same project, but now with the information your team would have contributed.

Your task

Feed the regulatory context document to your AI and regenerate the WBS. Compare the result with your first attempt.

The key takeaway

1 **Case 1**

How you feed information to the AI changes what it can do for you.

2 **Case 2**

The AI does not replace your team. Today the gap was local regulations. But it could just as easily be a procurement constraint your buyer knows about, a labor issue your site manager has dealt with before, or a stakeholder dynamic that only your team lead understands.

The AI gives you a strong starting point, and that is genuinely valuable. But your team is what turns it into something you can actually execute. **Planning is not a solo exercise with a tool. It is a conversation with the people who will do the work.**