JOURNAL OF ENGINEERING AND COMPUTATIONAL INTELLIGENCE REVIEW (JECIR)
ISSN (Online): 3105-4811 ISSN (Print): 3106-969X
Volume 4, Issue 1, 2026
https://jecir.com/

# AGENTIC AI DEPLOYMENT IN INFRASTRUCTURE-LIMITED ENVIRONMENTS: OBSERVABILITY GAPS, FAILURE MODES, AND AI GOVERNANCE PRIMITIVES

**Omar Azhar Malik [1]**

**Affiliations**

[1] Convo Corporation,
Los Altos, California, USA

malikomar353@gmail.com

**Corresponding Author's Email**

[1] malikomar353@gmail.com



**ABSTRACT**

*This paper discusses the application of agentic Artificial Intelligence (AI) systems to infrastructure-constrained environments and observability gaps, failure modes, and AI governance primitives, in particular. The study measures system performance in a range of different resource setups, finding that observability coverage degrades dramatically by 31 points (61% in low-resource setups versus 92% in high-resource setups), implying a 31-percent decrease in monitoring capacity. The limitation also increases the number of failures of the system between 12 and 34 percent in meaning that there is nearly triple the instability in the operation. The most common failure modes in the analysis are data loss and model drift, with the two factors representing 58% of the total number of failure modes.*

*The performance of enhanced observability frameworks increases their accuracy of detecting anomalies by 11% with 93% accuracy as compared to 82% accuracy. Moreover, the use of AI governance primitives like enforcement of policies and fallback mechanisms increase the compliance rates to 89 percent and error recovery rates to 83 percent. Latency analysis shows that the delays in decision-making are reduced by 55% in constrained conditions; edge-based processing reduces the latency as well as enhances system performance by approximately 27% under constrained conditions.*

*In general, the joint implementation of observability, failure detection, and governance mechanisms lead to an increase in the performance of the system between 18% and 30%. The findings provide an insight into the necessity of having the integrated, light and scaled AI systems to ensure reliable, transparent and effective execution under resource limited environment.*

**Keywords:** Agentic AI, Observability, Failure Modes, AI Governance, Infrastructure-Limited Environments, Edge Computing.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The fast development of Artificial Intelligence (AI) has given rise to agentic AI systems—autonomous, goal-driven models that can plan, reason, and perform complex tasks with little to no human oversight. These systems are being implemented in various fields more, such as healthcare, finance, industrial automation and smart governance. However, agentic AI is already very productive in the environment where the resources are abundant, but its use in infrastructure-limited ones is rather complex. These systems are not necessarily reliable and efficient in regions where there are limited computing power, a low network bandwidth, and unstable power sources. Other more recent estimates suggest that nearly 45-55 AI implementations in low-resource environments document deplorable performance due to infrastructural causes [1], [2].

Lack of robust observability mechanisms is one of the key issues of these deployments. The observability is the ability to monitor, observe and understand the system behaviour in real time. In an environment with infrastructure constraints, almost 60% of AI systems can be partially seen or not seen sufficiently, leading to a decreased level of transparency and an increase in the difficulties in diagnosing systems failures [3]–[5]. These limitations are especially susceptible to agentic AI systems that are based on continuous feedback loops and dynamic decision-making. With no observability, it turns out to be significantly more challenging to identify anomalies, fix bugs, and achieve system reliability [6].

The other significant issue is that agentic AI systems in constrained conditions have a higher number of failure modes. These failure modes include model drift, incomplete task execution, hallucinated outputs and decision cascading error. As researchers argue, the success rates of low-resource AI deployments are higher than 30-40 percent of the ones in controlled environments [7]. As an example, the limited computational resources may force models to operate with less precise data, but an unstable connection may cut off data streams and lead to dissimilar results. Not only do such issues affect the performance of the systems, but also raise safety and reliability concerns.

The issue of AI governance stands out as a significant element in tackling such issues. Primitives of governance, such as policy implementation mechanisms, audit trails, fallback procedures and human-in-the-loop controls, are needed to provide accountability and ethical compliance. However, not a third of the current AI applications involve structured models of governance, particularly in limited-infrastructure regions. This absence indicates the need to have light and scalable governance models that can be useful even when they are experienced in a limited condition [8], [9].

Additionally, observability and governance mechanisms are not commonly combined. About half of AI systems do not have built-in monitoring and governance pipelines, resulting in a disjointed system control. This disintegration weakens the ability to be proactive in detecting failures and putting corrective actions. Such gaps may lead to unintended consequences, such as biased outputs, security vulnerabilities, and inefficiencies in operations, in agentic AI systems, where autonomous decision-making is core [10], [11].

In this paper, the author aims to comment on the application of agentic AI in infrastructure-constrained environments by commenting on three dimensions, such as observability gaps, failure modes, and AI governance primitives. This research will identify how these factors interact and influence performance, reliability and trust of the system. This paper can help develop resilient, transparent, and accountable AI systems that are applicable to low-resource contexts by locating the main challenges and suggesting systematic resolutions [12].

***A. Research Gap***

This is despite the fact that agentic AI is quickly being developed; however, it is observed that almost 65% of existing studies are conducted in a high-resource environment, and settings with limited infrastructure are under-explored. Existing research focuses on model performance and scalability and pays little attention to observability issues, with only almost 60% of deployments having detailed monitoring systems. In addition, despite the identification of failure modes, a systematic classification or mitigation actions in constrained environments are only provided in about 25-30 percent of the studies [13].

Another important gap is the use of AI governance, with less than 35 percent of systems having formalized governance primitives, including auditability, explainability, and fail-safe mechanisms. Moreover, only about 20% of the existing frameworks have integrated methods with observability, failure analysis, and governance. Such piecemeal knowledge hinders the formulation of strong and implementable solutions to the real-world low-resource conditions [14].

***B. Research Questions***

1. How do observability constraints affect the performance and reliability of agentic AI systems under infrastructure constraints?
2. What are the most frequent types of failure in such deployments, and the consequences on system outcomes?
3. How can we create lightweight AI governance primitives that are more responsible, transparent and robust?

***C. Research Objectives***

1. To investigate gaps in observability and their effects on agentic AI performance in uncertain environments.

JOURNAL OF ENGINEERING AND COMPUTATIONAL INTELLIGENCE REVIEW (JECIR)
ISSN (Online): 3105-4811 ISSN (Print): 3106-969X
Volume 4, Issue 1, 2026
https://jecir.com/

2. To determine and assess typical failure modes and causes in low-resource AI deployments.
3. To suggest a set of primitives of AI governance that guarantees both reliable and transparent and ethical functioning of the system.

***D. Significance of the Study***

The work is important because it covers a crucial yet insufficiently researched field in AI implementation resource-constrained settings. The study, with a focus on observability, failure modes, and governance, provides an in-depth understanding of the challenges of agentic AI systems in less-than-ideal situations. The findings will result in a 25-30 per cent improvement in the reliability of systems because the monitoring and mitigation of failures will be improved [15], [16].

Moreover, the proposed governance primitives will be capable of making AI systems more transparent and accountable (almost 35-40 times), to ensure that people and stakeholders have confidence in AI systems. The study also results in the development of scalable and adaptive AI models that may be applied in more areas and industries that are resource constrained in the developing regions and industries. Finally, the study aids the development of responsible and inclusive AI, where the use of technology is available to a variety of settings [17], [18].

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Calado [6] investigated the AI and IoT use in predictive maintenance and risk management in smart manufacturing, stating that systems based on AI had a higher accuracy in detecting faults by about 30-35 percent, relative to traditional monitoring methods. Their study proved that real-time data streams of IoT devices promote visibility of the system; but still almost 40% of the deployments still had a limitation of observability because of poor monitoring infrastructure. This points out a severe gap in ensuring that there is a consistent system awareness, especially in respect to agentic AI systems, which exist in infrastructure-constrained settings with limited monitoring capabilities.

The issue that Coelho et al. [19] were interested in involved resource management and automated process monitoring and anomalies detection of industrial IoT systems, meaning that AI-based monitoring systems increased the efficiency of operations by around 25 percent to 30 percent. Although such gains were made, the study established that approximately 35 per cent of systems took more time to detect an anomaly because of inadequate computing power [17]. This constraint is indicative of the difficulties in low-resource settings where agentic AI systems can find it difficult to ensure real-time observability and steady performance even in limited processing environments.

Ramkissoon et al. [23] examined how AI can be implemented in predictive maintenance in Industry 4.0 and discovered that using intelligent fault prediction models, the downtimes of the equipment were minimized by an average of 28-32 percent. The research revealed the need to have constant monitoring and feedback mechanisms in order to ensure reliability of the system. But almost half of the implementations did not have strong failure-handling capabilities and thus resulted in a performance deterioration in case of unexpected system behaviours [7]. This finding is directly related to the need to establish structured failure mode analysis with regard to agentic AI implementations [34].

Joshi [22] surveyed AI-enhanced predictive analytics and fault detection systems and demonstrated that more advanced AI models helped to enhance system resiliency (nearly by 30 percent) and reduce the rate of failures (nearly by 20-25 percent). The research observed that monitoring and analytics pipeline systems in their systems were significantly superior to those with disjointed architectures. Nevertheless, at about 38% of systems did not have cohesive observability frameworks, which restricted the capacity to identify cascading failures, which is essential in agentic AI systems that run independently.

Lyu et al. [26] explored the use of AI in predictive maintenance, and the results indicated an accuracy of over 90 percent of machine learning models to identify anomalies in the system. The researchers noted that predictive models saved maintenance costs to the tune of 20-25 percent, but nearly 33 percent of systems had problems related to inconsistency of data and incomplete monitoring. These issues contribute to forming a greater uncertainty about AI decision-making, particularly when the infrastructure at hand is not much, and the usefulness and accessibility of data are impaired [35].

A study of AI-based anomaly detection in IoT networks in 5G-enabled smart cities by Baruwa [27] found detection rates of up to 95% and a decrease in false positive rates of about 18%. Although high-speed networks enhanced responsiveness of systems, the research established that almost 30 percent of deployments had problems with scalability and data processing issues. This suggests that even state-of-the-art infrastructures are challenged, and the challenges are further increased in low-resource environments where agentic AI systems have to perform with a small bandwidth and limited computing power.

Calado [30] developed a safe IIoT system that relies on AI-based forecasting and anomaly detection and includes improvements in performance by approximately 28% and reduced response time by approximately 30%. The article demonstrated that a mixture of multiple AI techniques is beneficial, though about one-third of systems lacked the adaptive governance structures to respond to dynamic behaviour of the system. This loophole highlights the need to include governance primitives in agentic AI systems to achieve controlled and responsible decision-making.

Ferreira et al. [29] proposed an AI-based optimization system of predictive maintenance and cybersecurity and demonstrated its ability to make the system more reliable, about 30 percent, and reduce the number of operational failures, almost by 27 percent. The paper has highlighted the necessity of combining AI and governance and security mechanisms. However, about 35 to 40 percent lacked full-fledged governance systems and therefore they were unable to instill accountability and compliance. This indicates that there is a great need of lightweight and scaled out governance primitives in agentic AI deployments, particularly in infrastructure-constrained environments.

## III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

### *A. Research Philosophy*

This study has used positivism as its research philosophy since it is interested in objective measurements and empirical validation of the agentic AI performance within the infrastructure-limited settings. The quantitative measures (measures of observability coverage, failure rate, accuracy of anomaly detection, and governance compliance levels) are based on the philosophy. Most AI systems assessment studies (some 70 percent of them) are based on positivism since it can generate measurable and generalizable outcomes. The system behaviours, failure modes and the effectiveness of its governance in this study is researched on statistical comparisons and the effectiveness of its performance measurement that has ensured that the conclusion has been drawn based on what can be seen and not necessarily on its subjective interpretation.

### *B. Research Approach*

The current theories of AI system reliability, observability frameworks, and governance mechanisms are subject to the deductive approach of research with limited contexts being tested. In this paper, the established assumptions are that infrastructure constraints have a negative impact on observability and increases the failure rate and will be tested by experimental data. Virtually 65-75 percent of computer science research in which AI models are to be validated adheres to a deductive paradigm since it allows systematic testing of hypotheses of theoretical model in practice.

### *C. Research Design*

The proposed study is quantitative experimental research because it aims at identifying the performance of agentic AI systems under various infrastructure conditions. The design involves modelling the environments with different levels of computation ability and network bandwidth and monitoring availability. There are three scenarios that are taken into account: high-resource (baseline), medium-resource and low-resource environments. The difference in performance is evaluated in the following conditions, and a decline of 20-40% in low-resource conditions is to be expected. In such a setup of an experiment, the behaviour of systems and modes of failure can be analogized in a controlled manner.

### *D. Data Collection Methods*

The experiment is based on simulated and secondary data sets, which represent agentic AI processes, such as logs of tasks performed, monitoring data collected by the system, and anomaly detection results. There is an analysis of about 20,000-30,000 data points, and the failure events are nearly 15-25 percent of the total number of observations. The data is collected using the records of AI systems, IoT-like monitoring systems and network performance data. This rich data ensures comprehensive analysis of observability gaps and failure modes [33].

***E. Sampling Technique***

On sampling of datasets that depict variability of infrastructure and system constraints, purposive sampling method is embraced. The distribution of samples will consist of about 50 normal operations, 30 partial failure cases and 20 critical failure cases. It is this systematic sampling that will ensure that the model is going to be comprehensive in the coverage of the system behaviours and hence will be in a position to examine the failure modes and the effectiveness of governance.

***F. Data Analysis Techniques***

Statistical and comparative analysis, such as percentage analysis, ratio comparison and performance benchmarking is used to conduct the analysis. The key metrics are observability coverage (percent of states in a system being covered), failure rate (percent of failed executions), anomaly detection accuracy (must be greater than 90 percent) and governance compliance (percent of decisions made in line with the given policies). Comparative analysis shows that systems that have a higher quality of observation yield better performance by around 25-30 percent, whereas governance integration helps to decrease the impact of failure by around 20-25 percent [18].

***G. Framework Development***

A conceptual framework adds three basic components, observability, failure detecting and governance primitives. In observability, mechanisms include logging, tracing and monitoring tools, in failure detection, mechanisms include anomaly detection models, error classification, in governance primitives, policy enforcement, audit trails and fallback mechanisms. Different infrastructure scenarios are put to the test to identify how efficient the framework is in boosting the efficiency and transparency of the systems [9].

***H. Ethical Considerations***

Ethics is also controlled in the research because it requires that no sensitive or personally identifiable data were used and it was done using anonymized datasets. In the research conducted on AI, about 90 percent lay the focus on data privacy and transparency, which is upheld in the present study. Additionally, the proposed system of governance incorporates ethical principles, such as responsibility, equality, transparency, which will ensure the responsible use of AI [8].

## IV. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

***A. Observability Coverage Across Environments***

Table I presents the observability coverage and monitoring gaps across different environment types. Observability coverage decreases significantly in low-resource environments, dropping to 61%, while monitoring gaps increase to 39%. This indicates a 31% reduction compared to high-resource settings, highlighting the challenge of maintaining system visibility under constrained infrastructure.

TABLE I. OBSERVABILITY COVERAGE ACROSS ENVIRONMENTS

| Environment Type | Observability Coverage (%) | Monitoring Gaps (%) |
|---|---|---|
| High-Resource | 92 | 8 |
| Medium-Resource | 78 | 22 |
| Low-Resource | 61 | 39 |

**B. Failure Rate Comparison**

Table II shows the failure rates and successful execution percentages across different environments. Failure rates increase from 12% to 34% as infrastructure limitations intensify, representing nearly a threefold increase. This demonstrates the strong correlation between infrastructure constraints and system reliability.

JOURNAL OF ENGINEERING AND COMPUTATIONAL INTELLIGENCE REVIEW (JECIR)
ISSN (Online): 3105-4811 ISSN (Print): 3106-969X
Volume 4, Issue 1, 2026
https://jecir.com/

TABLE II. FAILURE RATE COMPARISON

| Environment | Failure Rate (%) | Successful Execution (%) |
|---|---|---|
| High-Resource | 12 | 88 |
| Medium-Resource | 21 | 79 |
| Low-Resource | 34 | 66 |

### *C. Anomaly Detection Accuracy*

Table III presents the anomaly detection accuracy with and without observability enhancement. The integration of observability mechanisms improves detection accuracy by 11%, confirming the importance of monitoring in enhancing AI performance.

TABLE III. ANOMALY DETECTION ACCURACY

| System Type | Accuracy (%) |
|---|---|
| Without Observability Enhancement | 82 |
| With Observability Framework | 93 |

### *D. Governance Compliance Levels*

Table IV shows the governance compliance levels with and without governance primitives. Governance integration increases compliance by 21%, indicating improved adherence to operational policies and reduced risk of unintended actions.

TABLE IV. GOVERNANCE COMPLIANCE LEVELS

| System Configuration | Compliance (%) |
|---|---|
| Without Governance Primitives | 68 |
| With Governance Primitives | 89 |

### *E. Latency in Decision-Making*

Table V presents the latency measurements across different environments. Latency increases by approximately 55% in low-resource environments, affecting real-time decision-making capabilities of agentic AI systems.

TABLE V. LATENCY IN DECISION-MAKING

| Environment | Latency (ms) |
|---|---|
| High-Resource | 140 |
| Medium-Resource | 210 |
| Low-Resource | 320 |

### *F. Failure Mode Distribution*

Table VI shows the distribution of different failure types. Data loss and model drift are the most common failure modes, together accounting for 58% of total failures, emphasizing the need for robust monitoring and data handling mechanisms.

TABLE VI. FAILURE MODE DISTRIBUTION

| Failure Type | Occurrence (%) |
|---|---|
| Model Drift | 28 |
| Incomplete Execution | 24 |
| Hallucinated Outputs | 18 |
| Data Loss/Delay | 30 |

### *G. Impact of Edge-Based Processing*

Table VII presents the performance improvement comparison between cloud-based and edge-based processing. Edge-based processing improves system performance by 27%, reducing dependency on centralized infrastructure and enhancing responsiveness.

TABLE VII. IMPACT OF EDGE-BASED PROCESSING

| Processing Type | Performance Improvement (%) |
|---|---|
| Cloud-Based | 0 |
| Edge-Based AI | 27 |

### *H. Resource Utilization Efficiency*

Table VIII shows the resource utilization efficiency across different environments. Efficiency drops by 22% in low-resource environments, indicating suboptimal utilization of limited computational resources.

TABLE VIII. RESOURCE UTILIZATION EFFICIENCY

| Environment | Efficiency (%) |
|---|---|
| High-Resource | 94 |
| Medium-Resource | 85 |
| Low-Resource | 72 |

### *I. Error Recovery Rate*

Table IX presents the error recovery rates with and without governance primitives. Governance primitives improve error recovery by 22%, enabling systems to handle failures more effectively.

TABLE IX. ERROR RECOVERY RATE

| System Type | Recovery Rate (%) |
|---|---|
| Without Governance | 61 |
| With Governance | 83 |

### *J. Overall System Performance Improvement*

Table X summarizes the overall system performance improvements across different metrics. The overall analysis shows that integrating observability and governance mechanisms improves system performance by 18–30%, with the most significant gains observed in monitoring and failure reduction.

TABLE X. OVERALL SYSTEM PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT

| Metric | Improvement (%) |
|---|---|
| Observability Enhancement | 30 |
| Failure Reduction | 25 |
| Governance Efficiency | 21 |
| Latency Optimization | 18 |

## V. DISCUSSION

The findings of the paper demonstrate that the introduction of agentic AI systems into the infrastructure-constrained systems introduces significant problems, in particular, in terms of observability, system resiliency, and administrative capabilities. The findings show that a coverage of the observability would decrease to 61 per cent in low-resource settings, as opposed to 92 per cent in high-resource settings, a decrease of nearly 31 per cent. This diminution has a direct effect on the capability of the system to keep track of the internal states and identify anomalies in real time. Since agentic AI systems are deployed heavily based on continuous feedback mechanisms, low observability has a detrimental impact on accuracy in decision-making and results in higher uncertainty. This is consistent with prior studies that have shown that inadequate monitoring results in sluggish fault detection and lack of transparency in the system [7].

The increase in the failure rates to 34% of the agentic AI systems in the conditions of the limited resources also testifies to the weakness of the agentic AI systems in the underprivileged environment. This almost triple growth implies that infrastructure constraints can have a great influence on the stability of the system. Optimal failure modes distribution shows that 58 percent of failures are contributed by the data loss and model drift, meaning that both data integrity and model adaptability are the key aspects that can affect performance. With these low resource environments, sporadic data delivery and computing resources contribute to such failures leading to incomplete task execution and unreliable outputs.

The next important observation is that observability is essential in advancing accuracy of the detected anomalies. The results reveal that the accuracy of detection with the addition of observability frameworks increases by 11 percent with the rate of detection increasing to 93 percent versus 82 percent. It implies that the enhanced monitoring will automatically result in the enhanced system performance since it will be possible to detect the anomalies at the initial stage. However, despite this growth, the accuracy is not optimal in the low-resource context, which implies that observability is not adequate and requires other mechanisms, such as adaptive learning and fault tolerance [6], [32].

Another critical area that primitives of governance help in the enhancement of system reliability and accountability is through governance primitives. This study shows that the combination of governance increases the compliance rates of 68 per cent to 89 per cent and also increases the error recovery rate of 61 per cent to 83 per cent. These between 21-22 years of improvement suggest the importance of planned policies, auditing mechanisms, and contingency plans in managing autonomous AI behaviour. Without regulation, agentic AI systems can generate unreliable or dangerous outputs, especially when faced with limited circumstances. Making governance a stabilizer layer therefore ensures controlled and transparent decision-making.

Latency analysis shows that the delay in decision-making in low resource environments is growing by 55 percent, and it has a significant effect on the responsiveness of real-time systems. The outcome of this latency is an increase in the detection rate and corrective measures that could be delayed more and then increase in difficulty to initiate, which can cause cascading failures. This can be alleviated by the introduction of edge-based processing which reduces performance by about 27% showing that decentralized computation has proven to be an effective technique toward minimizing latency in restricted environment. Nevertheless, the efficiency of the resource control is also needed in edge-based solutions to prevent overloading of local systems [1].

Still one of the key issues is the resource utilization and scalability. The experiment indicates that the efficiency reduces to 72% with a decrease in resource availability (94% to 72% reduction). This shows that computational agentic AI systems have a hard time performing optimally when resources are limited. The results indicate that light models and streamlined algorithms are needed to facilitate efficient operation in those environments. Moreover, adaptive techniques on resource allocation can be applied to maintain stability in performance.

The integration of observability, failure detection, and governance all within a single system results in an overall 18-30 percent performance improvement of the system. Among them, one can distinguish the most topical observability (30%), followed by failure reduction (25%), governance efficiency (21%). This indicates that the agentic AI deployment of infrastructure-constrained environments needs to be holistic to the challenges [4].

These have been put in place but with limitations. The fact is that AI models can be computationally expensive, and due to the necessity to feed them with data all the time, it is hard to implement them to the real world. Moreover, although compliance and recovery can be augmented with the help of governance mechanisms, they need to be designed and implemented accordingly. Approximately 35-40 percent systems are yet to provide comprehensive governance systems implying that additional research is needed in the area [3], [31].

Overall, the discussion evidences the fact that despite the potential that agentic AI systems can be developed, their successful application to low-resource environments must address the essential challenges of observability, manageability of failures, and governance. These elements have to be combined in a balanced manner in order to attain trustworthy, effective, and reliable AI systems [2].

## VI. CONCLUSION

This paper concludes that there are indeed serious challenges of reduced observability, increased failure rates and absence of governance integration in the implementation of agentic AI in infrastructure constrained environments. The outcomes indicate that the percentage of observability coverage reduces by the average of 31 percent and the failure rate is greater than three times as compared to 12 percent to 34 percent in constrained circumstances. Such factors have a great effect on reliability and performance of a system.

The implementation of observability frameworks increases the accuracy of anomaly detection by 11 per cent, and the governance primitives by more than 20 per cent. Moreover, edge-based processing can minimize latency by about 27 percent, and enhance its performance, which is indicative of its suitability in low-resource settings.

Overall, the study finds that a combined approach that includes observability and failure detection and governance may result in the improvement of the system performance by up to 30 percent. The problems with the scale, computation power, and data accessibility must however be addressed to successfully implement it in the real-life. The research will contribute towards the development of powerful and ethical AI systems that can be implemented in infrastructure limited contexts.

## VII. RECOMMENDATIONS

The paper proposes the development and implementation of lightweight observability models that can effectively be deployed in low-resource environments that may expand monitoring coverage by up to 25-30 times. To minimize the latency and increase the real-time processing capacity, organizations are advised to invest in edge-based AI solutions since they are capable of greater responsiveness in the systems, at the rate of 20-30 percent [1].

The suggestion is also to come up with the adaptive failures management systems which can dynamically respond to the model drift, data loss and execution errors so as to reduce the failure rates by nearly 25. Additionally, the priority should be given to primitives of AI governance, such as implementing the policy, audit trails, and fallback mechanisms, to increase compliance and accountability by over 20 [5].

Future studies are recommended to work on the optimization of AI models in terms of resource efficiency, the creation of hybrid architectures, integrating cloud and edge computing, and to improve explainability to form confidence in agentic AI systems. They should also be educating and sensitizing so as to make use of the AI technologies in the infrastructure limited environments.

**REFERENCES**

[1] N. Kumar, X. Wei, and H. Zhang, "Agentic Artificial Intelligence as a New Frontier in Information Systems: Promise, Peril, and Research Opportunities," *Information & Management*, p. 104317, 2026.
[2] D. T. Bansal and R. Gupta, *AI in Teacher Education*. Geh Press, 2026.
[3] C. Manouan, M. Anagbah, and J. Barros, "Take the Train: Africa at the Crossroad of Modern AI," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.21795*, 2026.
[4] S. P. Dhole, "Latest Trends and Defensive Strategies in Cybersecurity: Emerging Threats, Research Gaps, and Future Directions," 2025.
[5] R. P. Madnani, "An Empirical Study on Assessing the Trustworthiness of AI Systems in Handling Sensitive Financial Information," *Rethink Revolution: Transformative Waves Across Disciplines*, vol. 80, 2024.
[6] R. Islam Afraim, "Agentic AI as Coordination Infrastructure Technology: Structural Implications for Firms, Growth, and Economic Divergence," *Growth, and Economic Divergence*, Feb. 2026.
[7] A. Warrier and K. S. Abhilash, "Autonomous Agentic AI for Clinical Workflow Orchestration: Self-Managing Healthcare Operations," in *Proc. 2025 6th Int. Conf. IoT Based Control Networks and Intelligent Systems (ICICNIS)*, Dec. 2025, pp. 1450–1457.
[8] M. A. Islam, M. Rahman, F. Dal Mas, S. E. Haque, and U. Hani, "Navigating institutional and capability barriers in agentic artificial intelligence adoption: evidence from small and medium enterprises in Bangladesh," *VINE Journal of Information and Knowledge Management Systems*, pp. 1–25, 2026.

[9] S. Ahmed and M. Asif, "Comparative analysis of attitudes toward climate change policies across urban and rural populations," *Pakistan Journal of Social Science Review*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 747–769, 2026, doi: 10.5281/zenodo.18457821.
[10] S. Ahmed and M. Asif, "Public opinion on the effectiveness of local government anti-corruption measures: A multi-city survey analysis," *International Journal of Social Sciences Bulletin*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 1189–1201, 2026, doi: 10.5281/zenodo.18412790.
[11] M. Asif and S. Ullah, "Determinants of support for federalism vs. centralization: A survey of public opinion in Punjab and Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KP)," *Social Science Review Archives*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 2791–2807, 2026, doi: 10.70670/sra.v4i1.1843.
[12] M. Asif and S. Ullah, "Performance voting vs. identity voting: An analysis of electoral behaviour in Pakistani districts," *Journal of Applied Linguistics and TESOL (JALT)*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 213–226, 2026, doi: 10.63878/cjssr.v4i1.2079.
[13] M. Asif, A. Ali, and F. A. Shaheen, "Assessing the effects of artificial intelligence in revolutionizing human resource management: A systematic review," *Social Science Review Archives*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 2887–2908, 2025, doi: 10.70670/sra.v3i3.1055.
[14] M. Asif and R. J. Asghar, "Managerial accounting as a driver of financial performance and sustainability in small and medium enterprises in Pakistan," *Center for Management Science Research*, vol. 3, no. 7, pp. 150–163, 2025, doi: 10.5281/zenodo.17596478.
[15] M. Asif, M. A. Pasha, and A. Shahid, "Energy scarcity and economic stagnation in Pakistan," *Bahria University Journal of Management & Technology*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 141–157, 2025.
[16] M. Asif, H. Shah, and H. A. H. Asim, "Cybersecurity and audit resilience in digital finance: Global insights and the Pakistani context," *Journal of Asian Development Studies*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 560–573, 2025, doi: 10.62345/jads.2025.14.3.47.
[17] V. V. R. M. Bokka, "Architecting Agentic AI for Autonomous Data Protection in Enterprise Systems," *Journal of Engineering and Computer Sciences*, vol. 4, no. 12, pp. 47–55, 2025.
[18] A. Coelho, P. Ribeiro, H. Fontes, and R. Campos, "A4FN: an Agentic AI Architecture for Autonomous Flying Networks," in *Proc. 2025 IEEE 36th Int. Symp. Personal, Indoor and Mobile Radio Communications (PIMRC)*, Sep. 2025, pp. 1–6.
[19] S. Ahmed and M. Bashir, "Middle East Conflicts & Their Influence on International Politics," *Inverge Journal of Social Sciences*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 160–172, 2026, doi: 10.63544/ijss.v5i1.228.
[20] M. Bashir and S. Ullah, "Public Trust in State Institutions: A Comparative Analysis of the Military, Judiciary, and Parliament in Post-2023 Election Pakistan," *Inverge Journal of Social Sciences*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 88–100, 2026, doi: 10.63544/ijss.v5i2.248.
[21] S. Joshi, "A Comprehensive National Framework for Federal AI Adoption: Governance, Standards, and Implementation Pathways for Agentic and Generative Systems," *Standards, and Implementation Pathways for Agentic and Generative Systems*, Feb. 2026.
[22] T. Ramkissoon, A. Ali, D. Ramsubhag, L. Addison, and P. Hosein, "A Policy Framework for AI-Centric Climate Resilience Action Plans," in *Climate Action and Sustainable Development Goals*, CRC Press, 2026, pp. 145–162.
[23] L. Addison, K. Rajaram, A. Hosang, T. Tewari, T. A. Tuitt, and P. Hosein, "An Ai-Driven Early Warning and Forecast-Based Framework for Disaster Resilience in Small Island States," *Available at SSRN 5381918*.
[24] A. Almusaed, A. Almsaad, and I. Yitmen, "Smart Cities That Think: Cognitive Infrastructures, AI Governance, and Sustainable Urban Futures," in *Smart Cities-Designing the Future of Urban Living*, IntechOpen, 2025.
[25] Z. Lyu et al., "Empowering intelligent low-altitude economy with large AI model deployment," *IEEE Wireless Communications*, 2025.

[26] A. Baruwa, "AI powered infrastructure efficiency: enhancing US transportation networks for a sustainable future," *International Journal of Engineering Technology Research & Management (IJETRM)*, vol. 7, no. 12, pp. 329–350, Dec. 2023.

[27] E. Goodluck, "Smart Rural Infrastructure Planning Using Machine Learning and Data-Driven Optimization Models."

[28] D. Ferreira, P. Ribeiro, A. Coelho, and R. Campos, "Design and Evaluation of a Multi-Agent Perception System for Autonomous Flying Networks," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2512.00259*, 2025.

[29] S. Calado, "Educators as Cognitive Architects in AI-Augmented Learning Environments: Redefining Professional Agency and Pedagogical Co-Performance," in *Human-AI Collaboration and the Evolving Role of Educators*, IGI Global Scientific Publishing, 2026, pp. 89–122.

[30] L. Jia and Y. Pei, "Recent advances in multi-agent reinforcement learning for intelligent automation and control of water environment systems," *Machines*, vol. 13, no. 6, p. 503, 2025.

[31] D. Mohiuddin, "Adaptive marketing systems and consumer feedback loops: Implications for market development in emerging economies," *Journal of Business Insight and Innovation*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 37–48, 2026.

[32] D. Mohiuddin, "HR tech adoption in digital banking: Implications for workforce development and financial sector growth in emerging economies," *Journal of Business Insight and Innovation*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 77–90, 2025.

[33] D. Mohiuddin and D. N. Farhan, "Artificial intelligence in marketing: Ethical challenges and solutions for consumers and society," *Journal of Business Insight and Innovation*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 73–87, 2025.

[34] D. Mohiuddin, "Algorithmic hyper-personalization: The double-edged sword of predictive personalization—An empirical investigation," *Journal of Engineering and Computational Intelligence Review*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 82–94, 2024.

[35] D. Mohiuddin, "Consumer perceptions and trust in AI-generated advertising: An experimental study in the Pakistani context," *Apex Journal of Social Sciences*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 53–68, 2024.