

AN INDUSTRY BRIEFING FROM GRAIL

What's Changing in the Backlog You Sign

Your next €10M of capital. The project margin you commit. The backlog-quality thesis your lender and your board trust. Three questions that look separate, but are actually one. A briefing for CFOs at mid-market European infrastructure and civil engineering firms.

PREPARED BY

Johan Grönstedt · GRAIL

FOR

European mid-market
infrastructure and civil CFOs

DATE

April 2026

Monday morning, board pack due Friday

Every CFO at a mid-sized European civil-engineering group has had the same Monday morning. Four things on the screen at 7:45. Three live D&B jobs are printing project margin four points below plan, contingency is drawing faster than cover. Your best principal engineer retired two weeks ago; twenty-three years of regulatory-pathway judgment walked out with her. Your CTO wants €3M next quarter to stand up a BIM-AI tender engine, and his one-page says "digital capability investment." The framework renewal tender opens in Q3, and the procurement body has just asked every bidder to respond on "digital maturity" in the technical response.

You have signed fifteen project-margin forecasts for this board. The pattern used to be simple. Win the framework, defend the rate, close the monthly WIP clean. Hold the lender syndicate steady on the quarterly review. The business was understandable.

Something changed. Your project margin is drifting and your team cannot reconstruct the job-level story. Your BIM-AI capital is running through the IT budget as a tooling line. Your sharpest mid-market competitor compressed tender preparation from six weeks to three days and is quoting more frameworks per quarter without growing estimating headcount. Your Senior Controller is closing the monthly WIP faster than ever, and the lender's quarterly review is asking about "AI covenant risk." The close is clean. The project-margin story underneath it is not.

The job has not changed in fifty years. The bar has risen on every measure of doing it, simultaneously, and the contradictions you have been navigating since you took the seat are suddenly re-openable. The CFOs who treat them as engineering problems run the offensive play. The ones who treat them as permanent trade-offs lose capital-allocation authority to the CTO within eighteen months.

This briefing covers what is happening in your sector, what it means for the finance function you run, and the three questions your team should answer before the next board pack.

Mid-market civils just lost the equation that priced the sector for a decade

Every tender your estimating team prepares now takes a fraction of the time it used to. The sharpest mid-market competitors compressed a six-week bid to three days without growing headcount. Under framework agreements, none of that productivity flows to the top line, because the hourly rate is locked for the next four years. Your competitors are bidding three times as many frameworks and closing on the ones where their technical response reads one cycle ahead of yours. The firms ahead of this are not waiting for the framework to renew. They are preparing the next bid on an outcome-based structure the procurement body has never seen, and the first mover will reshape what the procurement norm looks like for everyone behind them.

Your competitors are not waiting. AECOM paid \$390M for the Norwegian AI startup Consigli, confirming that AI-engineering capability now carries acquisition value in this sector. Norconsult bought Aas-Jakobsen, Sigma Civil, and Metier in a single cycle, and the pattern is repeating at mid-market scale across Nordic, DACH, and Benelux. The firms moving first are buying specialist design and AI-native firms as tuck-ins rather than trying to rebuild themselves. The patient ones are building the tender-memory and project-precedent asset that AI-native entrants cannot replicate in eighteen months, because the data only exists in twenty years of closed-out final accounts. They are the quiet compounders. The rest of the sector is shipping pilots into the BIM team and wondering why the project-margin story has not improved.

Your tender-preparation cost is falling. Your framework rate is not. The estimating team did not cause this. A pricing decision the finance seat has not yet claimed did.

The sector is repricing underneath everyone at the same time. BCG's Nordic construction survey this cycle: one in four firms generate meaningful business impact from AI. Zero qualify as future-built. The demographic retirement wave is closing a window that was never open very far. A quarter of the construction workforce is over 55. The firms that treat this as a workforce-planning problem rather than a tender-memory and regulatory-pathway problem are walking into a framework-renewal tender they will not win.

Your capital, your project margin, and your backlog are feeling it every day

Your capital allocation. Your CTO's €3M BIM-AI request is sitting in the IT budget, routed through the same mechanism you use to sign off on Autodesk licences and workstations. It is not a tooling request. It is the largest single capital-allocation decision you will make this decade, and it deserves the same discipline you bring to a specialist-design-firm tuck-in. The finance seats that ship this as a capital line to the board, with alternatives analysis and an ROIC hurdle, keep the authorship for the next framework cycle. The ones that sign the requisition hand the authorship to the CIO and the CTO by default.

Your project-margin forecast. The team built the annual plan on an 11% project-margin assumption. The Q2 print came in at 7% because three D&B jobs are drawing contingency faster than cover. Your Head of FP&A cannot reconstruct the job-level story because the variance signal lives in field-reports, the design-change signal lives in BIM revision logs, and the sub-contractor pricing signal lives in commercial procurement notes her team has never had access to. The plan is not wrong because the forecast was aggressive. It is exposed because the data architecture underneath it was built for monthly WIP close, not for continuous reconstruction of the project-margin story.

Your framework and tender architecture. The board voted on a framework-rate strategy that assumed tender-preparation costs would stay roughly flat. They did not. Your AI-native competitors are running three pricing structures across their framework book. You are on one. The framework bid that ran clean from 2018 to 2024 is now the reason your senior-engineer billable realisation is drifting on the jobs where the comparison is clearest. Framework-rate architecture looks like a procurement question. The honest read is that it is a capital-allocation question about where the tender-memory moat gets built.

Your project-accountant and FP&A bench. The WIP reporting, earned-value reconciliation, standard variance decomposition, and first-draft tender cost build-ups that used to train a junior project accountant into a Senior Controller into a Head of Project Controls are now running on agents. The Q1 headcount win is real. The 2031 succession bench is empty. The finance function that cuts the junior layer without rebuilding the entry pathway has a cheaper quarter this year and no internal Head of Project Controls candidate in five.

Your backlog-quality thesis. Your board has asked for the strategy-day preview. Your lender syndicate has asked for the AI-and-covenant note. Your chair has asked how the firm wins the Q3 framework renewal. Three audiences, three different documents, each drafted by a different team. None of them are anchored in the same tender-memory data. The CFOs pulling ahead write the thesis once and let the three audiences draw from the same architecture. The ones behind them are editing three decks and hoping the numbers match.

You do not have three scorecard problems. You have one.

Your sector is repricing from below because AI-native and sharp mid-market competitors bring three tender mechanics to the table and the rest of the market is on one. Your finance function is stretched because the forecast credibility, the capital-allocation authority, and the backlog-quality thesis are each being managed as a separate programme, each drawing on a different data layer, each drafted by a different team. Same force, two altitudes. But there is a third thing happening that most mid-market infrastructure CFOs have not named yet, and it is the one that matters most.

Capital allocation without forecast credibility is guessing. Forecast credibility without a backlog-quality narrative is scorekeeping. A narrative without a tender-memory asset underneath it is marketing. The finance seat that holds all three holds one integrated asset, not three separate programmes. Every capital-allocation question, every forecast-credibility gap, every narrative weakness is a symptom of the same missing layer: the tender-and-project-memory infrastructure that feeds all three from the same data, the same governance, the same discipline.

This is the ERP decision of this decade. Every civil-engineering CFO in your cohort is making it right now, whether they see it or not. The ones who personally owned the 1993-1998 ERP decision kept capital-allocation authority for the next twenty years. The ones who signed the IT requisition because "that was an IT decision" watched the CIO take a board seat and the next CFO hire come from outside. The shape is the same. The asset under decision is different. The cost of getting it wrong in 2026 is compressed into eighteen months instead of five years.

You can tell which camp a firm is in from a single question. Can your team answer any material board question by walking the same project-margin and tender-memory graph, in the same meeting, with the same data? Most mid-market civils cannot. The ones that can have already made the shift, and they are the ones winning the next framework renewal.

You have twelve to eighteen months before the Q3 framework tender opens. The cohort that owns this decision personally runs the offensive play. The ones who do not become the CFO the board replaces when the successor walks in with a thesis and a working prototype.

What most firms are doing. What the winners are doing instead.

Every civils CFO has had the AI conversation. Most are making the same four decisions. A smaller group is making different ones. Default looks cleaner for three quarters. Winners compound from month fifteen.

THE DEFAULT PATH

Route BIM-AI through the IT budget

Sign the CTO's requisition. Tooling line in the annual plan. CIO owns the roadmap within eighteen months.

Hold the framework rate, ship tender productivity

Estimating cost drops thirty to fifty percent. Framework rate flat. Productivity gifted to the client. Senior-engineer realisation drifts.

Run project-margin on a rolling spreadsheet

Monthly cadence. Three D&B scenarios take a week. Below-plan jobs produce no job-level story until post-mortem.

Cut the project-accountant layer for the Q1 win

Headcount down fifteen to twenty-five percent. Empty Head of Project Controls bench in 2031. External hire the year after.

THE WINNERS' PATH

Route BIM-AI through the M&A hurdle

Alternatives against tuck-ins, working capital, buyback. Board sees one capital line, five options, one choice.

Position next framework on outcome-based structure

Multi-dimensional rates on technical content, output-based deliverables, outcome-share on PPP. Productivity converts to rate uplift.

Rebuild project-margin as a live driver graph

Ten scenarios in an afternoon. Below-plan jobs produce the job-level story in the same lender review.

Redesign the junior pathway around judgment

New hires pair with agents on scenarios, capital exposure, tender-memory review. Bench rebuilds faster than it would have grown.

The default path shows a cleaner Q1. The winners' path has visible friction for three quarters and compounds from month fifteen. The difference is whether the CFO is authoring the capital or administering it.

Capital Allocation. Forecast Credibility. Value-Creation Narrative.

Three questions every infrastructure CFO is tracking. The first is the crux. The other two are how you earn the right to answer it.

01 · CAPITAL ALLOCATION

Where does the next €10M actually compound?

BIM-AI tender engine? Specialist-design-firm tuck-in? Working-capital financing for the D&B pipeline? Covenant-supporting revolver draw? Buyback to the family or PE owner? Today's default: the CTO asks, the IT budget funds, the requisition gets signed, and the capital-allocation authority slides away from the seat. The question is not which tool. The question is whose decision this is.

02 · FORECAST CREDIBILITY

Why did the project margin print below plan, and what is the job-level story?

Your board voted on 11% project margin. Your firm is printing 7%. Your Head of FP&A cannot walk the lender syndicate through the job-level story because the variance signal sits in field-reports, the design-change signal sits in BIM revision logs, and the sub-contractor pricing signal sits in commercial procurement notes the finance team has never seen. Three D&B scenarios used to take a week. They now run in an afternoon. The bar has risen on what credible means.

03 · VALUE-CREATION NARRATIVE

What does this firm do that compounds faster than peers?

Your board wants the strategy-day preview. Your lender wants the AI-and-covenant note. Your chair wants the framework-renewal answer. Three audiences, three documents, three teams, and the numbers underneath them do not match. The CFOs pulling ahead write the backlog-quality thesis once and refresh it continuously from the same tender-memory architecture that runs the project-margin forecast. The three audiences read excerpts of the same document.

What the firms winning this play are actually doing

Four concrete moves any civils CFO can start this quarter. Each addresses one lever. Pulled together, they become one tender-and-project-memory asset the firm runs on.

1

Capital: route the BIM-AI decision through the M&A hurdle, not the IT requisition

Your CTO's €3M request is a capital-allocation decision. Treat it like one. Present the alternatives on one page: BIM-AI tender engine, specialist-design-firm tuck-in, working-capital extension on the D&B pipeline, covenant-supporting revolver, buyback to the owner. ROIC-scored against the same five-year horizon you use for M&A. Name what you are choosing not to fund to protect the thing you are funding. That is the sentence that keeps authorship at the seat.

2

Forecast: rebuild project-margin as a live driver graph, not a rolling spreadsheet

Your project-margin model should draw from live cost actuals, live schedule progress, live BIM design-change logs, and live sub-contractor commercial notes, as one graph rather than five spreadsheets stitched together. Three D&B-job scenarios compress from a week to an afternoon. Below-plan jobs produce the job-level story in the same lender review, not in the post-mortem. The forecast stops being a deliverable on a cadence and becomes a live artefact the CFO invests in continuously.

3

Pricing: position the next framework renewal on an outcome-based structure

Multi-dimensional rates on technical content. Output-based deliverables on standard engineering packages. Outcome-share or gain-share on PPP and D&B where AI touches measurable client value. The hourly framework rate holds the base on the existing book. The three new mechanics convert the thirty to fifty percent tender-preparation cost drop into framework-rate uplift on the jobs where AI-native competitors are already quoting. Finance authors the migration plan. Commercial builds the bid against it.

4

Narrative: write the backlog-quality thesis once, refresh continuously

Three sentences on one page. What does this firm do that compounds faster than peers? What capital gets starved to protect it? What gets fed? Refresh the thesis continuously off the same driver graph that runs the project-margin forecast. Lender quarterly excerpts the thesis. Audit review excerpts the thesis. Framework-bid technical response excerpts the thesis. Three audiences, one artefact, four registers. The CFO authors the narrative. The board and the lender recite it back.

The only firm that joins capital authorship to the working tender stack

The infrastructure CFO has four places to go. None can do what we do.

The Big 4 capex-programme practices sell twelve-to-twenty-four-month programmes billed by partner and analyst hours. The audit arm constrains governance advice. The billable-day model requires selling substrate work agents commoditise. A tighter WIP close, not the tender-memory moat.

The construction-tech vendors sell BIM and project-controls licences and a long implementation. The tender-memory moat has to sit on firm-owned infrastructure, or it becomes a vendor asset at renegotiation.

The estimating and project-controls specialists sell a point tool for one layer: takeoff automation, cost benchmarking, earned-value reporting. None run the capital-allocation-plus-narrative conversation the seat requires.

The MBB infrastructure and capex advisory practices write a diagnostic with a partner and an analyst. A year of slides and a steering committee. No working tender engine in the team's hands in three weeks.

The market offers four things you have already said no to. GRAIL is the fifth option.

WHAT YOU GET

Senior advisory that speaks board-room, not deck-room

Working infrastructure your team uses the same week

Custom agents built on your backlog, your tender memory, your data

The start of a project-memory layer your Head of FP&A owns

No vendor lock-in at any phase of the engagement

WHY IT MATTERS

Founded by operators who have carried CFO-adjacent seats

Business first, technology second

Three weeks from first meeting to working infrastructure

Your team keeps the infrastructure, you own the IP

Every next step earned by what just shipped, never assumed

Three sessions with your finance leadership. Working infrastructure from week one.

We start with your finance leadership team because the change cannot outrun the team's personal understanding of what is possible. Three workshops. Each delivers standalone value. Each earns the right to the next.

WORKSHOP 01

How to think

Walk through what is happening in your sector and inside your finance function. Build the first piece of infrastructure in the room: a live project-margin agent on your real three-to-five D&B jobs, running against your real cost, schedule, and BIM-revision data. Your leadership team leaves with a shared view of what to do next and the first piece of working infrastructure already in their hands.

WORKSHOP 02

Your finance infrastructure

A half-day build. Your Head of Project Controls, Head of FP&A, Treasurer, and Head of Commercial each leave with five to ten pieces of working infrastructure tuned to their function. Project-margin agents. Continuous tender-memory retrieval. Covenant-headroom intelligence. Framework-bid technical-response drafting. Infrastructure your team is using the same week, not decks about infrastructure.

WORKSHOP 03

Ready to run

Refined infrastructure based on real use. The rollout plan to the wider finance and commercial organisation. The capital-allocation-thesis document for the next board meeting. The framework-bid positioning for the Q3 tender. And the CEO and lender conversation with numbers they can check: ROIC alternatives, project-margin scenario ranges, backlog-quality measurement.

Three weeks. No IT project. No board approval needed to start. The infrastructure your finance function is already running on when we finish.

For your next lender review or board pack

The questions where your finance leadership cannot agree on an answer are the ones worth an hour on the agenda. Ask these honestly.

Your CTO wants €3M for BIM-AI. Is it in the IT budget as a tooling line, or on the capital page as one option among five? If the former, what would it take to move it before the Q3 framework tender opens?

Your board voted on 11% project margin. Your print is 7%. Can your team walk the lender syndicate through the job-level story in the same meeting, or does it take a post-mortem? If the latter, what data architecture is missing?

Your sharpest competitors are positioning the next framework renewal on outcome-based structure. You are on hourly under the old framework. What is the twelve-month plan to migrate, and who on your team is authoring it?

Your lender, your chair, and your CEO have each asked for a different AI-and-strategy document in the last ninety days. Are they excerpting the same backlog-quality thesis, or are your teams drafting three documents that do not reconcile?

Of the junior project accountants and FP&A analysts you are cutting to agents this year, how many are the people who would have made your 2031 Head of Project Controls bench? What are you doing instead to build that bench?

If any of these produces a disagreement in your finance leadership, that is the conversation worth having before the lender asks.

IN THIS SERIES

There's a version of this briefing for every seat at the table.

GRAIL has produced industry briefings calibrated to the specific reality of each C-suite role.

CEO

Revenue. Margin. Valuation.

Three numbers your board reads. AI is rewriting all three in your industry.

CFO

▶ YOU ARE READING

Capital. Forecast. Story.

What you allocate this year is the story your board reads next year.

COO

Cheaper. Better. Faster.

The triple threat that used to be a tradeoff is now table stakes.

CHRO

Capacity. Capability. Promise.

The biggest talent transition of a career. Compete on capacity, not headcount.

CPTO

Moat. Speed. Allocation.

The platform moat that survives 2028 is being chosen this year.

CCO

Margin. Pace. Position.

The whole GTM playbook is being rewritten in real time, across every commercial team at once.

Visit grail.works for the full series.

GRAIL

An AI-native management consultancy helping European mid-market leadership teams figure out what fundamentally changes about their business as AI enters their industry.

www.grail.works