

AI USE CASE EVALUATOR

A Framework for C-Suite Decision Makers

Evaluate any AI opportunity across three dimensions: feasibility, ROI potential, and time-to-results. Use this tool to identify the 2–3 highest-leverage use cases to pursue in the next 90 days. This is not meant to be prescriptive, but the process should result in discussion and deeper examination.

HOW TO USE THIS DOCUMENT

1. Identify a specific internal use case you are considering for AI adoption.
2. Work through each section with the team or function closest to that workflow.
3. Score each question 1 (low) to 3 (high) using the scoring guide provided.
4. Total your scores and consult the Prioritization Matrix to determine next steps.
5. Repeat for each candidate use case. Compare totals to prioritize your portfolio.

Complete one copy per use case. A score alone is not sufficient — the narrative notes you capture are equally important for making the right judgment call.

Use Case Identification

Use Case Name	
Business Function	<i>e.g., Finance / Sales / Operations / HR / Legal / IT</i>
Approach Considered	<i>Build custom / Buy a solution / Prompt a foundation model / Undecided</i>
Evaluator / Date	
Brief Description	

1

Feasibility & Readiness

Can we actually do this? Do we have the data, tolerance, and structure to succeed?

Score each question from 1 (low) to 3 (high). Use the scoring guide to calibrate your answer. Capture key notes in the 'Notes' column — context matters as much as the score.

#	Question & Guidance	Scoring Guide	Score (1-3)	Notes
1.1	Data availability and quality <i>Is the relevant data already collected, accessible, and reasonably clean? Scattered, siloed, or dirty data is often the single biggest barrier to AI success.</i>	1 = Scattered/unavailable 2 = Accessible but needs work 3 = Centralized and clean		
1.2	Data type fit <i>What type of data does this workflow primarily involve? AI handles structured data (tables, records) differently from unstructured data (documents, emails, conversations) or hybrid combinations.</i>	1 = Highly unstructured/hybrid, no prior tagging 2 = Mixed, some structure available 3 = Well-structured and labeled		
1.3	Error tolerance <i>What is the cost of an AI mistake in this workflow? Some errors are cheap (a flagged email that shouldn't have been flagged); others are expensive (a missed fraud signal, a bad contract clause).</i>	1 = Low tolerance — errors have significant consequences 2 = Moderate — errors are correctable with reasonable effort 3 = High — errors are easily caught and low-cost to fix		
1.4	Human-in-the-loop positioning <i>How will humans remain involved? AI that only proposes carries lower risk than AI that executes autonomously. Be specific about where the human checkpoint sits.</i>	1 = AI executes autonomously with minimal oversight 2 = AI assists; human makes final call 3 = AI proposes; human reviews and approves every output		
1.5	Determinism requirements <i>Does this workflow require perfectly reproducible, auditable outputs every time? Traditional enterprise software is deterministic — AI is probabilistic. For regulated or auditable workflows, this distinction matters.</i>	1 = Strict reproducibility required (audit, compliance, support) 2 = Some variability acceptable with documentation 3 = Probabilistic output is fine		
1.6	Workflow definition clarity <i>How well-defined is the current workflow? AI is much easier to deploy against a documented, repeatable process than an ad hoc or highly variable one.</i>	1 = Informal, highly variable, poorly documented 2 = Partially documented, generally consistent 3 = Well-documented, stable, and repeatable		
SECTION 1 TOTAL (max 18)				

2

ROI Potential

Is there meaningful value here — across revenue, margin, and cost?

Table 1: Summary of Data

Year	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
2018	100	120	150	180
2019	110	130	160	190
2020	120	140	170	200
2021	130	150	180	210
2022	140	160	190	220



Page 1 of 1

Page 1 of 1

Page 1 of 1

Page 1 of 1

Page 1 of 1

Page 1 of 1

Page 1 of 1

Page 1 of 1

Page 1 of 1

Page 1 of 1

Page 1 of 1

Page 1 of 1

Page 1 of 1

Page 1 of 1



[Illegible text]

[Illegible text]

[Illegible text]

[Illegible text]

[Illegible text]

[Illegible text]

[Illegible text]

[Illegible text]

[Illegible text]

[Illegible text]

[Illegible text]

[Illegible text]

[Illegible text]

[Illegible text]



1. The first step in the process is to identify the problem or goal that needs to be addressed. This involves a clear understanding of the situation and the resources available.

2. Once the problem is identified, the next step is to develop a plan. This plan should outline the steps that need to be taken to achieve the goal.

3. The third step is to implement the plan. This involves putting the plan into action and monitoring progress.

4. The fourth step is to evaluate the results. This involves assessing the outcomes of the plan and determining if the goal has been achieved.

5. The final step is to reflect on the process. This involves thinking about what worked well and what could be improved for future projects.

6. The sixth step is to share the results. This involves communicating the outcomes of the project to others who may be interested.

7. The seventh step is to document the process. This involves creating a record of the steps taken and the results achieved.

8. The eighth step is to review the process. This involves looking back at the entire process and identifying any areas for improvement.



9. The ninth step is to implement the improvements. This involves putting the changes identified in the review into action.

10. The tenth step is to evaluate the final results. This involves assessing the outcomes of the improved process and determining if the goal has been achieved.

11. The final step is to reflect on the entire process. This involves thinking about the overall experience and identifying any lessons learned.

Introduction

1. Introduction	2. Theoretical Framework	3. Methodology
4. Results	5. Discussion	6. Conclusion
7. References	8. Appendix	9. Acknowledgements
10. Author Biographies	11. Contact Information	12. Declaration of Interest

This document is a draft and should not be used for publication without the author's approval. All rights reserved.