

AI Use-Case Prioritization

A practical way to choose which AI ideas to pursue first, instead of chasing hype. You score each possible use case on two things, how much business value it could create and how feasible it is to build, then plot them on a simple grid. High-value, easy-to-build ideas become 'quick wins'; high-value but hard ones become strategic bets. It turns a long wish-list into a clear plan.

Best for: AI roadmaps · Prioritisation · Portfolio planning · Avoiding hype

01 — AT A GLANCE

Plot each idea by value and feasibility. The top-right, high value and easy to build, is where you start.

Score each AI idea on value and feasibility, start with the high-value quick wins.

	Feasibility: low	Feasibility: high
Value: high	Strategic Bets	Quick Wins
Value: low	Avoid	Fill-Ins

02 — THE CORE COMPONENTS

Two questions drive the score, plus the grid that ranks them.

Business Value	How much would this move a metric leadership already cares about, revenue, cost savings, a strategic edge, and can the impact be seen soon?
Feasibility	How realistic is it to build? This depends heavily on data readiness (is the data available, clean, labelled?), technical complexity, and adoption effort.
The 2x2 Grid	Plot value against feasibility. Quick wins (high value, high feasibility) come first; strategic bets (high value, low feasibility) need planning; low-value ideas wait or drop.
Filter First	Before scoring, screen ideas with hard yes/no gates (data, risk, ownership). Plotting fifty unfiltered ideas creates noise, not clarity.

Data readiness quietly decides feasibility

Most AI pilots don't stall on clever algorithms, they stall on messy, missing data. So when judging feasibility, be honest about your data first. Start with quick wins to build momentum and trust, then use that credibility to fund the harder, higher-value strategic bets. And re-score as your data and skills grow.

03 — WHEN TO USE IT & WHEN NOT TO

This framework isn't right for every situation. Used at the wrong moment, it can point you in the wrong direction.

✓ USE IT WHEN...	✗ DON'T USE WHEN...
• Turning a long list of AI ideas into a roadmap • Choosing where to start for fast, visible value • Balancing quick wins against bigger strategic bets • Justifying AI priorities to stakeholders	• Plotting unfiltered ideas (screen out non-starters first) • Treating scores as exact truth rather than a guide • Ignoring risk and governance in the rush to value • Doing it once, priorities shift as AI and data evolve

04 — IN ACTION

Orbit Telecom — From Wish-List to Roadmap

Orbit Telecom has a dozen exciting AI ideas and limited resources. Instead of guessing, it scores them on value and feasibility to decide where to start.

How the framework was applied:

Step 1	List and filter — A churn predictor, a fraud detector, a fancy 'AI strategist' and more, screened first for data and risk.
Step 2	Score value — A churn predictor would directly cut customer losses: high business value.
Step 3	Score feasibility — Orbit already has clean customer data for it: high feasibility, a quick win.
Step 4	Spot the bet — A real-time fraud system is high-value but needs new data and infrastructure: a strategic bet.
Step 5	Sequence it — Orbit ships the churn quick win first, then funds the fraud bet with the wins it earns.

The numbers at a glance

Churn Quick win valuable, ready	Fraud Big bet valuable, hard	'AI strategist' Drop vague, no data	Plan Sequenced wins fund bets
---	--	---	---

Why scoring beat chasing hype

Orbit's flashiest idea (an 'AI strategist') had no data and unclear value, it scored low and was dropped. Scoring on value and feasibility surfaced a humble churn predictor as the quick win, building momentum to fund harder bets later. Priorities by evidence, not hype.

05 — KEEP IN MIND

Even experienced teams slip up here. Keep these in mind to keep your analysis honest and useful.

1. Plotting every idea without first filtering out non-starters.
2. Underestimating effort, especially the state of your data.
3. Chasing flashy, low-value ideas because they sound impressive.
4. Treating the scores as exact instead of a guide for discussion.
5. Never re-scoring as data, skills and AI capabilities change.