

A Repeatable Framework for Evaluating AI at the Enterprise Level

From Vendor Demos to Production Reality

itx®

Executive Introduction 03

Step-by-Step AI Evaluation Process 05

Step 1: Establish Strategic Context and Stakeholder Alignment

Step 2: Define Use Case Scope and Approval Boundaries

Step 3: Assess Data Foundation and Quality

Step 4: Evaluate Legal, Ethical, and Regulatory Risk

Step 5: Review Technical Compatibility and Integration Requirements

Step 6: Test Workflow Integration and User Experience

Step 7: Conduct Structured Pilot Testing

Step 8: Assess Total Cost of Ownership and Business Value

Step 9: Evaluate Vendor Maturity and Partnership Capability

Step 10: Plan for Scaling, Governance, and Continuous Improvement

Practical Buyer Checklist 25

How to Apply This Framework During Live Vendor Evaluations 27

Before First Vendor Contact

During Initial Vendor Conversations

Before Committing to Pilots

During and After Pilots

Before Full Deployment

How to Handle AI Features in Already-Approved Tools 28

How to Align Executives, Technical Teams, and Operators 29

When to Move Forward, Pause, or Stop 30

Executive Introduction

Every quarter, enterprise technology leaders face the same challenge: another wave of AI vendor demonstrations, each promising transformative results. The demos are polished. The case studies are compelling. The pressure to act is real.

Yet many AI initiatives fail. Not because the technology doesn't work, but because organizations skip the fundamental work of evaluation. They conflate a successful pilot with organizational readiness. They treat vendor checklists as strategy. They move forward without alignment between executives who see opportunity, technical teams who see complexity, and operators who must live with the consequences.

Complicating matters further, AI is increasingly embedded within tools organizations already use. The question is no longer simply 'Should we adopt this AI tool?' but also 'Should we enable AI features in our existing platforms?' A team may have already approved Jira, Salesforce, or Microsoft 365, but when these vendors add AI capabilities, each feature requires separate evaluation. The framework must accommodate both standalone AI tools and AI-enhanced versions of approved platforms.

The cost of these missteps extends beyond wasted budget. Failed AI initiatives erode trust, delay digital transformation, and create organizational scar tissue that makes future innovation harder. In regulated industries like financial services and healthcare, the stakes include compliance risk, patient safety, and reputational damage.

> This guide presents a structured evaluation framework designed to help enterprise leaders such as CIOs, Chief Digital Officers, VPs of Engineering, and Directors of Data Science make confident AI decisions. It synthesizes technical due diligence, operational readiness, data governance, and business impact into a cohesive decision system.

The framework recognizes that different roles bring different perspectives. A Chief Data Officer focuses on data quality and governance. A VP of Engineering worries about technical debt and integration. A Director of Patient Experience cares about adoption and outcomes. Effective AI evaluation requires all of these perspectives working in concert, not in isolation.

What follows is not a one-time checklist. It's a repeatable process that scales from individual tool evaluations to enterprise-wide AI governance. Use it during vendor assessments, pilot planning, and post-deployment reviews. Share it with cross-functional teams to create common language and shared accountability.

The goal is simple: to help you distinguish between AI tools that deliver sustainable value and those that create expensive problems.

The Unified AI Evaluation Framework

Most AI evaluation frameworks focus narrowly on either technical capabilities or business outcomes. This creates blind spots. A tool might excel technically but fail operationally because it disrupts critical workflows. Another might align perfectly with business goals but introduce unacceptable compliance risks.

Effective evaluation requires five interconnected dimensions:

1. Strategic Alignment

Does this tool solve a real business problem worth solving? Is the organization ready to adopt it? Do stakeholders, including clients, partners, and regulators, support or constrain its use?

2. Use Case Scope and Boundaries

Which specific use cases will this AI serve, and for which users? Can we approve the tool for limited scenarios while restricting it from others? How do we enforce use case boundaries when AI is embedded in platforms with broad access?

3. Data and Risk Governance

Can we trust the data this tool uses and produces? Do we understand the legal, ethical, and regulatory implications? Can we maintain control and visibility over AI-driven decisions?

4. Technical and Operational Fit

Will this tool integrate with existing systems? Does it match our architectural standards? Can our teams operate and maintain it without creating new technical debt?

5. Adoption and Measurement

Will people actually use this tool? Can we measure its impact? Does the value justify the total cost of ownership, including training, support, and ongoing maintenance?

These dimensions are not sequential gates; they're interdependent considerations that inform each other. A tool that fails decisively on any single dimension should be rejected, regardless of its strengths elsewhere. A tool that shows promise across all five deserves deeper evaluation through structured pilots.

The framework that follows breaks these dimensions into actionable steps, with specific questions, decision criteria, and warning signs for each phase of evaluation.

Step-by-Step AI Evaluation Process

Step 1:

Establish Strategic Context and Stakeholder Alignment

Purpose

Before evaluating any specific tool, clarify why you're considering AI at all. Many AI initiatives fail because organizations start with a solution looking for a problem, rather than a problem worth solving. This step ensures you have genuine business need, organizational readiness, and stakeholder support.

Key Questions

- What specific business problem or opportunity does this AI tool address? Can you quantify the current state and desired future state?
- Who are your critical stakeholders? Are they internal teams, clients, partners, regulators; and what are their constraints or requirements regarding AI?
- Do any stakeholders prohibit AI use outright, or have regulatory/legal constraints that limit what's permissible?
- If a client or partner requires a specific AI system, are you being asked to work within existing boundaries?
- Is this AI capability embedded in an existing approved tool, or is it a standalone platform?
- If embedded in an existing tool, which specific AI features are we evaluating versus the base platform?
- Can we approve this AI for specific use cases while restricting others? (e.g., approve Copilot for general productivity but not for code generation)
- What use case boundaries can we enforce, and how will we communicate and maintain those boundaries?
- Do different user groups need different approval levels for different AI use cases within the same tool?
- What organizational changes or resource commitments would successful adoption require?
- Is this a "must-have" driven by competitive pressure, or a "nice-to-have" that could wait?

Strong vs. Weak Signals

STRONG SIGNALS:	WEAK SIGNALS:
• Clear, measurable problem definition with documented pain points • Explicit stakeholder input gathered before vendor conversations began • Known regulatory framework with defined compliance requirements • Clear documentation of which AI features within a platform require separate evaluation • Defined use case categories with specific approval criteria for each • Ability to enable/disable specific AI features independently • Executive sponsorship with committed resources • Realistic timeline that accounts for learning curve and change management	• Generic descriptions like “increase efficiency” or “leverage AI” • Stakeholder consultation deferred until after tool selection • Regulatory status described as “probably fine” or “we’ll figure it out” • All-or-nothing approach: either approve all AI features or none • No distinction between AI embedded in existing tools versus new AI platforms • Assumption that AI adoption requires no organizational change • Timeline driven by vendor sales cycles or fiscal year deadlines

Common Pitfalls

- Starting with a specific AI tool recommendation rather than a validated business problem
- Treating client or regulatory constraints as obstacles to route around rather than requirements to respect
- Assuming all stakeholders share the same enthusiasm for AI that early champions feel
- Confusing early adopter excitement with organization-wide readiness

Cross-Functional Input Required

This step requires input from business leaders who own the problem, legal/compliance teams who understand constraints, client-facing teams who manage relationships, and executive sponsors who control resources. No single department should drive this conversation alone.

Step 2:

Define Use Case Scope and Approval Boundaries

Purpose

AI tools, especially those embedded in existing platforms, support multiple use cases with different risk levels. Treating tools like Copilot or Jira AI as a simple yes/no decision ignores that some uses are low-risk and valuable while others carry unacceptable risk or cost. This step clarifies which use cases are being evaluated and whether partial approval makes sense.

Key Questions

- What specific use cases will this AI serve? (e.g., meeting summarization, code generation, customer service, data analysis, content creation)
- Can use cases be evaluated and approved independently, or is this an all-or-nothing decision?
- For each use case, who is the intended user population, and what is the sensitivity of data involved?
- Does the vendor's platform allow you to enable some AI features while disabling others?
- How will you communicate use case boundaries to users and enforce compliance?
- What happens when users attempt to use AI for unapproved use cases: technical controls, policy enforcement, or monitoring?

Strong vs. Weak Signals

STRONG SIGNALS:	WEAK SIGNALS:
• Vendor provides granular feature controls (enable AI for X but not Y) • Clear documentation of which use cases carry which risk levels • Use case categories aligned with your organization's risk appetite and compliance requirements • Ability to pilot different use cases with different user groups independently • Technical controls that enforce use case boundaries, not just policy statements	• Vendor offers AI as monolithic feature set with no granular controls • Assumption that one approval decision covers all possible use cases • No mechanism to restrict which teams use which AI features • Use case boundaries enforced only through user policy, not technical controls

Common Pitfalls

- Approving AI broadly when only specific low-risk use cases were evaluated
- Restricting valuable use cases because high-risk use cases in the same tool failed evaluation
- Creating use case categories so narrow that administrative overhead exceeds value
- Failing to revisit use case approvals as AI capabilities and organizational needs evolve

Step 3:

Assess Data Foundation and Quality

Purpose

AI tools are only as good as the data they use. Before evaluating any tool, make sure your data infrastructure can support reliable AI outcomes. This avoids deploying advanced AI only to discover the data is incomplete, inconsistent, or inaccessible.

Key Questions

- What data does the AI require for training, operation, and improvement, and do you have access to it at the needed quality, volume, and consistency?
- Where does the data live (legacy systems, cloud platforms, third-party sources), and can it be accessed reliably?
- What data governance exists around ownership, quality, access permissions, and lineage?
- Do you have the infrastructure and pipelines to support large datasets if required?
- How are data gaps, errors, and edge cases outside training parameters handled?
- Can AI-generated outputs be audited and traced back to source data?

Strong vs. Weak Signals

STRONG SIGNALS:	WEAK SIGNALS:
• Documented data architecture with clear ownership and stewardship • Existing data quality metrics and monitoring processes • Established data access controls aligned with privacy and security policies • Data pipelines that support both batch and real-time requirements • Ability to provide representative training data that reflects actual use cases • Clear understanding of data refresh requirements and latency tolerances	• We have lots of data" without specifics on accessibility or quality • Data scattered across disconnected systems with no integration plan • Undefined data ownership or governance structure • Assumption that vendors will "figure out the data part" • No baseline metrics for measuring data quality before or after AI deployment • Inability to explain how training data relates to production scenarios

Common Pitfalls

- Overestimating data quality based on optimistic assumptions rather than actual measurement
- Underestimating the effort required to clean, integrate, and maintain data pipelines
- Ignoring data bias or representativeness issues that will undermine AI fairness
- Failing to plan for ongoing data requirements after initial training
- Treating data access as a one-time setup rather than continuous operational need

Cross-Functional Input Required

This step requires data engineers who understand infrastructure, data scientists who can assess quality and representativeness, data governance leaders who enforce policies, and business owners who can validate whether data reflects actual operational reality.

Step 4:

Evaluate Legal, Ethical, and Regulatory Risk

Purpose

AI introduces unique legal and ethical considerations that traditional software doesn't face. Algorithmic bias, data privacy, explainability requirements, and liability for AI-generated decisions can all create significant organizational risk. This step ensures you understand and can manage those risks before deployment.

Key Questions

- What legal or regulatory frameworks govern your use of AI in this context (GDPR, HIPAA, financial services regulations, medical device requirements)?
- Does the AI tool's use of data comply with privacy laws and your organization's privacy commitments?
- Who is liable if the AI makes an incorrect decision or produces harmful output: your organization, the vendor, or shared responsibility?
- Can you explain how the AI reaches its decisions to regulators, customers, or affected parties?
- What bias risks exist in the training data or algorithm, and what mitigation strategies does the vendor provide?
- If the AI tool processes personal, sensitive, or protected information, what safeguards prevent misuse or unauthorized access?
- What happens to your data after the contract ends: is it deleted, anonymized, or retained by the vendor?
- Does the tool create intellectual property concerns, either for your organization or for third parties whose work might be used in training?

Strong vs. Weak Signals

STRONG SIGNALS:	WEAK SIGNALS:
• Vendor provides detailed documentation on compliance certifications (SOC 2, ISO 27001, GDPR compliance) • Clear contractual terms defining data ownership, liability, and deletion policies • Transparent explanation of how the AI model works, including training data sources • Evidence of bias testing and mitigation strategies • Documented audit trails and explainability features • Legal review completed before vendor engagement, not after	• Trust us, we're compliant" without supporting documentation • Vague terms of service that shift liability to the customer • Black-box algorithms with no explainability mechanism • Unclear data retention and deletion policies • No evidence of fairness testing or bias audits • Compliance concerns dismissed as "we'll deal with that later"

Common Pitfalls

- Assuming vendor compliance claims are verified without independent validation
- Treating explainability as optional when regulators or customers will demand it
- Ignoring bias risks because the AI performs well on average metrics
- Deferring legal review until after organizational commitment to a vendor
- Underestimating reputational damage from AI-related incidents, even if technically legal

Cross-Functional Input Required

This step requires legal counsel familiar with AI regulations, compliance officers who understand industry-specific requirements, risk management teams who assess liability exposure, and ethics experts or DEI leaders who can evaluate fairness concerns.

Step 5:

Review Technical Compatibility and Integration Requirements

Purpose

Even the most capable AI tool creates problems if it can't integrate with your existing systems or requires architectural changes you're not prepared to make. This step assesses whether the tool fits your technical environment or introduces unacceptable complexity and technical debt.

Key Questions

- How will this tool integrate with your existing technology stack (CRM, ERP, data warehouses, APIs)?
- What APIs, connectors, or integration mechanisms does the vendor provide, and are they compatible with your systems?
- If you operate legacy systems with outdated architectures or data formats, will this tool work within those constraints or require costly modernization?
- Does the tool require specific cloud platforms, on-premise infrastructure, or hybrid deployment models?
- What are the performance requirements (latency, throughput, uptime), and can your infrastructure support them?
- How will the tool affect downstream systems that consume its outputs; will they require modification?
- What technical skills will your team need to implement, operate, and maintain this tool?
- Is the vendor's technology roadmap aligned with your architectural direction, or will it create divergence?

Strong vs. Weak Signals

STRONG SIGNALS:	WEAK SIGNALS:
• Vendor provides detailed integration documentation and reference architectures • Proven API compatibility with your existing platforms • Successful deployments in similar technical environments (same industry, similar architecture) • Clear performance benchmarks validated by independent testing • Modular design that doesn't require rip-and-replace of existing systems • Technical partnership mindset, not just sales engagement • Infrastructure requirements within your current capacity or growth plans	• Integration described as "simple" or "plug-and-play" without supporting evidence • Requirement to re-platform critical systems to accommodate the AI tool • Vendor unfamiliar with your legacy technology constraints • Performance claims unsupported by realistic testing scenarios • Dependency on vendor-specific infrastructure that creates lock-in • Skills gap requiring external consultants for implementation and maintenance • Technical requirements that conflict with your architecture standards

Common Pitfalls

- Believing vendor integration claims without pilot validation
- Underestimating the cascading impact on downstream systems
- Ignoring the total cost of architectural changes required to support AI
- Treating integration as a one-time project rather than ongoing maintenance burden
- Failing to assess whether your team can support the tool after vendor implementation ends

Cross-Functional Input Required

This step requires enterprise architects who understand system dependencies, infrastructure engineers who know capacity constraints, security teams who enforce standards, and the application teams who will ultimately maintain the integration.

Step 6:

Test Workflow Integration and User Experience

Purpose

Tools that work in isolation but disrupt critical workflows create more problems than they solve. This step evaluates whether the AI tool fits naturally into how people actually work, or forces unnatural changes that reduce productivity and harm adoption.

Key Questions

- How well does the tool fit into existing workflows and processes?
- What changes or training do users need to use it effectively?
- Does the tool introduce context-switching or require jumping between systems?
- Can users review, apply judgment, and correct AI outputs?
- Are there manual fallbacks if the tool is unavailable?

Strong vs. Weak Signals

STRONG SIGNALS:	WEAK SIGNALS:
• Tool designed with deep understanding of actual user workflows • Minimal learning curve with intuitive interfaces that match user mental models • Seamless integration into existing tools users already rely on • Clear value proposition: tool saves time or improves outcomes in ways users recognize • Positive user feedback from pilot testing, not just executive enthusiasm • Graceful degradation when AI is uncertain or unavailable • Support for different user skill levels and use cases	• Tool requires significant workflow redesign to accommodate AI • Users describe the tool as "another thing to check" rather than helpful assistant • High training requirements before basic proficiency • Frequent user errors or confusion about how to interpret AI outputs • Workflow disruption that eliminates efficiency gains the AI was supposed to create • Binary AI decisions with no ability for human oversight or adjustment • Vendor has never observed actual users in their working environment

Common Pitfalls

- Evaluating usability with power users or early adopters rather than typical users
- Assuming users will adapt to poor workflow integration "over time"

- Measuring tool adoption without measuring whether it improves outcomes
- Ignoring user feedback that conflicts with executive vision
- Treating change management as optional rather than essential

Cross-Functional Input Required

This step requires input from front-line users who will operate the tool daily, managers who understand workflow constraints, training teams who must build enablement programs, and change management leaders who can assess organizational readiness for process changes.

Step 7:

Conduct Structured Pilot Testing

Purpose

Demonstrations and proofs-of-concept operate in controlled environments that don't reflect production complexity. Structured pilots test whether the tool performs in real conditions, with actual users, real data, and genuine workflow constraints. This step turns theoretical capability into validated performance.

Key Questions

- What specific success criteria will determine whether the pilot succeeds or fails?
- What metrics will you measure, and how will you collect reliable data?
- How long must the pilot run to produce statistically valid results that account for variability?
- Who are the pilot users, and do they represent the broader user population?
- What data will you use: production data, anonymized production data, or synthetic test data?
- How will you gather both quantitative metrics (accuracy, speed, adoption) and qualitative feedback (user satisfaction, workflow impact)?
- What conditions would cause you to pause or stop the pilot early?
- Who will review pilot results, and what decision-making process will follow?

Strong vs. Weak Signals

STRONG SIGNALS:	WEAK SIGNALS:
• Clear, measurable success criteria defined before the pilot begins • Representative sample of users across different skill levels and use cases • Production or production-like data that reflects actual complexity • Defined pilot duration based on statistical requirements, not vendor preferences • Structured feedback collection from both users and technical teams • Executive commitment to pause or stop based on pilot findings • Post-pilot analysis comparing results to baseline metrics and alternative approaches	• Success criteria defined as "see if people like it" • Pilot users limited to early adopters or tool champions • Test data that's cleaner or simpler than production reality • Pilot duration dictated by contract deadlines or budget cycles • Feedback collection through informal conversations rather than structured surveys • Assumption that pilot will succeed and lead to immediate full deployment • No baseline metrics to enable before/after comparison

Common Pitfalls

- Running pilots too short to encounter real-world edge cases and variability
- Cherry-picking pilot scenarios that showcase strengths while avoiding weaknesses
- Treating pilot as vendor validation exercise rather than genuine evaluation
- Ignoring negative feedback because it conflicts with desired outcome
- Failing to test failure scenarios, degraded performance, and error handling
- Moving to full deployment despite mixed or inconclusive pilot results

Cross-Functional Input Required

This step requires pilot program managers who can design valid tests, data analysts who can measure results, IT teams who support the pilot environment, users who provide honest feedback, and executives who commit to evidence-based decisions.

Step 8:

Assess Total Cost of Ownership and Business Value

Purpose

Licensing fees are only one component of AI cost. Training, integration, maintenance, opportunity cost, and potential failure costs often exceed the initial price tag. This step ensures you understand the complete financial picture and can validate that expected benefits justify total investment.

Key Questions

- What are all the costs: licensing, implementation, integration, training, ongoing support, infrastructure upgrades, consultant fees?
- How does pricing scale with usage, data volume, or user growth; are there unexpected cost cliffs?
- What internal resources will this initiative consume: engineering time, data science support, training development, change management?
- What's the opportunity cost; what initiatives will you delay or cancel to resource this one?
- What specific, measurable business outcomes do you expect: revenue increase, cost reduction, risk mitigation, customer satisfaction improvement?
- How long before you expect to realize these benefits, and what assumptions underlie that timeline?
- What's your downside scenario if the tool underperforms or fails; can you recover or pivot without major loss?
- Are there less expensive alternatives (e.g. better processes, different tools, or incremental improvements to existing systems) that deliver similar value?

Strong vs. Weak Signals

STRONG SIGNALS:	WEAK SIGNALS:
• Detailed total cost model including direct and indirect expenses • Clear understanding of pricing structure and how it changes over time • Quantified business case with specific metrics tied to strategic priorities • Realistic timeline accounting for learning curve and organizational change • Risk-adjusted ROI calculation that considers probability of success • Defined decision criteria: at what cost or performance level does this stop making sense? • Executive willingness to compare AI investment against alternative uses of resources	• Focus on licensing cost without considering total implementation expense • Vague benefits like “better insights” or “improved efficiency” without metrics • ROI calculations based on best-case scenarios with no risk adjustment • Assumption that benefits begin immediately upon deployment • No comparison to alternatives, including “do nothing” or incremental improvement • Unwillingness to define conditions under which investment should be reconsidered • Business case driven by fear of missing out rather than validated opportunity

Common Pitfalls

- Underestimating internal resource requirements and opportunity costs
- Ignoring sunk costs when deciding whether to continue troubled initiatives
- Treating pilot success as proof of full-scale ROI without accounting for scaling challenges
- Confusing activity metrics (adoption, usage) with outcome metrics (business impact)
- Failing to establish baseline metrics before deployment, making impact measurement impossible

Cross-Functional Input Required

This step requires finance teams who can model total cost, business leaders who define value metrics, IT leaders who estimate resource requirements, and program managers who understand implementation timelines and risks.

Step 9:

Evaluate Vendor Maturity and Partnership Capability

Purpose

The AI tool market is volatile, with new vendors appearing constantly and established players pivoting strategies. Your vendor's stability, roadmap, and partnership approach directly impact long-term success. This step assesses whether you're entering a sustainable partnership or taking on vendor risk.

Key Questions

- How long has this vendor been in business, and what's their financial stability?
- What's their customer retention rate, and can you speak with long-term customers (not just reference accounts they pre-select)?
- How mature is the specific product you're evaluating; is it production-ready or still evolving?
- What's the vendor's product roadmap, and does it align with your strategic direction?
- How responsive is their support organization, and what service levels do they guarantee?
- If the vendor were acquired or went out of business, what happens to your implementation and data?
- How transparent are they about limitations, known issues, and development priorities?
- Do they demonstrate genuine understanding of your industry, or are they learning on your dime?

Strong vs. Weak Signals

STRONG SIGNALS:	WEAK SIGNALS:
• Established track record with customers similar to your organization • Transparent product roadmap aligned with your multi-year strategy • Responsive support with documented service level agreements • Clear data portability and exit terms in the contract • Willingness to discuss product limitations and competitive positioning honestly • Evidence of deep industry expertise, not just generic AI capability • Customer advisory board or formal mechanism for product input	• Newly launched product with limited production deployments • Vague or frequently changing roadmap • Support quality unknown or inconsistent • Contract terms that create lock-in with difficult exit • Marketing materials focused on AI buzzwords rather than specific capabilities • Generic approach that doesn't reflect understanding of your industry constraints • Resistance to candid discussion of weaknesses or competitive alternatives

Common Pitfalls

- Selecting vendors based on impressive demos rather than production customer success
- Ignoring vendor financial instability signals because the technology looks promising
- Accepting vendor roadmap promises without contract commitments
- Failing to negotiate data portability and exit terms before signing
- Treating vendor relationship as transactional rather than strategic partnership

Cross-Functional Input Required

This step requires procurement teams who negotiate contracts, legal teams who review terms, technical teams who assess vendor capabilities, and business relationship managers who evaluate partnership fit.

Step 10:

Plan for Scaling, Governance, and Continuous Improvement

Purpose

Tools that work in limited pilots often break when scaled to full production. Without clear governance and improvement mechanisms, AI systems degrade over time as data and business conditions change. This step ensures you have a plan for sustainable, responsible AI at scale.

Key Questions

- How will you scale from pilot to production: all at once, phased rollout, or continuous expansion?
- What governance structure will oversee AI usage? Who approves new use cases, monitors performance, and addresses issues?
- How will you track which use cases have been approved for which AI tools and communicate this to users?
- What process will handle requests to expand AI usage to new use cases within already-approved tools?
- How will you monitor actual AI usage to detect drift from approved use case boundaries?
- How will you monitor AI performance over time to detect drift, degradation, or bias?
- What processes will ensure the AI continues to receive fresh, representative training data?
- How will you manage version control, model updates, and regression testing?
- What's your plan for continuous user training as the tool evolves?
- How will you gather and act on user feedback after initial deployment?
- What metrics will you track to validate ongoing business value, and who reviews them?

Strong vs. Weak Signals

STRONG SIGNALS:	WEAK SIGNALS:
• Detailed scaling plan with clear phases, success criteria, and rollback procedures • Established AI governance committee with defined authority and accountability • Registry or catalog tracking approved AI tools with specific use case permissions • Streamlined process for evaluating new use cases within existing approved platforms • Usage monitoring that flags potential out-of-scope AI applications • Automated monitoring for performance, bias, and data quality • Documented processes for model retraining and validation • Change management plan that extends beyond initial deployment • Regular business reviews of AI performance against expected outcomes • Continuous feedback mechanisms from users and stakeholders • Resource commitment for ongoing maintenance, not just initial implementation	• Assumption that successful pilot automatically translates to successful scaling • No governance structure beyond initial implementation team • Manual, periodic checks rather than continuous monitoring • Unclear responsibility for model maintenance and retraining • Training treated as one-time event rather than ongoing capability building • Metrics measured only during pilot phase, not production • No plan for addressing performance degradation or changing business needs

Common Pitfalls

- Scaling too quickly before understanding edge cases and limitations
- Treating AI deployment as “set and forget” rather than living system requiring attention
- Ignoring early warning signs of performance degradation or bias
- Failing to adapt governance as AI use expands to new scenarios
- Underinvesting in the operational capabilities required to sustain AI at scale

Cross-Functional Input Required

This step requires operations teams who will support production systems, governance leaders who establish policies, data teams who maintain quality, training teams who enable users, and business leaders who ensure sustained value delivery.

Conclusion

AI tool evaluation is not a one-time checklist exercise. It's a discipline that organizations must develop and refine as AI capabilities evolve and business needs change.

The most successful AI adoptions share these common characteristics: clear business purpose, rigorous evaluation, strong governance, and commitment to continuous improvement. They treat AI as a tool to augment human capability, not replace human judgment. They remain skeptical of hype while staying open to genuine innovation.

Use this framework as a starting point. Adapt it to your organization's specific context, industry constraints, and risk tolerance. Share it with your teams to create common language for AI evaluation. Apply it consistently across different AI initiatives to build organizational muscle for making good technology decisions.

Most importantly, remember that the goal is not to evaluate AI tools perfectly. It's to make better decisions more consistently; decisions that deliver sustainable value while managing risk responsibly.

The organizations that thrive in the AI era won't be those that adopt the most tools the fastest. They'll be those that develop the judgment to distinguish between AI that creates genuine value and AI that creates expensive problems.

Practical Buyer Checklist

Use this condensed checklist during vendor evaluations and internal reviews. Each item represents a critical decision factor derived from the detailed evaluation framework.

Strategic Alignment

- ☐ Clear business problem defined with measurable current and desired states
- ☐ Stakeholder input gathered, including clients, partners, and regulators
- ☐ No stakeholder prohibitions or constraints that would block AI usage
- ☐ Executive sponsorship with committed resources and realistic timeline
- ☐ Organizational readiness assessed for required changes

Use Case Definition and Boundaries

- ☐ Specific use cases identified and documented for this AI evaluation
- ☐ Use case risk levels assessed independently (not all-or-nothing)
- ☐ Vendor capabilities reviewed for granular feature control
- ☐ User populations defined for each approved use case
- ☐ Technical or policy controls identified for enforcing use case boundaries
- ☐ Process established for evaluating additional use cases in the future

Data and Risk

- ☐ Required data identified with confirmed access and quality metrics
- ☐ Data governance structure in place with clear ownership
- ☐ Legal and regulatory compliance requirements documented
- ☐ Vendor provides compliance certifications and transparent data policies
- ☐ Bias and fairness testing conducted with documented results
- ☐ Liability and data ownership clearly defined in contract terms

Technical Integration

- ☐ Integration requirements documented with existing system compatibility confirmed
- ☐ APIs and connectors validated for your technology stack
- ☐ Performance requirements defined and infrastructure capacity verified
- ☐ Skills assessment completed with training or hiring plan if gaps exist
- ☐ Technical debt and long-term maintenance implications understood

Workflow and Adoption

- ☐ User workflows mapped with AI tool integration points identified
- ☐ User experience tested with representative users, not just champions
- ☐ Training requirements assessed with realistic time-to-proficiency estimates
- ☐ Change management plan developed addressing organizational impacts
- ☐ Manual fallback procedures defined for tool unavailability

Pilot Validation

- ☐ Success criteria defined with measurable metrics before pilot begins
- ☐ Representative users and production-like data selected for testing
- ☐ Pilot duration sufficient for statistical validity and edge case discovery
- ☐ Structured feedback collection from users and technical teams
- ☐ Decision-making process established for post-pilot evaluation

Financial Justification

- ☐ Total cost of ownership calculated including all direct and indirect costs
- ☐ Business value quantified with specific, measurable outcomes
- ☐ ROI timeline realistic with risk-adjusted assumptions
- ☐ Alternative approaches considered including lower-cost options
- ☐ Decision criteria defined (i.e. when does this investment stop making sense)?

Vendor Partnership

- ☐ Vendor stability and track record verified with reference customers
- ☐ Product maturity assessed with honest evaluation of limitations
- ☐ Support quality and service level agreements documented
- ☐ Data portability and exit terms negotiated before contract signing
- ☐ Vendor roadmap aligned with your strategic direction

Scaling and Governance

- ☐ Scaling plan developed with phased approach and rollback procedures
- ☐ AI governance structure established with clear authority
- ☐ Performance monitoring plan includes automated checks for drift and bias
- ☐ Model maintenance and retraining processes documented
- ☐ Continuous improvement mechanisms defined with ongoing resource commitment

How to Apply This Framework During Live Vendor Evaluations

Vendor evaluations move fast. Sales teams create urgency, demos look compelling, and internal champions push for quick decisions. This framework helps you maintain discipline without slowing down unreasonably.

Before First Vendor Contact:

Complete Step 1 (Strategic Context) internally. Know your problem, your stakeholders, and your constraints before vendors start proposing solutions. This prevents you from evaluating tools designed for different problems.

During Initial Vendor Conversations:

Use Steps 2-5 (Use Case Definition, Data, Risk, Technical) to ask probing questions that reveal whether vendors understand your reality. Strong vendors welcome tough questions. Weak vendors deflect or promise to “figure it out later.”

Before Committing to Pilots:

Complete Steps 6-9 (Workflow, Pilot Design, Cost, Vendor Assessment). Don’t run pilots until you know what success looks like and how you’ll measure it.

During and After Pilots:

Rigorously apply Step 7 criteria. Resist pressure to declare success based on incomplete data or cherry-picked examples.

Before Full Deployment:

Ensure Step 10 (Scaling and Governance) is complete. If you can’t articulate your ongoing governance and improvement plan, you’re not ready to scale.

How to Handle AI Featuresin Already-Approved Tools

When vendors add AI to platforms you've already approved, resist the temptation to automatically approve the AI features. Treat each AI capability as a new evaluation:

- Document which AI features exist in the platform (many tools now have 5-10 distinct AI capabilities)
- Evaluate each major use case independently using this framework
- Approve specific use cases for specific user groups rather than blanket approval
- Establish a lightweight review process for expanding to new use cases
- Monitor actual usage to ensure it aligns with approved use cases

Example: You might approve Microsoft Copilot for meeting summarization and email drafting (low-risk productivity features) but restrict it from code generation or handling sensitive customer data until those use cases pass separate evaluation.

How to Align Executives, Technical Teams, and Operators

AI evaluation requires different perspectives working together:

Executives focus on strategic value, competitive positioning, and resource allocation. They need clear business cases and risk assessments.

Technical teams focus on integration complexity, technical debt, and operational sustainability. They need architectural review and skills assessment.

Operators and end users focus on workflow impact, usability, and whether the tool actually helps them do their jobs. They need hands-on evaluation and honest feedback mechanisms.

Governance and compliance teams focus on risk management, regulatory compliance, and ethical considerations. They need transparency and control mechanisms.

Misalignment happens when these groups evaluate AI tools in isolation. Use this framework to create shared understanding:

- Form cross-functional evaluation teams that include all perspectives
- Use the structured checklist to ensure no dimension is overlooked
- Require explicit sign-off from each functional area before major commitments
- Create decision forums where different perspectives can surface concerns early
- Treat disagreement as valuable signal, not obstacle to overcome

When to Move Forward, Pause, or Stop

Move Forward When:

- All checklist items in critical areas (strategic, use case, data, risk, technical) show strong signals
- Pilot results clearly validate expected benefits with minimal concerning findings
- Cross-functional team reaches consensus that benefits justify costs and risks
- You have committed resources and executive support for full deployment and ongoing governance
- Users demonstrate genuine enthusiasm, not just compliance with top-down mandate

Pause When:

- Checklist reveals significant gaps in 1-2 areas that could be addressed with additional work
- Pilot results are mixed; some clear successes but also concerning performance or adoption issues
- Resource constraints or competing priorities make full deployment timing questionable
- Vendor capabilities are promising but product maturity requires waiting for next release
- Organizational readiness needs improvement before scaling

Stop When:

- Critical checklist items (legal compliance, data quality, stakeholder alignment) show weak signals with no clear path to resolution
- Pilot fails to demonstrate measurable value or reveals fundamental flaws
- Total cost of ownership exceeds realistic business value even in optimistic scenarios
- Vendor stability or partnership capability creates unacceptable risk
- Organizational resistance signals that forcing adoption would create more problems than value
- Alternative approaches (process improvement, different tools, manual methods) offer better risk-adjusted returns