Five Complete Project Examples: AI, IT, and Business

Training materials 3.1 | Calculation model 3.0 | US edition: October 7, 2026

Original methodology published September 17, 2026. https://enableaisi.com/insights/five-project-examples-vp-se/

Model 3.0 · September 17, 2026

P1 · Customer service knowledge assistant

Service business. AI initiative. Accountable owner: head of customer service. The assumptions and follow-up figures in this example are illustrative.

12,000 × 0.75 × 3 net minutes saved / 60 × 2/3 of released capacity put to use = 300 hours. Preventing 24 errors is a separate customer benefit.

Before phase	VP	Base SE	R + U SE	Total SE	VP/SE
Hypothesis	19.5	10.0	1.5	11.5	1.70
MVP	20.1	8.7	0.7	9.4	2.14
Scaling	18.9	5.6	0.3	5.9	3.20

Before the hypothesis phase, the estimate is 300 internal hours and $6,800 in external costs. The spreadsheet covers all 11 internal activity areas and five purchasing areas. Before the MVP and scaling phases, update both expected effects and remaining size; add past resource use only to the final forecast.

After phase	Phase estimate[1]	Actual[1]	Scope-adjusted[1]	Error[2]
Hypothesis	$6,050	$5,900	$5,900	-2.8%
MVP	$11,100	$10,900	$10,900	-2.5%
Scaling	$20,000	$19,600	$19,600	-1.8%

[1] Rounded reference USD. [2] Scope-adjusted variance from the approved phase estimate, calculated before currency rounding. Reserves are already included in the phase estimate.

Measurement, decision, and next steps

The MVP confirms time savings, but less of the released capacity is being used than expected. Revise the target before scaling and retain the quality test. Adjust before expanding further.

After 90 days of use, measured value is 16.5 VP versus the original 19.5. The complete project uses 10.7 SE versus the original 11.5. The realized index is 1.54 VP/SE. Indirect contributions remain documented indicators or risk models.

Value measurement (target → actual): Hypothesis: 3.00 → 2.00; MVP: 3.15 → 2.40; Scaling: 2.85 → 2.40. Unit: minutes. Falling below the minimum triggers an adjustment and a new test before further expansion. The next phase requires a newly approved decision basis.

Primary phase metric: net minutes saved per AI-assisted case. Method: use the same case types, randomize employee testing periods, and include review time. See the spreadsheet for each phase's targets, minimum thresholds, and measurements.

Methodological references: GAO: estimating and monitoring, MCDA: common criteria. Related real-world examples: Morgan Stanley for knowledge and evaluation; NAO/NHS for scope and costs. None of these sources substantiates the illustrative figures used here.

P2 · Invoice processing agent

Trading business. AI initiative. Accountable owner: head of finance. The assumptions and follow-up figures in this example are illustrative.

4,000 × 0.9 × 4 net minutes / 60 = 240 hours. The $9,050 saving comes from eliminating a separate external quality-control subscription; significant errors fall from 80 to 40. One opportunity is expected to meet all four qualification criteria.

Before phase	VP	Base SE	R + U SE	Total SE	VP/SE
Hypothesis	25.3	16.2	2.8	19.0	1.33
MVP	25.3	14.1	1.5	15.5	1.63
Scaling	23.3	9.1	0.6	9.6	2.42

Before the hypothesis phase, estimate 440 internal hours and $15,100 in external costs. The spreadsheet covers all 11 internal activity areas and five purchasing areas. Before the MVP and scaling phases, update effects and remaining size; add past resource use only to the final forecast.

After phase	Phase estimate[1]	Actual[1]	Scope-adjusted[1]	Error[2]
Hypothesis	$10,100	$9,350	$9,350	-7.3%
MVP	$21,800	$21,400	$18,800	-13.5%
Scaling	$32,700	$31,700	$31,700	-3.1%

[1] Rounded reference USD. [2] Scope-adjusted variance from the approved phase estimate, calculated before currency rounding. Reserves are already included in the phase estimate.

Measurement, decision, and next steps

An additional control requirement is approved as a scope change. Report the variance from the original estimate separately from accuracy against the adjusted scope. Revise the scope and continue.

After 90 days of use, measured value is 16.8 VP versus the original 25.3. The complete project uses 18.4 SE versus the original 19.0. The realized index is 0.91 VP/SE. Indirect contributions remain documented indicators or risk models.

Value measurement (target → actual): Hypothesis: 1.00 → 0.80; MVP: 1.00 → 0.80; Scaling: 0.90 → 0.80. Unit: percentage points. Falling below the minimum triggers an adjustment and a new test before further expansion. The next phase requires a newly approved decision basis.

Primary phase metric: reduction in the rate of material errors. Method: blind expert review of matched invoices, comparing actual accounting entries. See the spreadsheet for each phase's targets, minimum thresholds, and measurements.

Methodological references: GAO: estimating and monitoring, MCDA: common criteria. Related real-world examples: Morgan Stanley for knowledge and evaluation; NAO/NHS for scope and costs. None of these sources substantiates the illustrative figures used here.

P3 · Better IT operations and incident readiness

Manufacturing business · no AI. Process and IT improvement without AI. Accountable owner: head of operations. The assumptions and follow-up figures in this example are illustrative.

6 × 1 hour of downtime avoided × 300 users = 1,800 user hours protected. The 120 hours cover the IT team's response work, not users' downtime. The risk benefit concerns other serious security incidents.

Before phase	VP	Base SE	R + U SE	Total SE	VP/SE
Hypothesis	18.7	16.4	2.2	18.6	1.01
MVP	17.4	14.5	1.1	15.7	1.11
Scaling	16.7	9.8	0.4	10.2	1.64

Before the hypothesis phase, estimate 380 internal hours and $21,100 in external costs. The spreadsheet covers all 11 internal activity areas and five purchasing areas. Before the MVP and scaling phases, update effects and remaining size; add past resource use only to the final forecast.

After phase	Phase estimate[1]	Actual[1]	Scope-adjusted[1]	Error[2]
Hypothesis	$9,250	$8,750	$8,750	-5.3%
MVP	$15,900	$13,600	$13,600	-14.8%
Scaling	$34,600	$41,500	$41,500	19.7%

[1] Rounded reference USD. [2] Scope-adjusted variance from the approved phase estimate, calculated before currency rounding. Reserves are already included in the phase estimate.

Measurement, decision, and next steps

More local environments require a more extensive handoff. The scaling phase exceeds the size tolerance, even though estimates for the first phases appeared accurate. Revise the operations estimate before expanding further.

After 90 days of use, measured value is 10.5 VP versus the original 18.7. The complete project uses 18.8 SE versus the original 18.6. The realized index is 0.56 VP/SE. Indirect contributions remain documented indicators or risk models.

Value measurement (target → actual): Hypothesis: 1.00 → 0.80; MVP: 0.90 → 0.80; Scaling: 0.85 → 0.67. Unit: hours. Falling below the minimum triggers an adjustment and a new test before further expansion. The next phase requires a newly approved decision basis.

Primary phase metric: shorter disruption per comparable incident. Method: incident replay during hypothesis testing, controlled exercises during the MVP, and incident logs in production. See the spreadsheet for each phase's targets, minimum thresholds, and measurements.

Methodological references: GAO: estimating and monitoring, MCDA: common criteria. Related real-world examples: Morgan Stanley for knowledge and evaluation; NAO/NHS for scope and costs. None of these sources substantiates the illustrative figures used here.

P4 · Redesigned customer onboarding

Subscription business · no AI. Process and IT improvement without AI. Accountable owner: commercial director. The assumptions and follow-up figures in this example are illustrative.

1,500 × (8% - 6.8%) = 18 additional customers retained. The 15 qualified brand-related inquiries come from a different cohort. Preparation saves 80 net hours.

Before phase	VP	Base SE	R + U SE	Total SE	VP/SE
Hypothesis	17.0	7.3	1.1	8.3	2.04
MVP	14.7	6.5	0.5	7.0	2.08
Scaling	13.5	3.6	0.2	3.8	3.51

Before the hypothesis phase, estimate 240 internal hours and $3,000 in external costs. The spreadsheet covers all 11 internal activity areas and five purchasing areas. Before the MVP and scaling phases, update effects and remaining size; add past resource use only to the final forecast.

After phase	Phase estimate[1]	Actual[1]	Scope-adjusted[1]	Error[2]
Hypothesis	$3,950	$4,000	$4,000	0.7%
MVP	$8,800	$8,750	$8,750	-0.9%
Scaling	$13,000	$13,000	$13,000	-0.4%

[1] Rounded reference USD. [2] Scope-adjusted variance from the approved phase estimate, calculated before currency rounding. Reserves are already included in the phase estimate.

Measurement, decision, and next steps

Retention improves less than expected. A high initial ranking is no reason to stick to the original plan. Limit the rollout and improve onboarding.

After 90 days of use, measured value is 8.5 VP versus the original 17.0. The complete project uses 7.6 SE versus the original 8.3. The realized index is 1.12 VP/SE. Indirect contributions remain documented indicators or risk models.

Value measurement (target → actual): Hypothesis: 1.20 → observation pending; MVP: 0.96 → 0.80; Scaling: 0.84 → 0.60. Unit: percentage points. Falling below the minimum triggers an adjustment and a new test before further expansion. The next phase requires a newly approved decision basis.

Primary phase metric: reduction in churn relative to a control group. Method: comparable customer groups and renewal periods; no assumption that AI is involved. See the spreadsheet for each phase's targets, minimum thresholds, and measurements.

Methodological references: GAO: estimating and monitoring, MCDA: common criteria. Related real-world examples: Morgan Stanley for knowledge and evaluation; NAO/NHS for scope and costs. None of these sources substantiates the illustrative figures used here.

P5 · Shared, secure AI knowledge platform

Knowledge-based business. AI initiative. Accountable owners: head of IT and business sponsor. The assumptions and follow-up figures in this example are illustrative.

Four instances of reuse are verified in other teams. Two opportunities each have an owner, a business need, and a test. The 60 hours cover the platform's own onboarding tasks; benefits from future projects are not counted here.

Before phase	VP	Base SE	R + U SE	Total SE	VP/SE
Hypothesis	21.5	24.0	4.5	28.5	0.75
MVP	20.6	22.3	2.4	24.7	0.84
Scaling	18.6	14.1	0.9	15.1	1.23

Before the hypothesis phase, estimate 600 internal hours and $27,100 in external costs. The spreadsheet covers all 11 internal activity areas and five purchasing areas. Before the MVP and scaling phases, update effects and remaining size; add past resource use only to the final forecast.

After phase	Phase estimate[1]	Actual[1]	Scope-adjusted[1]	Error[2]
Hypothesis	$14,300	$14,600	$14,600	2.2%
MVP	$32,700	$33,600	$33,600	2.8%
Scaling	$51,100	$64,800	$64,800	26.9%

[1] Rounded reference USD. [2] Scope-adjusted variance from the approved phase estimate, calculated before currency rounding. Reserves are already included in the phase estimate.

Measurement, decision, and next steps

Access management and adoption require more effort. Verified reuse and reliable operations must come first; new opportunities are not cash savings. Limit the platform to demonstrated use cases.

After 90 days of use, measured value is 12.6 VP versus the original 21.5. The complete project uses 33.3 SE versus the original 28.5. The realized index is 0.38 VP/SE. Indirect contributions remain documented indicators or risk models.

Value measurement (target → actual): Hypothesis: 1.00 → 1.00; MVP: 1.00 → 1.00; Scaling: 2.00 → 1.00. Unit: count. Falling below the minimum triggers an adjustment and a new test before further expansion. The next phase requires a newly approved decision basis.

Primary phase metric: qualified future use cases. Method: each opportunity must have an owner, a business need, a successful test, and a next decision. See the spreadsheet for each phase's targets, minimum thresholds, and measurements.

Methodological references: GAO: estimating and monitoring, MCDA: common criteria. Related real-world examples: Morgan Stanley for knowledge and evaluation; NAO/NHS for scope and costs. None of these sources substantiates the illustrative figures used here.

Currency: rounded USD equivalents at the ECB reference rates for October 6, 2026. Calculations use unrounded values; displayed amounts may not reproduce exact totals. The original model calibration is retained. Reference rates are resource weights, not US market rates or billing prices.