

Project Prioritization

A practical balance of achievability and attractiveness

A WORKING COMPANION TO THE BOOK

Compare projects using the same criteria and evidence. Weigh the ability to deliver alongside the value of success. Complete this printable version manually.

A4 LANDSCAPE

Print at actual size. Write by hand or annotate with your PDF reader.

CHOOSE THE PAGE YOU NEED

01 Agree the scoring criteria

Achievability and attractiveness rubrics · pages 2-3

02 Score each project

One evidence sheet per project · page 4

03 Compare and choose

Portfolio ranking and decision record · page 5

Use evidence. Record uncertainty. Revisit the decision.

Achievability scoring guide

Start with these source weights. Agree any changes and complete each set to 100% before scoring projects.

Criterion	Weight	0	1	2	3
Time to launch	30%	More than 3 years	2 to 3 years	1 to <2 years	Less than 1 year
Project budget	20%	€500k or more	€100k to <€500k	€10k to <€100k	Less than €10k
Capital expenditure	20%	More than €1m	€100k to €1m	Above €0 to <€100k	None
Resource needs	20%	More than 2 FTEs	More than 1 to 2 FTEs	Above 0 to 1 FTE	None
External competence dependency	10%	Yes	-	-	No

Reader adaptation: numerical bands have been made continuous so boundary values have one score. For external dependency, use only 0 or 3 unless the team defines intermediate anchors first.

Achievability = sum of (weight as a decimal × score) ÷ 3 × 10. Higher = easier to deliver. FTE = full-time equivalent.

Attractiveness scoring guide

Use the same interpretation for every project. Support scores with evidence and make uncertainty visible.

Criterion	Weight	0	1	2	3
Competitive differentiation / long-term fit	20%	None	Low	Medium	High
Country reach / transferability	20%	One country	Potential for more than one	Two countries	More than two
Strategic fit: people, sustainability, customer, profit	20%	No	-	-	Yes
Additional turnover / avoided sales loss	30%	€500k or less	>€500k to €2m	>€2m to €10m	More than €10m
Potential for patent differentiation	10%	Not possible	Difficult	Possible, not easy	Possible

Agree a common revenue time horizon before scoring. Strategic fit uses only 0 or 3 unless intermediate anchors are defined. Tailor the industrial criteria before use in another context.

Attractiveness = sum of (weight as a decimal × score) ÷ 3 × 10. Higher = more attractive.

Project scoring worksheet

Record a score and supporting evidence for every criterion. Use a fresh copy for each project.

IDEA / CHALLENGE

TEAM / DATE

Dimension / criterion	Weight	Score 0-3	Weight × score	Evidence / rationale
A - Time to launch	30%			
A - Project budget	20%			
A - Capital expenditure	20%			
A - Resource needs	20%			
A - External dependency	10%			
V - Differentiation / long-term fit	20%			
V - Country reach / transferability	20%			
V - Strategic fit	20%			
V - Turnover / avoided sales loss	30%			
V - Patent differentiation	10%			

A = achievability V = attractiveness Use decimal weights in the calculation (30% = 0.30).

A subtotal ____ ÷ 3 × 10 = ____ /10 **V subtotal** ____ ÷ 3 × 10 = ____ /10 **Overall** = (A + V) ÷ 2 = ____ /10

Portfolio comparison and decision

Rank completed projects from highest to lowest overall score. Equal scores share a rank; discuss ties using evidence.

Rank	Project / ID	Achievability /10	Attractiveness /10	Overall /10	Decision / next step

Decision and rationale

Record dependencies, resource limits, risk gates and any reason to override the ranking.

Owner and review

Who acts next? By when? What evidence would change the decision?