



AI Value and Governance

Category Description

This award recognizes organizations that have leveraged TBM to bring transparency, governance, and measurable value realization to enterprise AI investments and operations. It honors teams that have established a structured TBM practice and TBM model to understand the full cost of AI, manage consumption and demand, and connect AI spend to business outcomes through repeatable decisioning and performance management.

Submissions should demonstrate an organization-wide approach that uses TBM to govern AI as a portfolio of products, platforms, and services - not merely a narrow deployment focused on isolated or single-function cost tracking that does not encompass full TBM practices.

Application Questions

1. What challenges did your organization face in managing AI investments, costs, and value realization before using TBM?
 2. What specific actions did your organization take, using TBM, to address each challenge?
 3. What was the outcome of these actions?
 4. How will your TBM practice evolve over the next 12 months?
 5. What technical modifications or enhancements were made to your TBM model to support AI investment governance and value management?
-

Question #1 Guidance & Scoring Criteria

What challenges did your organization face in managing AI investments, costs, and value realization before using TBM?

Expert Guidance: Clearly list and describe each distinct challenge that led your organization to apply TBM to AI investment governance and value realization. Challenges may include limited transparency into end-to-end AI costs, inconsistent accountability for AI spend across teams, difficulty forecasting or controlling AI consumption, unclear unit economics for AI capabilities, challenges prioritizing AI initiatives, or difficulty demonstrating measurable outcomes from AI investments.

Each challenge should be separately identified and explained in detail, including how it impacted financial decision-making, risk posture, operating efficiency, or business value realization. Avoid broad statements - ensure each challenge is well-defined and directly connected to the need for disciplined AI governance and value management.



Judging Criteria

- **Exceptional:** Clearly articulated, TBM-relevant challenges with strong specificity and clear business impact. The response demonstrates why AI required structured governance and value realization beyond ad hoc reporting.
- **Strong:** Well-defined challenges with reasonable depth, but may lack specificity in business impact, operating context, or evidence of why TBM-based governance was required.
- **Moderate:** Challenges are mentioned, but they are general, weakly connected to TBM-based AI governance, or not well supported by examples or impacts.
- **Weak:** Vague or missing response; challenges are not clearly tied to managing AI investments, controlling consumption, or demonstrating value through a structured TBM approach.

Question #2 Guidance & Scoring Criteria

What specific actions did your organization take, using TBM, to address each challenge?

Expert Guidance: For each challenge listed above, describe the specific actions taken to resolve it, ensuring that every action is directly linked to a challenge. Focus on how TBM was used to establish accountability, improve transparency, and enable decision-making for AI investments and operations.

Actions may include defining AI services/products and their cost structures, establishing AI consumption measures and allocation approaches, building showback/chargeback for AI usage, integrating AI spend and consumption data into TBM reporting, introducing governance forums and decision guardrails, prioritizing AI initiatives using TBM insights, or creating standard performance measures for AI value realization.

Avoid general statements and clearly explain how each action was executed, what TBM tools or methodologies were used, and how these actions strengthened governance and improved value realization.

Judging Criteria

- **Exceptional:** Clearly defined actions that directly map to each challenge, demonstrating structured execution and strategic alignment. The response includes strong detail on how TBM principles were applied to AI governance and value realization, with clear evidence of adoption and stakeholder engagement.
- **Strong:** Actions are well described and linked to challenges, but may lack depth in execution detail, stakeholder integration, or the mechanisms used to sustain governance.
- **Moderate:** Actions are mentioned but loosely connected to TBM principles, lack execution detail, or do not clearly demonstrate how TBM drove improved governance and decision-making for AI.
- **Weak:** No clear actions described; vague, missing, or weakly justified response. No clear link between actions and the challenges.



Question #3 Guidance & Scoring Criteria

What was the outcome of these actions?

Expert Guidance: Describe the outcome that resulted from each action taken. Clearly link each outcome to the challenge it addressed to show direct cause-and-effect. Outcomes may include improved transparency into AI costs, stronger accountability for AI consumption, improved forecasting accuracy for AI demand, reduced waste through consumption optimization, faster or higher-quality investment decisions, improved ability to compare AI initiatives, or stronger alignment between AI investments and business outcomes.

Please include quantitative data if available (e.g., reductions in unmanaged consumption, improved forecast accuracy, improved allocation accuracy, reduced cycle time for AI investment decisions, measurable value realization tied to AI initiatives). If outcomes differed from what was anticipated, explain why and how the organization adapted or learned from it. Avoid broad success statements. Each outcome should reflect real impacts, whether positive, negative, or a learning experience.

Judging Criteria

- **Exceptional:** Clearly articulated outcomes that directly tie to both challenges and actions, with strong evidence and quantitative results where applicable. The response demonstrates measurable improvements in AI governance, financial control, and value realization.
- **Strong:** Outcomes are described with reasonable depth and some evidence of impact, but may lack comprehensive metrics or a fully developed cause-and-effect linkage.
- **Moderate:** Outcomes are general, anecdotal, or weakly connected to TBM-driven actions. The response may not clearly demonstrate value realization or sustained governance improvements.
- **Weak:** No clear outcomes presented; vague or unsupported claims of success, with little to no measurable impact and no discernible linkage to actions taken.

Question #4 Guidance & Scoring Criteria

How will your TBM practice evolve over the next 12 months?

Expert Guidance: Describe the priorities your organization has identified for its TBM practice over the coming year. Focus on the new capabilities, use cases, or outcomes you intend to pursue as a result of the progress described in your submission. This may include expanding TBM into new domains, deepening existing use cases, strengthening governance, refining your TBM model, or extending TBM insights to additional stakeholders or decision processes.

Your response should clearly connect your future plans to what you have already achieved. Explain how lessons learned, organizational momentum, or demonstrated value are shaping the next phase of your TBM journey. Avoid broad aspirations—be specific about the areas you plan to develop, the problems you aim to address, and how TBM will continue to enable better decisions over the next 12 months.



Judging Criteria

- **Exceptional:** The response presents a clear, well-articulated roadmap for how the organization will advance its TBM practice over the next 12 months. Plans are directly informed by prior success and demonstrate strong alignment to business objectives. The submission shows a mature understanding of how TBM will be expanded to deliver continued value.
- **Strong:** The response outlines thoughtful next steps for evolving the TBM practice, with reasonable clarity and relevance. Plans are connected to current efforts but may lack depth, prioritization, or strong linkage to business outcomes.
- **Moderate:** Future plans are mentioned but remain high-level or loosely defined. The connection between past success and next steps is weak, with limited detail on how TBM capabilities will evolve.
- **Weak:** The response provides little to no insight into future direction. It focuses primarily on past achievements or treats the initiative as complete, with minimal evidence of a forward-looking TBM strategy.

Question #5 Guidance & Scoring Criteria

What technical modifications or enhancements were made to your TBM model to support AI investment governance and value management?

Expert Guidance: Describe any technical modifications, enhancements, or refinements made to your TBM model that directly supported AI financial management, consumption governance, and value tracking. This may include new cost and consumption structures for AI services, updated allocation logic for AI platforms, integration of AI consumption data sources, enhancements to tagging or classification for AI-related spend, creation of AI-focused dashboards and reporting, automation of AI usage-to-cost mapping, or extensions to reporting that connect AI costs to outcomes and performance measures.

Clearly explain what modifications were made, why they were necessary, and how they improved the ability to manage AI investment decisions and operational governance. This question is focused solely on technical improvements to the TBM model itself. Avoid general descriptions of business process changes that may have been covered in previous questions. Be as specific as possible about technical execution and implementation details.

Judging Criteria

- **Exceptional:** Well-documented technical modifications with clear examples of how they enabled AI cost transparency, consumption governance, and value tracking. The response includes demonstrable business impact supported by data and model improvements.
- **Strong:** Clear description of technical modifications with reasonable evidence of effectiveness, but may lack depth in implementation details or quantifiable impact.
- **Moderate:** Some modifications are mentioned, but they are loosely connected to TBM principles, lack execution detail, or do not clearly demonstrate improvements in AI governance or value management.
- **Weak:** No clear description of how the TBM model was enhanced to support AI governance and value realization; vague or missing response with no discernible connection between model enhancements and outcomes.