

Capability-Contribution Scoring Template

Rank a project portfolio by how far each initiative closes a capability gap your strategy depends on — not by value over effort. Fill Step A with the people who own the strategy; fill Step B with the sponsors and architects; decide at the portfolio governance table.

Step A. Set the capability weights

Once a cycle, by the strategy owners. From your Where to Play and How to Win choices, name the handful of capabilities you must build to win where you have chosen to compete. Any capability that cannot be traced back to the strategic choice gets no weight.

PRIORITY CAPABILITY (TRACED TO THE STRATEGIC CHOICE)	WEIGHT (1-5)	CURRENT → TARGET MATURITY	GAP

Step B1. Rank by contribution

Contribution leads the ranking. An initiative that moves nothing the strategy named scores zero, and competes in a separate, smaller pool of routine improvements.

INITIATIVE	CAPABILITY IT MOVES	GAP CLOSED (0-1)	CONTRIBUTION (WEIGHT × GAP)

Sequence the funded set, then read the portfolio

Step B1 decided what gets funded. Step B2 decides what order the funded work runs in — keeping the two apart is what stops value and effort creeping back into the ranking.

Step B2. Sequence the funded set

Value and effort are inputs to sequencing, not to the ranking. Dependencies are hard constraints: an enabler is sequenced before anything that needs it, whatever its value density.

[illegible]

Step C. Read the portfolio

1. Rank by contribution. Draw the capacity line.
2. Above the line is funded this cycle; below the line is backlog, revisited next cycle.
3. **Sanity check:** is your highest-contribution initiative (often the foundational one) near the top, or deferred again? If it is at the bottom, you are ranking on value and effort, not capability contribution.
4. **If Step A was hard to fill**, that is a finding, not a template problem: it usually means the strategic choice has not been made clearly enough to prioritise against.