

USE CASE 02

The evidence exists. Nothing connects it to the decision it was supposed to inform.

Interviews sit in one tool, tickets in another, the roadmap in a third, and the reason a feature was cut lives in a call nobody recorded. Six weeks later the same debate reopens, and no one can say what changed — the evidence or the argument.

For a product leader whose team runs real research and still argues from memory in prioritization.

The problem	Customer evidence, product decisions, and requirements live in different places.
The workflow change	Use AI agents to assemble the evidence while named people set priorities and approve decisions.
The working result	A current product record that connects evidence, priorities, and decisions.

What the workflow becomes

Prioritization stays a human judgment call. What changes is that the judgment is made against an assembled record instead of whoever remembers most vividly.

01 One product record

Customer evidence, the current decisions, and the requirements they produced live in one place with the link between them intact. A decision without its evidence is visibly incomplete.

Carried by people

02 AI agents assemble the evidence

AI agents gather what was said, group it, and attach each finding to its source — the call, the ticket, the message. They surface where the evidence contradicts itself instead of averaging it away.

Carried by AI agents

03 Named people set priority

Priority is set by the person accountable for the outcome, reading the assembled evidence. The AI agent can argue against the ranking; it does not hold it.

Carried by people

04 The decision keeps its reason

What was decided, by whom, on what evidence, and what would change it are recorded together. When the debate reopens, it reopens against the record.

People and AI agents together

Where the manual work goes

PROBLEM	WHAT A PERSON DOES TODAY	WHAT THE WORKFLOW CHANGE DOES
Evidence in four tools	Re-read everything before each planning cycle.	Assembled once, attached to its source, kept current.
The same debate, twice	Argue from whoever remembers most confidently.	The prior decision carries its evidence and its reversal condition.
Contradictory research	Quietly average it into a compromise.	The contradiction is surfaced as a contradiction and given an owner.
Requirements drift from evidence	Discover the gap during build.	The requirement links to the finding it came from.

What you end up holding

A product record where evidence, priority and decision are connected; a list of the contradictions the evidence actually contains; and, for each live decision, the condition that would change it.

WHAT THIS DOES NOT CLAIM

This describes a workflow design. It is not a claim that AI agents should set product priority, and it is not a measured delivery outcome. Prioritization stays with the accountable person by design, not as a temporary caution.

NEXT STEP

Bring us this workflow.

Twenty minutes, one recurring workflow, and an honest answer about whether a bounded first case is worth running.

[Book a 20-minute call](#) · di@8hats.ai