

Agentic PM Evaluation Checklist


Use this checklist when comparing agentic project management tools. A real platform maintains trusted project truth while humans remain in control.

12 Criteria

- The tool maintains a persistent project graph, not only chat history.
- Agents can read and write structured project objects.
- Goals, requirements, decisions, risks, and action items are linked.
- The system can ingest signals from email, docs, websites, meetings, chat, tickets, and files, then propose context updates.
- Human approval acts as the quality and consistency gate for consequential changes.
- Every update has a traceable history.
- External agents can access the same context through MCP, A2A, or an equivalent interface.
- The PM agent can execute or delegate work to connected coding, web research, workflow agents, and humans.
- Permissions are scoped by role, tool, and action type.
- Teams can bring their own model or run locally when privacy requires it.
- The project context survives model changes and agent handoffs.
- Project data can be exported.

TensorPM Project Graph

Shared project context for humans, PM agents, coding agents, and research agents.



Scoring

10-12

Likely a real agentic PM platform.

6-9

Likely AI-enhanced PM with some agentic workflows.

0-5

Likely a PM assistant, chatbot, or automation layer.

Evaluation Rule

Do not evaluate only the AI demo. Ask: Where does project context live? Which source types can the system ingest? Who can change it? How are changes approved? How does the system explain what changed and why? Can the PM agent execute or delegate tasks? Can other agents use the same context?

Bottom line: The difference between an AI assistant and agentic project management is not how fluent the model sounds. It is whether the system can maintain trusted project truth while humans remain in control.