

# Viggo Ahl - An experimental comparison of five prioritization methods (2005)

Tom Rochette <tom.rochette@coreteks.org>

December 21, 2025 — [77e1b28a](#)

## 0.1 Context

## 0.2 Learned in this study

## 0.3 Things to explore

## 1 Overview

### 2 4.3 Planning Game (PG)

- Customer stories are written on cards
- Cards are put into 3 piles
  - Those without which the system will not function
  - Those that are less essential but provide significant business value
  - Those that would be nice to have
- The programmer estimates how long each requirement would take to implement and then begin to sort the requirements into 3 piles (i.e. sort by risk)
  - Those that can be estimated precisely
  - Those that can be estimated reasonably well
  - Those that cannot be estimated at all
- Requirements are not compared against each other but again which “bucket” they are in, thus it takes  $n$  time to prioritize  $n$  requirements

### 3 4.4 100 Points method

- Each person gets a certain amount of points to “purchase ideas”
- The requirement that has got the highest score (amount of points given by the participants) is the most important requirement
- This method only works once in every project (as participants learn what others will value)
- It takes  $n$  time to prioritize  $n$  requirements, but because a ratio scale is used, it takes more time per decision than PG

## 4 See also

- [An evaluation of methods for prioritizing software requirements](#)

## 5 References

- <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.103.3674&rep=rep1&type=pdf>