

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

Tom Rochette <tom.rochette@coreteks.org>

August 30, 2025 — [861fb9d0](#)

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>