



## Business case

Name:	Shane Toma
Community (UN SD goal):	Goal 3: Healthy lives and well-being
Date:	October 4, 2021

<b>Proposed Project</b>	RageQuit No More
<b>Date Produced</b>	October 4, 2021
<b>Background</b>	<p>Video game addiction, while at times profitable, harms the players that are hooked and damages gaming communities. The desire to reduce gaming addictions is something everyone involved in gaming culture should strive for. Beyond improving the lives of those afflicted, overplay of a given game can lead to player burnout which means the player has played all they can play and move on to a different title. Alternatively, a player may remain on the game and become an increasingly detrimental presence, they can ruin other players in game experience, communicate harmful messages on community platforms, and generally belittle those around them. Tainting a game with such negativity tends to spiral, more and more players become frustrated and become negative community members. Maintaining a healthy community surrounding a game should be on the mind of game makers everywhere because toxic communities chase away existing players and dissuade new ones from giving a game a try.</p>
<b>Business Need/ Opportunity</b>	<p>Criticism about gambling-like mechanics is terrifying to all games that employ loot boxes. If this stream of revenue is cut off, many game makers will be taking a serious hit to their wallets. By improving the well being of players and lessening gaming addictions, the chances that loot boxes will remain an unregulated source of income goes up.</p> <p>The business need for emotional and community wellness controls stems from the fact that players leave games that provide a negative experience. With the trends towards cheap/free-to-play and turning a profit through cosmetic sales and loot boxes this means a player is likely to spend less time in game when they could be making purchases.</p> <p>Another important factor to consider is government intervention in gaming. The most prominent example is the government of China setting a strict 3hr/week playtime limit to those under eighteen years of age. Better self regulation could help prevent government intervention in video games.</p>
<b>Options</b>	<p>A) Perform the Project Using Traditional Rigid Controls</p> <p>B) Performing the Project With Individuals in Mind:</p> <p>C) Do Nothing:</p>

## Cost-Benefit Analysis

[This section contains the detailed costs and benefits of each option listed in the previous section. The costs may include considerations such as financial expenditures, the amount of time required, possible risks, and the potential for reduced quality. The benefits may include the potential of increased sales, market share, and brand recognition and the reduction of errors and ongoing costs. Each option should be clearly identified and listed separately.]

### A) Perform Project Using Traditional Rigid Controls

Cost: Nothing really changes, same controls as already exist persist and if we just add another, no improvement is made.



---

Benefit: May be easier to market. Easy for the community to accept since it does not make a splash.

B) Perform Project With Individuals in Mind

Cost: Community will have to accept change. May be perceived as more intrusive. Extra load for weak machines.

Benefit: Change could improve the well being of players. By tailoring a solution for players individually real change might occur. Enjoyment of time spent on games and forums is liable to increase. Gaming stereotypes may eventually change if the community adapts.

C) Do Nothing

Cost: No improvement occurs. Existing tools may still be used to the existing level of success.

Benefit: Very easy to accept.

---

### Recommendation

**Option B) is recommended. The community opens up a chance for improvement while a failure would not result in a loss greater than the reality of the other options.**

---