**Artifact 5: The Core Game Mechanics Summary**

1. **Budget:** 14 units total. Strict limit for individual Phase I package AND group Phase II package. Cannot be exceeded.
2. **Policy Areas:** 7 defined areas (Access, Language, Teacher Training, Curriculum, Psychosocial Support, Financial Support, Certification).
3. **Options/Costs:** 3 options per area (Option 1, 2, 3) costing 1, 2, 3 units respectively.
4. **Variety Rule:** User's Phase I package cannot be all Option 1s or all Option 2s.
5. **MPs:** Default 4 simulated peers. Unique hidden profiles (Age, Ed, Occ, SES, Stance; no sensitive attributes). Profiles influence preferences/arguments but are not shown to user. MPs must engage each other.
6. **Voting:** Phase II concludes with user + MPs voting per area. Majority wins; Speaker breaks ties randomly. Final package must be <= 14 units.
7. **Interaction:** Turn-based, dialogue-driven. Facilitated by Speaker.
8. **Input:** Primarily text-based, voice optional/flexible.

**Artifact 6: The Phase III Debrief Content Outline**

The Parliamentary Debrief (delivered by Speaker, replacing original questions):

1. **Final Package Recap:** Clear statement of the final group policy package voted on and total cost.
2. **Initial vs. Final Comparison:** Highlight differences between user's Phase I proposal and the final group package, area by area.
3. **Motivation <> Outcome Link:** Analyze how well the user's stated Phase I motivations for key choices were reflected or compromised in the final package.
4. **Negotiation Narrative:** Briefly summarize the flow – e.g., "Initial disagreement centered on [X], a key compromise was proposed regarding [Y], consensus formed around [Z]."
5. **Identified Trade-offs:** Explicitly state 2-3 major trade-offs made (e.g., "The final package prioritized [Area A] but required significant limitations in [Area B]").
6. **Targeted Reflection Prompts:** Focus on negotiation process/strategy. Examples:
   * "How did the group manage the **Budgetary Trade-offs** required to stay within 14 units?"
   * "Reflecting on your initial motivations, how effectively did you advocate for your **core priorities** during the debate?"
   * "Was the final package's **Consensus Viability** surprising, or did it align with the dynamics you observed?"
   * "Considering Member [Name]'s arguments on [Topic], could a different approach have led to stronger alignment or finding more **common ground**?"
   * "What aspect of navigating the parliamentary negotiation would you approach differently next time?"

**Artifact 7: Development Considerations (Web/LLM API)**

* **Frontend:** Web framework (React, Vue, etc.) for UI, displaying scenario, options, budget, dialogue history. Firebase Hosting is an option.
* **Backend Logic:** Primarily handled by the LLM configured with the Core Prompt (Artifact 1). Needs API access.
* **State Management:** Crucial for tracking phase, user choices, motivations, budget, dialogue history, MP profiles (server-side/hidden), final package. Firestore or Realtime Database suitable, potentially accessed via Cloud Functions.
* **MP Simulation:** Requires structured API calls to the LLM: Provide current state, MP profile, user input/motivation, recent history -> request MP response based on profile logic.
* **Cloud Functions:** Recommended for:
  + Securely calling LLM API.
  + Managing complex state updates (e.g., vote tallying).
  + Triggering end-of-game report generation/emailing.
* **Data Structures (Firestore Example):**
  + gameSessions/{id} (phase, budget, finalPackage, participantData)
  + gameSessions/{id}/participants/{userId} (choices, motivations)
  + gameSessions/{id}/mps/{mpId} (hiddenProfile - secured via rules)
  + gameSessions/{id}/dialogue/{turnId} (speaker, content)
  + gameSessions/{id}/reflections/{promptId} (verbatimResponse)
* **Reporting:** Cloud Function triggered by game end state -> aggregate data from Firestore -> format report -> call email service (e.g., SendGrid) with required recipients and content.
* **Authentication:** Firebase Authentication if user accounts are needed.

**Artifact 8: Conceptual Alignment Summary**

The Parliamentary Policy Simulator's design integrates concepts from several sources:

* **Core Foundation (AI CHALLENGE Hackathon.docx, Untitled design.pdf):** Adopts the Republic of Bean scenario, 7 policy areas/options/costs, 14-unit budget, 3-phase structure idea, and the justice/inclusion focus.
* **Negotiation Principles (Appendix 1...docx):** The *spirit* of adaptive communication based on profiles informed the design of adaptive MPs (though using different profile types). Concepts like identifying trade-offs, analyzing negotiation dynamics, and underlying principles (BATNA/ZOPA reframed) influenced Phase II logic and the Phase III debrief structure.
* **Agent Logic (AI Agent Model Spec...docx):** Provides the detailed blueprint for *how* MPs should function internally – using utility functions derived from profiles for preferences, employing argumentation-based reasoning, adapting responses based on context/arguments, and demonstrating strategic compromise. This adds depth to the MP simulation.
* **Initial Framing (SYSTEM INFORMATION.docx):** Provided the starting "autogpt game" request but its specific Manager/Agent structure was largely superseded by the Speaker/MP parliamentary model.
* **Collaborative Refinement (Chat History):** Key elements like the Speaker role, integrated motivation capture, value-centric terms ("Budgetary Trade-off," "Consensus Viability," "common ground," "core priorities"), and the negotiation-focused debrief were co-developed iteratively based on user feedback and discussion.

The result is a simulation aiming for the ethical depth of the original CHALLENGE game but with enhanced interactivity, adaptive AI opponents informed by detailed agent logic, and a reflective focus shifted towards the negotiation process itself.