[12:06:08 Chuck] I wanted to share some information: The SAIS wargaming Club is hosting a conversation on Millennium Challenge 2002. I know some of us remember that event, with the panel of Industry experts. There's going to be a keynote speech by Dr. Micah Zenko Who has written a book "Red Team - How to Succeed By Thinking Like The Enemy". There's going to be a talk from a Rand policy analyst Becca Wasser. And then from Center for Navy Analyses (CNA) lcead wargaming designer Dr. Jeremy Zapinsky will be there in a moderated panel, leading a moderate a panel discussion. And the idea is to talk about wargaming. What went wrong and what's been imporoved and where we are today. It's next Thursday at 6PM if anyone is interested, I will share the sign-up link and information on our Reflector. So just send send send send out a quick peep if you're interested.

[12:07:27 Chris] Just put it on the reflector.

[12:07:31 Kevin]   Put it on the Reflector and then people can just register.

[12:07:46 Chris] 6PM Eastern Time?

[12:07:47 Chuck] I believe that correct.

[12:07:51 Kevin] 11PM In the UK.

[12:08:01 Chris] Just when you're settling down to your third or fourth drink, that should be fine.

[12:08:05 Kevin] Normally I'll be listening to CNN news for the for the hour of comedy that you were present every day.

[12:08:11 Chuck] You listen to CNN news, that's problem number one.

[12:08:20 Chris] Well he said for comedy though. That was interesting.

[12:08:24 Kevin] I did say for comedy, did I not?

[12:08:28 Chris] Kind of his, late night show.

[12:08:33 Kevin] Yeah, I only listen to the the daily update from the White House because it really is actually amusing at times.

[12:08:43 Tracy] I once listened to a speech at AFCEA and there was a speaker that said he he listened or watched the BBC early in the morning because he is US East Coast. That's because they got a five hour head start on the rest of the world. So congratulations.

[12:09:07 Kevin] Well, I do like I'm getting a bit sick and tired of hearing the "great" though, I'm afraid. It just it just "grates" on me slightly.

[12:09:20 Tracy] He also mentioned that he was he was wanted to listen to a news broadcast that was still wary of the Spanish Armada of the 1500s. They were they were not prejudiced against anybody but them.

[12:09:35 Kevin] It's all good fun. I trust you're all keeping well during this period of so-called lockdown and social distancing.

[12:09:46 Chuck] We still have a problem in this country with people going nuts and buying certain products. But for the most part we're able to get what we need as long as we stay separate. Hopefully it will get to a pretty quick.

[12:10:01 Kevin] I'm going to post the wargaming slides that were at the conference a few weeks back before we all got locked down? I couldn't get I didn't get a copy of the Canadian officer's slide, but I asked Tom Mouat who gave the presentation at the last moment. I think he may replaced a Canadian officer who wasn't allowed to travel. I copied common Tom in, you saw Chuck? You should have an email from me? With Tom's address on it. So you can send the survey to him.

[12:10:45 Chuck] With a request for him to forward it to as many friends neighbors and colleagues that he can.

[12:10:48 Tracy] Oh Chuck, I sent you a scan of some business cards? Tom Mouat I was I met him at connections 2019, and he gave me his personal card that may be different than the email that Kevin found. Because he also seems to have a side business.

[12:11:12 Kevin] He has a side business quite correct.

[12:11:17 Chuck] And I know again like many of us who's also a hobby wargamer. He and I are in some of the same wargaming discussion groups on Facebook.

[12:11:28 Kevin] He's also actually been deployed at the moment. He is still serving.

[12:11:36 Chuck] Every time I run to win the conference, he's always in uniform.

[12:11:40 Kevin] Wherever he's gone to look at any of the modeling for Covid-19, or is actually at one of the field hospitals, I don't know but he has been deployed.

[12:11:55 Chuck] So the research group out of Quantico, even though we're shut down right now and everyone's working from home, one of the things we are discussing is hosting a virtual or online wargame actually hosting a wargame. It would be a matrix game or decision-makers game on the Covid-19 response very similar to the one from the materials that were published on PAXSIMS. I think that was Rex Brynen who put that up and put it out. But basically it would be a it would be a matrix style game where we would be looking for teams of players to represent five different player teams: The United States government, the UK government, the population at large, the disease itself. A player represents the disease because they're trying to think of new ways to be infectious and nasty. To keep the other players on their toes and so on. If we do that and we actually host it and we look for outside players to participate, I will put an invitation on this reflector, on the mailing list here.

[12:13:14 Chris] Is it a kind of recreational game or for serious research?

[12:13:24 Chuck] It's serious game it's intended for research or to get highlights to generate information for decision makers. And so we would end up writing a report on it. If we do it and we get some possible funding from Georgia Tech to do it. We would end up writing some reports possibly even a journal article on our findings especially if anything interesting it's gets uncovered.

[12:13:50 Chris] There is a methodology with data collection and the whole bit?

[12:13:55 Chuck] Absolutely. That's really interesting.

[12:13:57 Tracy] Would it be full online or would it be transmit and forget play?

[12:14:05 Chuck] So it's it's not precisely a board game. There is a map or a like a tableau of information and pieces get moved to shift around on that. But that would all be handled online by the facilitators. The most part of it is conversation. So amongst the teams they converse every turn. Each team gets to make a strategic move. (It's a Matrix Game.) They get to make a strategic move and then they present arguments of why their move will be successful. For instance, suppose. the United States government said: "We're going to move to social distancing and we believe it's going to be successful because of a nationwide advertising campaign telling people the benefits of social distancing." The other players not necessarily in their own roles will come up with reasons why it will not be successful. "That won't be successful because United States population is naturally distrustful of the government." That could be an argument again. After you collect your Arguments for against, then the referee staff either through a dice roll or subject matter expertise, will determine whether or not that strategic move is successful. Then that forwards the situation in the game, and then you go to the next team. Each turn every team gets to make some some move, the scenario is government and population response to the disease.

[12:15:35 Tracy] So it sounds like during business hours

[12:15:38 Chuck] Yeah, we would do it during business hours … over several days. I don't know if we would do one solid four hour chunk. It's possible. So these are these are traditionally done in one sitting, but since we're online we may stretch it out.

[12:15:54 Tracy]   I guess that cuts down on the the non-professional attendees.

[12:16:04 Curt] Yeah, I was actually going to say could you …

[12:16:07 Angus] I know that there are some some folks. This is Angus by the way. I know there's some folks in Raytheon technologies that actually would be interested in kind of participating. But we can't break out blocks like that. Would it be possible to reorganize it so that maybe it's you know, a 15-minute chunk at the top of the hour and then four hours later another 15-minute chunk? So the adjudication could happen inbetween but 15-minute intervals. Where the decision making would happen and the exchanges would occur and so forth?

[12:16:46 Chuck] Angus that's actually a really good idea. That way people can do it and not have to be quote/unquote stay online and active in-between. Thomas and I are discussing it. He's of course not on our call today. He got pulled away for something else.

[12:17:08 Angus] You're referencing the PAXSIMS page

[12:17:15 Chuck] Yeah there's a bunch of different …

[12:17:16 Angus] I'm checking that out the power there. It actually looks really cool.

[12:17:25 Chuck] And like I said, normally in normal times, you would gather bunch of people together and you do it as one sit-down session, like in a single afternoon. These days with distancing we have a perfectly good reason to do it distributed. And there's no reason why we couldn't stretch out the time so we could do it in, you know, small small small slices or chunks of time. \

[12:17:50 Angus] So when you're in the same environment your your white force, your adjudicators and stuff or your judges. They're interactive with the with the folks right there in the exercise in real time.

[12:18:06 Chuck] Right, and their main job is to keep the conversation going. Keep the turn structure in place, and keep keep it kind of moving so it doesn't evolve into just sideline conversations.

[12:18:26 Angus] I think that would be really interesting. And then of course in an online chat forum kind of a way you also want to have some audio visuals to help. Are there any grafts or or depictions that maybe could even mirror some of the websites that I'm sure we're all monitoring to watch the progress of the of the virus around, you know the country and around and around the world so anything like that that you could kind of bring to bear?

[12:18:55 Chuck] Yes, certainly. So one thing that we could do is we could even be generating our own graphs of what happens in quote/unquote, our game world. The fictional game world of the wargame. You know, what does describe look like? What does the infection curve look like? What does the recovery curve look like? We could be generating those in between, maybe even have like a standard format and just adjust it that every turn and you can use that information to hand out to the players post those. One of the nice things about being online, it's a little easier to do really nice graphical representation of game data.

[12:19:37 Angus] So you do ever throw in in this type of game you ever throw in disinformation or misinformation?

[12:19:48 Chuck] Yeah. So these kind of games. I mean that's yeah, that's key. Sometimes in some games like this that are very adversarial, the players will make their moves in private to the referee staff and not announce them publicly and then the referee staff will announce what needs to be made

public to to the other players. So you may keep things secret. You may keep private, put out disinformation, all that's possible. The referee could put out this information right? If they're putting out new information, right the new situation between each turn, they could put out, you know, misleading stuff to see what the response is.

[12:20:35 Angus] Depending upon the goal of the of the event whether it's you know, educating leaders or testing hypotheses, you know achieve different strategies on how to reveal or change the information that gets gets presented. Obviously you can have private conversations backwards so that people don't realize that they are operating under different assumptions as they as they implode.

[12:21:14 Chuck] Exactly So any of those levels of transparency or non-transparency all could serve different purposes in the game? Yeah. Absolutely.

[12:21:35 Jane] I just I had a question about that because I really like this. I think this is really cool. But I wanted to clarify did you say that it would be in sequence? In other words one player would play and then the next one and it would be like a round? The reason why I was asking if that's true I'm wondering if we should not consider the fact that with a virus it could interact at any time or change its gameplay at any time that that might make it more realistic.

[12:22:09 Chuck] Oh, no, say that's very interesting. Normally there is a play sequence. A turn sequence that's designed by the game designers in order to sort any kind of situation. We have multiple sides or multiple viewpoints. Some people are active and some people are reactive right ? As normally will structure it so your active people will do their turns first. I then your reactive people can go later on? They may be more of a subsidiary player or like a smaller world power if it is a world powers kind of thing. Normally whatever results from player one before player two does their turn some of those results will affect the situation before player choose to go on. In the case like this where we're talking about, you know, the disease itself being, you know active and nasty and trying to affect people with different and exciting ways that make us, you know think about horrible ways to have to wash our hands for the next 10 years. It's you know, basically kept very interesting.

[12:23:17 Jane] Yeah, because I'm almost thinking that the virus itself is really playing both roles active and reactive. In other words. They have it's own mindset of what he wants to do, but then it will also react based on what's happening in the system over.

[12:23:30 Chuck] Right, and looking to exploit, you know weaknesses in strategies from the other players. We're considering hosting one of those as a research project through Georgia Tech if we do it it's going to be pretty soon. But I think if we do do it, I would love to open it up to participation in front for members from this group.

[12:24:02 Kevin] Yeah Count Me In choke if it's the right time of the day.

[12:24:06 Chuck] Absolutely, absolutely. All right. So enough of that. Tracy was kind enough to send a notice about it and also to put it in our in our file structure, a copy of the draft of Survey questions.

[12:24:27 Tracy] Oh, I'm in the middle of the uploading it now.

[12:24:31 Chuck] Okay, very good.

[12:24:32 Tracy] I'll delete the old one I put up there yesterday.

[12:24:36 Chuck] Okay. This is a it's a slimmed-down of a very much slimmed down version of the set of survey questions that we had developed about two months ago. And the reason is we thought that that survey was too long. The idea was that we would follow this up by a second survey in a more pointed direction, maybe asking about different processes in the in the life cycle of a wargaming event.. What about design and development? We were not really sure where we go with a second survey. But the first survey we wanted to get as many results back as possible. So we tried to keep it short. I t's less than 20 questions at this point. So if you can if you have access to the reflector go ahead and grab a copy of that tape. a look. We can go through it.

[12:25:44 Jane] Is this the date of March 26 for this online survey posted?

[12:25:50 Chuck] No it was sent out just this Morning.

[12:25:55 Tracy] And I just put the draft version on the folders.

[12:25:57 Chuck] The one from March 26, that is the older one in the opinion of the conversation going on here, it was too long.

[12:26:10 Stephen] This is Stephen here. Under the SISO website under the S&WG Study Group Library. All I'm seeing are three folders and a TOR. I'm not seeing anything else. So I'm obviously in the wrong place.

 [12:26:27 Tracy] Do a refresh. I just deleted the old one, put the new one up.

[12:26:35 Stephen] Ah, thank you.

[12:26:49 Chuck] So you can see that we'll have some introductory information. Who we are, why we're conducting a survey, that kind of stuff. We will have some information that hasn't been written yet. That's going to be pretty pro forma, assuming based on the organization here and you know the statements our TOR and that kind of thing. And then we have what we're just some text here that could serve for that but introductory paragraph. I think if you read through that let me know what you think.

[12:27:23 Curt] Yeah, I mean, I like it. I think it's a pretty good paragraph talking about what the study groups trying to do I don't think you want it to be any bigger than that. That's for sure.   When you get to the anonymous stuff, I think we ought to talk about it. I don't think we ought to collect any identifiable information.

[12:27:56 Chuck] One thing I was going to make it all optional. The only thing I was going to make mandatory would be either the name or email with a promise that we won't publish It. It would just be used it for getting back in touch with them or identifying unique responses to the survey.

[12:28:18 Curt] I think instead of that, don't ask for any identifying information at all. And just somewhere, in the intro or at the end of the thing, say if you would like a copy of the results of this survey email, and put something in there and it could even be an organizational kind of email. Maybe SISO or something.. You could do an individual there, but you just have to be careful of that. If somebody wants to offer their gmail account or something for possible spam. That would be one way to go or maybe we use, some general thing like SISO_Help or something.   So you can try to collect the names of people that way and collect the names of people that way. I'm just kind of sensitive about people giving any kind of identifying information. We've got a lot of strong restrictions on that at NPS. For conducting studies that involve things like this. It's pretty strict

[12:29:33 Chuck] Looking over the list of questions, number one and number two obviously identifying information name and email. What about the organization name?

[12:29:47 Curt] I think that would be okay. Although it gets a little sticky and based on people's answers, you know, someone might be able to infer the person but you know, I think that's a longer shot. We might be okay with but organization. Type of organization clearly is.

[12:30:08 Tracy] When I was doing my survey of other survey engines, it turns out the usual anchor for these things is is the email. Anything else is extra. So I'd put a required on the email star or something.

[12:31 Chuck] Most surveys I've responded to have asked for [overhead jet noise] this conversation will be publicly disclose disclose for anything other than survey results.

[12:30:44 Curt] And we trust all of those of course, eh? [Chuckle]

[12:30:51 Chuck] It's all those other people who are untrustworthy, not us. So moving on to the questions then, starting with number 5. "Do you consider your organization experienced with wargaming?" and then "Are you an experienced wargamer?"

[12:31:10 Curt] On on each of these and you know to possibly eliminate some of the short answer ones later. On each of these you could have a little short answer optional thing that if they want to add. If they want to elaborate on their yes or no. Yeah, do you consider your organization and experience and then have a little short answer thing for you know, what kinds of experience or something?

[12:31:46 Angus] Well I hear that. I think that makes sense. I was actually going to go in a different direction. Some of this is going to be, I mean the yes or no questions aren't going to be particularly informative. If we could just change them to for example, consider your organization experience. You know, it just change it to: "To what degree do you consider your working to be essential to your organization functions?", and have a range of answers from: "Yes we use it every day." to "No and never use it at work." One to five or something like that.

[12:32:30 chorus of likes]

[12:32:34 Tracy] I have a I can ratchet up number six. Instead of yes/no on six, indicate your wargaming experience in number of years and ask for an integer.

[12:32:47 Angus] Yep.

[12:32:49 Jane] Well actually give a range that you don't have to you know, you're not dealing with all hundred different numbers.

[12:32:55 Kevin] Yeah, a range would be good.

[12:33:02 Tracy] Sanitizing input would be good.

[12:33:07 Angus] I think you're going to end up with a lot of people that are going to say. "Well I've been using my whole career." and so you're going to end up with essentially age minus 18 or age minus 22 kind of an answer.

[12:33:21 Tracy] But there are also some people that just got thrown in the job and it's what they have to do because they got assigned to it.

[12:33:31 Kevin] You could use you could use a verbal scale from Expert, to Competent, Novice, Just Starting, Never heard of, or Don't even know how to spell wargames.

[12:33:42 Chris] I think that would be another good way to do it, right.

[12:33:55 humor chatter on war-game word] One word, definitely hyphenated.

[12:33:58 Kevin] Why would we want that information? Because surely this survey is going out of people who are involved in wargaming not necessarily people who are not.

[12:34:12 Chuck] What are the groups to whom we send this out? Or the SISO membership at large?

[12:34:16 Kevin] That would make sense that would be fine.

[12:34:22 Angus] We also want to make sure that we have some way of calibrating and interpreting the results if we find out that a bunch of people have found this and we're get a bunch of survey spam. We want to be able to strip that out.   I anticipate we'll get to discover this and end up with a with a 150 responses from from 16 year olds. We probably want to be able to identify that.

[12:34:54 Kevin] I would also tell cousin to avoid binary answers completely. Either use scales or use strength of agreement with a statement like [garble]

[12:35:12 Chuck] Say again? Like a Likert scale or more …

[12:3514 Stephen] You have to be very careful though. There are Likert responses but in Likert you don't have time to put together a proper Likert scale. A Likert scale is a collection of Likert response questions, which have been carefully constructed so that adding up the ordinal numbers across multiple, Likert style questions emulates a cardinal score. You do not have that here. Use a scale and use text. Text identifiers down the scale. Don't use numbers and certainly don't start doing arithmetic on the numbers other than frequency.

[12:36:10 unknown] You mean we can't add up probabilities?

[12:36:14 multiple laughter]

[12:36:20 Stephen] The banging noise you hear from the North is me hitting my head on the table. And Tracy is doing that to me deliberately.

[12:36:33 Angus] … t my job a business meeting and people were making Market assessments, saying how much money we expect to make out of something. So well, it's 50% probability of win over here, and people just multiply the probability times the base value and that is everything up and make billions of dollars, zillions.

[12:36:58 Stephen] On things like age etc. I wouldn't ranges at all. I would simply allow a drop down menu with a minimum age and a maximum age and just let the computer handle slicing and dicing those. If you start breaking it up, one to five years five to fifteen or whatever, how you select those ranges has an effect on your answers and you don't know what that effect was going to be.

[12:37:43 Chuck] That's pretty good advice and for six and seven, eight...

[12:37:51 Stephen] Hang on a sec there. For seven, I recommend replacing it with "How important to organization is to wargaming?"

[12:38:05 Curt] Like a Likert scale or something?

[12:38:09 Stephen] Stop using the word Likert.

[12:38:12 Curt] One to five or whatever.

[12:38:14 Stephen] No not quantified very important. You know.

[12:38:18 Curt] That's what I meant.

[12:38:23 Stephen] You're jerking my chain again.

[12:38:26 Angus] … we use it every day, we use it annually. I was actually thinking maybe a multi selection might be appropriate here. So we describe the things which would drive the frequency of utilization and then just allow them to pick all that apply.

[12:38:52 Stephen] You can do that by combining questions seven and eight. Have the nature of war-gaming and trust their application ABCDE and of alongside each of those have their scale of how important war-gaming to do analysis is, how important wargaming for training. Is etcetera?

[12:39:20 Chuck] Taking a look now at the answers that we have for eight. Of coure we have an 'other' because there's no way we would capture everything and I would be for some some text there for the description of what what they identify as 'other'. Do we have A through D? Do we have the basic categories? Is this all what other people would consider basic categories?

[12:39:50 Jane]   Do you think we should add Logistics?

[12:39:57 Angus] I agree with that one actually.

[12:40:09 Stephen] I would say no for the following reason: You could apply analysis to logistics, you

could train in logistics, you can do business decision-making about logistics. Logistics is the application of the war-game, then the nature of the war-game however, is in that list. Are you analyzing and retraining or are you educating etcetra. What you're buying into has an entirely separate list.

[12:40:39 Angus] Maybe it is an analytic function but in the logistics simulations, I'm familiar with that perfect tends to be the plan, you know end up with a planning function. Okay, we figured this out and so we're going to come up with the logistics plans to handle contingencies

[12:41:04 Kevin] Maybe planning because decision make it is not quite the same as planning.

[12:41:12 Chuck] So then you add 'Planning'. Agreement?

[12:41:22 Tracy] My only thought was you could just take business / investment out and just start it with decision-making overall.

[12:41:28 Chuck] I got it kind of kind of kind of flashed through that.

[12:41:33 Stephen] Yeah.

[12:41:37 Jane] Agreed.

[12:41:40 Kevin] I would still put 'Planning' in separate though.

[12:41:44 Chuck] I have a new list here. A list to have: Analysis, Training, Decision-making, Planning , Important to the Conduct of War-games, and Other.

[12:41:58 Kevin] That's good enough to go with.

[12:42:01 Stephen] I would suggest I would suggest sending out a note to people you're doing it here and I'll write something up an email it to Tracy.   The others should be minimized.   You obtained the others by a pre-survey sort of focus group. You send that list and ask what should be added here? You don't just take everything included on, but you get the ideas fed back. We've got some of them here and now but it's probably worth letting people are put together their own lists and emailing them into you rather than trying to come up with them on the fly.

[12:42:49 Chuck] Very good, and we can simply do that just as an email response on the Reflector. I think I think we've got about 20 or 30 people on Earth collector. That might be big enough without going outside.

[12:43:03 Kevin] Yeah, you want my want to test this on a couple of people as well first?

[12:43:11 Tracy] Oh so question Jane. Did you subscribe to the reflector yet?

[12:43:16 Jane] I tried to figure out how to do it. It used to have boxes beside the thing. So I select the boxes, so I could not find it at my end so I'm not sure. So I need to dig in to that and find out to do that.

[12:43:46 Tracy] So if you have a log in to sisostds.org, then you should be able to join the discussion board for S&W-SG.

[12:43:48 Jane] All right, I I'm logged in I can access the Reflector. I can access the
Speaker 7: files but I didn't see where I can actually say join this Reflector. I got to find that that's not my I'll take that offline.

[12:44:01 Tracy] Okay. Good.

[12:44:10 Chuck] A pre-survey response on the options for Nature of War-gaming that's a good suggestion and then we can maybe do away with the other category category.

[12:44:24 Kevin] Hey Chuck I've just had an email from the Smithsonian and they have got a thing

about how they're working on Covid-19, and they're talking about… Those I'll send you the email but it's interesting. There's a link between humans and animals and it might give you some ideas for your wargaming on Covid-19.

[12:44:49 Chuck] Sure. Absolutely. Question nine. Again our answers, are they too leading? It's a good question? Does it need to be redesigned? "Is your organization use digital or computer tools in the design development or execution of war-games?" I didn't want to mention analysis of war-gaming results here because I think they're pretty much everybody's going to be using digital tools. You said of one sort or another whether it's you know, data visualization or statistical analysis or whatever.

[12:45:35 Stephen] I would make that a matrix question again instead of just Yes, No, or Not, I would have Design, Development, Execution as the three categories and allow them to fill in what tools they use for each of those. Then again for question ten. Tabletop computer, allow them to fill in what commercial tabletop or computer or games they use or, the different types of war-game, or for the design development and execution.   For the categories in question eight, allow them to enter what what commercial tabletops for computer war-games are used for each of those categories.

[12:46:48 Angus] I prefer the term technology to digital computers.

[12:46:56 Stephen] I won't disagree.

[12:47:01 Angus] There might be purpose-built things that we wouldn't consider to be a computer that help and that technology is still of interest to us.

[12:47:25 Chuck] Chris good feedback on number 10 . Now we get into some opinion ones were they're looking for people to write opinions. Any thoughts on number 11?   And again, we could replace digital computer with technology.

[12:47:51 Stephen] How about wording these asking for the advantages and disadvantages of using digital computer tools for professional war-gaming? Rather than how do they benefit or not just after advantages and disadvantages of using them.

[12:4815 Angus] I mean you might get somebody who said well, I just got done telling you that we don't use computers. Now, you're asking me how the computers help me?

[12:47:26 Chuck] Maybe maybe they use this as an opportunity to say the disadvantages, you know highlights as to why they don't use tools.

[12:48:40 Jane] Perhaps what advantages or disadvantages do you see if you ask it that way or something similar to that, just because somebody not in it, they could still have opinions on what advantages and disadvantages they see based on observations they've had in the past.

[12:49:01 Chuck] We could follow that same format asking for advantages and disadvantages for number 12. And maybe even split up tabletop and command computer games. Number 13 is it too broad and wide open.

[12:49:38 Stephen] It's interesting. I believe it.

[12:49:42 Chuck] I was really hoping for a little [garble] of this one.

[12:49:47 Angus] I'm really I'm a little upset by the by the term 'professional'.

[12:49:53 Chuck] You think we should drop 'professional'?

[12:49:56 Angus] I mean we're talking about is that war-gaming as a utility and what stands in the way of realizing, that we're taking advantage of that utility.

[12:50:10 Chuck] Yeah. Okay. All right fair enough.

[12:50:22 Angus] We're not talking about the community right there.. We're saying what stands in the

way realizing the potential benefit of war-gaming?

[12:50:35 Stephen] That's a better wording.

[12:50:44 Chuck] So what do you see as roadblocks to realizing the potential benefit of wargaming?

[12:50:54 Angus] Something like that. Yeah. And in order for that to be concrete enough, you'd probably want to say 'in your profession', or 'in your career', or 'in the domain that you are interested in. '

[12:51:23 Stephen] I wouldn't do that. People with long careers have moved on and have seen problems in other people's areas. I'll just leave it as open-ended as it was.

[12:51:47 Angus] The point of that question in my mind is to to draw out problems that we might be able to identify and perhaps address collectively. So speculation is kind of what I want to avoid. I would love to see things that are concrete to say 'Hey, you know, we could figure out a way of institutionalizing, process X that would really simplify the application of of war-gaming as a practice within my organization or within my types of organizations.

[12:52:22 Jane] I would like to extend if you're going to say 'from your perspective' and ask that question, I would also include the word 'why'. For if you're asking them, 'What is their greatest challenge?', you want them to state it but then also say 'why'.

[12:52:44 Angus] They won't want a one-word answer.

[12:52:56 Chuck] Our time is falling short. Let's look at number 14. This should generate some I saw interesting responses.

[12:53:08 Chris] So this is one that actually an email already written to send you guys that we broke before we got to it. So I think this is a really interesting one that I understand. There may be the concern with having a short answer early on but I think this is something that would probably be good to get in front of people early in this while especially while they still had some motivation to Survey because I think this is gonna be very telling in all of the other answers you get. You can't even make it like not scary and say, you know in two to three sentences have you find war-gaming or something. But I think that's huge because there's so many definitions. Without understanding where somebody's coming from just the organization's not in my opinion going to give you enough insight.

[12:53:54 Angus] Yes, definitely. I agree completely agree that should be the first question.

[12:53:58 Chuck] So Chris in general you have good reasons, but your recommendation is to move this question to earlier in the Survey.

[12:54:10 Chris] Correct and obviously open for debate because I know there's pros and cons to that. But I I'm to the point almost would be like, one, two, three, four. who I am, then, whether you want to hit it before even five, or not long thereafter in that neighborhood of the first couple questions there.

[12:54:31] Chuck: that some organizations internally have different definitions of war-gaming.

[12:54:45 Jane] You may want to follow that one with number 15. So 14 would be first then 15, because I think I'm just thinking if I'm putting the hat on as if I'm with answering this. You've got the person's flow of thinking that they just gave. Either definition now, they're trying to give you their uses of the war-gaming, over.

[12:55:15 Chuck] Any any objections to the language or what we're asking for in 14 and 15?

[12:55:22 Angus] 14 seems like spot-on how would you mess with that? 15 'best', really?   What are the answers upon which 'best' is you know, it's defined?   Most 'effective', 'accurate' We just got done saying that you could be used for analysis, training, whatever. Then well, those are different ways of

measuring values, so 'best' is kind of a … I'm not sure about 'best.'

[12:56:14 Chuck] How about we replace 'best' with something like 'useful' or 'pragmatic'?   Maybe not 'pragmatic', maybe 'useful'.

[12:56:23 Stephen] I'm sort of Angus is side here. I would I would just take 15 out. The uses of war-gaming on the advantages is ... They're embedded in the other questions.

[12:56:37 Angus] I kind of agree with that.

[12:56:44 Stephan] Take it out and make question fourteen the new question five.   Slide it between yeah, what is now four and five?

[12:56:58 Chuck] Okay, that leads us to number 16. This certainly is one where there are no right or wrong answers.

[12:57:18 Chris] And obviously the guy that ilives in research-land. I'd love to hear some of the answer here too. And I think keeping it broad, whether it turns into technology discussions, methodologies, and so forth could be really fascinating.

[12:57:33 Curt] It may just need to be reworded a little bit because, it seems ambiguous to me as it areas of research. I'm interested in, or areas of research I'm interested in working on, or in the areas of research I'm interested in funding? It's not clear the perspective the guy should take.

[12:58:02 Chuck] Is it best to leave it open or to divide it up into several smaller questions?

[12:58:14 Curt] You know, maybe it's something like what are the key areas of research needed to promote the use of war-gaming. I don't know. I'm just flying off the cuff there. Number 13 is that you know are the challenges of the same thing as the research areas?

[12:58:41 Chuck] Could be things like governance or community or attitude? Funding research could be, you know, a very very different answer . Maybe I'm thinking like a research scientist.

[12:58:56 Angus] I'm not sure that that's what captured there. I really thought they were even for that question was what allowed the respondent to say. "If you entertained this issue or if you focus on this I'd be interested. So I kind of like it the way that it is. If there some other question that used to be there to get a broader response pool, but I'm kind of looking for you know, what would we focus on if we wanted to build constituency?

[12:59:29 Chuck] How about this and how about a follow-up to number 16, a second question. 'How do you view your relationship to wargaming research?' 'A possible program funder', 'A researcher', 'A user of the resulting research.'   Something like that.

[12:59:58 Stephen] There's two questions here. One is the area of research by Stephen do you want to do? The other is a broad one, what research is needed to prove the utility of wargaming?

[01:00:14 Kevin] Yeah, and that turns more realistic.

[01:00:34 Kevin] Chaps I'll have to drop off shortly. It's six o'clock in the UK, and it's start of a long weekend for us in the UK for Easter holiday.

[01:00:43 Chuck] Yep. Very good. Enjoy. Kevin always good to hear from you.

[01:00:53 Kevin] Take care everyone.

[01:00:54 Tracy] People are dropping off. Do we prove the old minutes?

[01:00:59 Kevin] Yeah. I move.

[01:01:01 Chuck] Yeah, I think so.

[01:01:05 Tracy] Next meeting two weeks?

[01:01:07 Chuck] Meeting to move? Yeah, very good.

[01:01:13 Jane] Thank you gentlemen.

[01:01:17 Chuck] I will take the notes that we captured today word up a draft to send it out and maybe we can just approve or disapprove next time and then start spinging it on the public Plus I'll do an internal questionnaire about ...