

[12:04:08 Chuck] On board.

Also called Curt Blais, Chris McGroarty, Tracy Johnson, Stephen Downes-Martin.

[12:04:23 Stephen] We kept conflicting with the Connections planning meetings.

[12:04:37 Chuck] I was busy attending the MORS cyber war-gaming. Hello. the Kevin it is How are you doing?

[12:05:05 Kevin] I've got used to lock-downs.

[12:05:10 Curt] Did your wife come through okay?

[12:05:12 Kevin] Yeah, no problem she's back at work.

[12:05:17 Chuck] Great. Thomas will be joining us with you said you would be a few minutes late. Joe (Saur) will not join us but sent some interesting comments about the survey. We have the minutes from the last meeting. Tracy thank you so much for taking care of the last meeting and working with Curt on the SSG stuff we'll go over today, the new TOR, and forwarding the Minutes. Do we have a motion to approve the minutes? Does anything need to be adjusted or edited?

[12:06:31 Kevin] I'll give you a motion to pass the minutes and someone would second it? the

[12:06:37 Curt] I'll second it.

[12:06:42 Chuck] So this is the minutes are approved.

[12:06:48 Tracy 12:05 (timer is 90 seconds off)

[12:06:50 Chuck] A report on some activities going on, this is a slight variation to the agenda I announced. This is something Tracy recommended. This is old news from last meeting so that is definitely warranted. There was a connections meeting last week. I did not attend. I got some information from Matt Caffrey afterward. Stephen did you attend the meeting?

[12:07:27 Stephen] I did not attend the technical meeting for what technology that is used for Connections. The white paper that ____ issued made out (background noise) ... how a conference works. How we should change assumptions, not trying to simply create online a face to face conference but exploit some of the strengths of online conferencing. They're looking at Zoom, GoTo meeting. They looking at looking at whether or not to contract _____ his experience running large conferences now. We should be coming to a decision on that pretty shortly. I'll know more after Tomorrow.

[12:08:32 Chuck] I saw Chris's agenda and I thought one of the more interesting things he addressed was one of the values of a conference is what happens between the tracks. Hallway meetings and networking and chats and meeting up in the evening and all that. That might be an interesting thing to address but like you said an online conference is going to be a different creation, its going to be a different creature than face-to-face, so doing it differently is good.

[12:09:07 Stephen] But I think having a having an inferior conference that attempts to be face-to-face vis-online is something we should avoid and they're trying to do so. It's not face-to-face, it's becoming completely different. Personally, you know, I think we lose a lot in not being face-to-face. You don't have the body language to personal energy. Attack time this you of touching war games, especially in the analog world. It's very different. I know kids seem to get a lot out of first person shooter distributed gaming and watch my grand daughter online all the time chatting with variety of people over her as she just shoots up aliens. They seem to enjoy the social aspects of that. I think us guys, older guys and gals have I may have a problem with that. So we have made the point that this year is geared to experiment. To go all out to experimenting because there will be lot of forgiveness for what doesn't work. Frankly the argument for next year is we go back to face to face completely if we are going to do online. We've run two separate conference. So it's six months upgraded, because of DoD

policy of refusing to send its employees to a face-to-face conference if you can also access that to online. So we're being very careful about not mixing the streams of having a combined online and face-to-face conference.

[12:10:56 Kevin] Stephen, it's Kevin here. I've been involved in a couple already now online, so-called conferences, and you're right. You miss the social connectivity between people and the act to track all the banter you get. So mixing them up. I think that would be a bad idea.

[12:11:20 Tracy] My wife is a teacher has learned how to use the conference, the zoom type and the first her first experience was the the number of users had trouble finding their mute buttons.

[12:11:41 Kevin] It's called radio distancing.

[12:11:45 Stephen] The really bad thing that happens is I wear noise canceling headphones. So I slap them on and connect and then I forget the mute button. And I don't notice the mayhem going on behind me. People are shouting from whatever it is, "Mute the damn button". It turns out to be me.

[12:12:10 Chuck] We had a senior researcher's meeting this morning that the group working at Georgia Tech and there was somebody's young child was just singing beautifully in the background and they weren't muted. They thought they were but they weren't and so we were treated to that during the meeting.

[12:12:42 Kevin] I suppose we have to get used to this though because epidemic situation. (jet noise)

[12:12:48 Chuck] ... it sounds like a lot of organizations are covering that they like telework. That it is actually a good thing. If they persist beyond (jet noise)

[12:13:07 Kevin] One of the things we have said that we will actually transform our business, we will spend less time in an office environment.

[12:13:22 Chuck] Tracy drafted a Final Report and also some work on the new TOR. Tracy do you want to tell us about that?

[12:13:31 Tracy] I gave the templates that Curt gave me, or I took the templates that Curt gave me and I modified them to suit our name. I took all the members and transpose them into a new table. But basically I left the justification to still up to you. And of course someone has to tell me where do where do we get serial numbers for these documents from?

[12:13:59 Curt] Oh that happens after we submit to the SAC. Yeah, we can we can ask for one in advance that. There's kind of no hurry for that at the moment.

[12:14:12 Tracy] Okay, so it's not like it the military unit level where you're assigned to one up digit for the beginning of the year.

[12:14:21 Curt] They are numbering them sequentially across all of the groups. Ours will be whatever is next. So I don't know. I guess they the TORs probably have sequential numbers.

[12:14:40 Tracy] So I submitted those to Curt, Chuck, and Thomas. So it's in their hands. So if anybody has any further suggestions and add that new guy, Darold.

[12:14:55 Chuck] For our next meeting I'll put out a Draft updated TOR for review. I looked through what Tracy had done, by the way great start. You got all the hard stuff done already.

[12:15:11 Tracy] I put Tomorrow's date because I didn't know how fast you were going to do it.

[12:15:16 Chuck] I apologize. I didn't get it done for today I had other stuff for today. But I'll try to get it for the next meeting and then we'll review that. Curt, is that an enough time for you?

[12:15:28 Curt] That'd be fine. The main thing I think is that's missing is the you know, some kind of schedule in section 6 for what we think is going to be happening over the next couple of years maybe.

[12:15:42 Chuck] Sure. So what is the life span of a Standing Study Group? I know that you go into perpetuity, right?

[12:15:50 Curt] Pretty much. It's just a matter of showing progress and if we're having regular meetings. things are moving along you little by little you know, they'll be perfectly happy with that.

[12:16:03 Tracy] It does change our annual report. It's either October or September. I saw October in ENGAMS, but September and the template so I wasn't sure which.

[12:16:13 Curt] Yeah, it's kind of weird they certainly moved all the annual reporting now to the February time frame because of the the move of the SIW. The Study Group the end of our year in March it made sense to put it out. I don't think they'll throw it away.

[12:16:42 Tracy] Then I would. suggest change that line in the the annual reporting to move to February because September seems too soon.

[12:16:52 Curt] Oh I see what you mean in the new TOR?

[12:16:58 Tracy] Because I was just trying to fit the template.

[12:17:00 Kevin] Okay.

[12:17:12 Mike] Mike Maldonado joins call.

[12:17:19 Chuck] Glad to have you. Is Jane planning to meet with us this week?

[12:17:27 Mike] No Jane had a conflict she will not be able to make it.

[12:17:33 Chuck] So we have a new TOR in the works, we have a new template we have some of the proforma stuff and then I promise to myself, I'll review the various terms in there, make sure that they're all brought up to date for a standard study group and I'll have a copy of that out to review for comments and feedback for our next meeting

[12:17:58 Tracy] And Curt said there was a grammatical error in section 4 point 2.

[12:18:06 Curt] Yeah number two, it's small. "Continue the previously defined online survey begin execution."

[12:18:12 Tracy] Needs a comma

[12:18:15 Kevin] Or a semicolon or something. Yeah.

[12:18:18 Chuck] If that's all that's wrong with our Terms of Reference document, we're doing pretty good. Next item Kevin, Literature Survey?

[12:18:45 Kevin] I suggested in the minutes that we include a literature survey on war-gaming, modeling and simulation and everything we can find. I suspect that you both you and Thomas in your work have come across a great deal of literature.

[12:19:05 Chuck] Possibly I doubt we're the experts in the group.

[12:19:11 Kevin] I didn't say you the expert I said I said we should pull together all the literature. We've come across as a list. And potentially a little synopsis on the things we've got. I've got a number of documents obviously. Done from when I was working with Kinetic as the SO2 combat Readiness where we're looking at war-gaming simulation. So these references may well, of course be restricted by their nation that least you can reference the name of the document, even if you can't actually get the document, you know what I mean?

[12:19:47 Chuck] Yeah. I think it's a good idea and I think we will benefit from (jet noise) work by other organizations that we can pull stuff into.

[12:20:04 Tracy] This does not include popular literature like stuff from H.G. Wells or Morschauser?

[12:20:13 Stephen] They're still resources when I teach war-gaming or C2SIM or give any lectures on war-gaming, I actually include that because although as a start Point. Bear in mind that a lot of these rules came out of these sort of things and because these rules we apply in simulation, in many ways. So I think it is important to identify them.

[12:20:40 Chuck] I think this is good. This is actually a good group activity for our group. It will be nice Kevin do you mind taking the lead to start collating as a people start giving you submissions?

[12:21:03 Kevin] if people can start sending me submissions to my email address, then I'll start collecting this as I think is a literature review. Okay good and they've documents or at least references they can share. If they got a document like a paper, then send that as well and I'll do some assimilation.

[12:21:27 Stephen] Excuse me are we dealing specifically with war-gaming as it relates to simulation, or vice-versa, or war-gaming at large?

[12:21:37 Kevin] I think we need an historical aspect and literature review about war-gaming and what it was used for. I mean in terms of decision-making not just for pleasure. HG Wells is very much that war-gaming as an as an activity. So I think we need to consider not war-gaming as a decision support tool.

[12:22:04 Stephen] There's a huge amount of literature what we call that professional war-gaming.

[12:22:13 Kevin] Yes I know that and I think we want to get a feel for it rather than say we're not going to actually review everything. But if we if we have a good selection of what we call that people recognize as good papers. That would contribute to this that would be great.

[12:22:32 Stephen] The Naval War College library has done a literature review on war-gaming. I'll take it up and give you the link.

[12:22:40 Kevin] Yes. Yes, they become a resource to tap into it later on if we need to go to more detail.

[12:22:50 Tracy] I remember a place called the foreign. Foreign Military Studies Office in Fort Leavenworth and they had a library that had every copy of Ivestia, Pravda, and Soviet Life. I also remember when they threw them out.

[12:23:14 Kevin] I've got a few things. I've got a presentation I go which includes the war-gaming element of course action analysis in that. I'll circulate that just to give a feel. I mean if you think about it Chess was just a form of war-gaming.

[12:23:33 Chuck] In addition to resources at the Naval War College, I think MORS put out a bibliography and suggested reading lists All those things are databases of information for what really is an emerging body of knowledge To receive war-gaming as a science, it has to have a body of knowledge. Has there been through any of the various organizations a body of knowledge (or BOK) for war-gaming projects?

[12:24:10 Kevin] I'm not certain in the UK. I know one thing when I asked our illustrious friends in what was the FTL when I was serving to send me a list of all reports on command and control. It came back with an nil response, which I thought was very interesting. Considering I'd actually written some of them.

[12:24:30 Chuck] That would be something good for the King's College Network or something?

[12:24:38 Kevin] Actually when we put our Survey, maybe that should be included as part of the survey if people have got could recommend a reference document. So I think that's what they recommend basically, on war-gaming and simulation.

[12:25:03 Chuck] How about this, Kevin how about you write up a description of the types of references you think would be good to collect for our project?

[12:5:15 Kevin] Okay I'll break it down into a structure into things that we're looking for.

[12:25:24 Chuck] Then we can move ahead with that and then people can recommend (jet noise)

[12:25:30 Kevin] And send in a synopsis of a document. Okay, no problem Chuck.

[12:25:44 Chuck] We have a few aboard new people, anybody want to announce?

[12:25:48 Darold] This is Darold Davis and this is my first call. Tracy sent me an email and got me enough information to be on the list.

[12:26:04 Tracy] Hello, this is Tracy.

[12:26:11 Darold] I'm familiar with war-gaming from the 1980s movie war-games. I'm current working on a Masters from John Hopkins University I'm also working on Foundations of Modeling and Simulation an I'm also working on my thesis and I came across your war-gaming study group from the SISO web site ...

[12:26:56 Chuck] Welcome!

[12:27:04 Tracy] So you're a professional student at this point?

[12:27:06 Darold] I'm a practitioner as well, I own a design firm where I do creative modeling and simulation and work (low volume) applications for training to work with virtual reality ... at the same time I'm also working on a Masters as well.

[12:27:45 Chuck] That covers the sort of different activities that are going on. We'll get to the other activated program right now which is the Survey, questions, some other things. Some old business that is on this agenda recommendation, the Final Report. Curt, are you waiting on anything else for the final report of the Study Group?

[12:28:14 Curt] No, whatever internal review we want to do to declare it ready to go.

[12:28:23 Chuck] We could probably do that through email or through the reflector. With the new Terms of Reference (TOR) we've talked about that. We'll be working on that, and then setting a date for the Survey launch. I've sent out today a refined version of our questions based on our review that we did a few a few meetings back. If you guys want to take a look through that email I sent out on the reflector. We don't necessarily have to go through it line by line again. I'll call, but if you have any suggestions or recommendations or trying to capture any of the changes quite right, then send a recommendation to the reflector, but other than that, I would like to before the end of the month. I would like to get this survey launched. Does anybody see any problems with that?

[12:29:26 Tracy] Do we have a Survey Monkey account set up?

[12:29:29 Chuck] I actually have a paid Survey Monkey account, as an academic it allows up to a thousand (1,000) responses to a survey. I would be surprised if we get more than a thousand responses to the Survey. I would be pleased, but that's my account. If you go for the free account, you're limited to 40 responses. And so, you know rather than the group create your own free account. I figure we just use my paid for account.

[12:30:03 Tracy] Okay, so we're looking at end of month.

[12:30:09 Chuck] We have another meeting planned for the 21st of May at that point basically present any last minute changes to our Survey questions and be ready to pull the trigger after that.

[12:30:29 Stephen] I've got a very minor point about the Survey? Do you want it verbally or email?

[12:30:36 Chuck] Sure, go ahead.

[12:30:38 Stephen] Questions 5 and 6 are binary, I suggest turning them into scale. Instead of “Do you consider your organization experienced with war-gaming?” “How experienced to you consider your organization to be?” And the same “Is war-gaming essential ...” “How essential to your organization function is war-gaming?” That’s all.

[12:31:01 Chuck] Good. And we actually had one suggestion from Joe (Saur) of somehow trying to figure out how to accommodate someone who knows about war-gaming and maybe used to work in war-gaming or has done some, but doesn't currently work for an organization. Maybe early on we can identify, “How do you see yourself your expertise? Again with a scale? What's your personal experience or expertise with war-gaming?”

[12:31:28 Stephen] You could change question four. Instead of set of “Other” have “Independent” as one of the options. So the type of organization is independent / self-employed. Add that as an option. I think that covers it. And then might you want to add the word “current” in front of “organization” in the following question. “How experienced you consider your ‘current’ organization ...”

[12:32:38 Curt] Do you guys talk about the comments Joe Saur turned in?

[12:32:46 Tracy] Yeah. Yeah, we just mentioned that.

[12:32:51 Chuck] The idea of trying to capture information from someone who is independent of an organization but still has something meaningful to say about war-gaming.

[12:33:02 Tracy] I think that defines me kind of because that's the kind of situation I'm in.

[12:33:10 Kevin] I think we can all join THAT club.

[12:33:13 Chuck] ... probably wouldn't know war-gaming if it bit them. (pause).

[12:33:25 Chuck] New items. The only one really that I have that we haven't covered already is lists of places to send the Survey. I have one or two that I would offer out. I don't think that Matt Caffrey would mind if we hit, if somehow they were able to submit it to the Connections larger audience. I have not explored that yet, but I think that Matt would see that as being definitely in the interests of the community of war-gaming. I have talked to Sue Collins from NATO ATP (or ACC?). She is currently in charge of a war-gaming study group for NATO that's got 30 nations participating in it, which is pretty good for study groups. She said she would be more than happy to forward the invitation for the Survey to all of the members from all the nations who are part of the study group we of course get access to the SISO mailing list which covers the Simulation Community very well some of which will have some overlap with war-gaming. And then I suspect we might be able to get an announcement and put the link up on PAXIMS. Stephen do you think they think they would be willing to going to go for that?

[12:35:02 Stephen] Yes. Absolutely. Send it to Rex (Brynen) if you'd like at it, CC me, because I can also put it up there. Then you'd contact Matt Caffrey, it's absolutely critical. you CC, Chris Weuve.

[12:35:23 Chuck] Okay. Yeah, just this past week. I sent that email to Matt. I think I also blasted it to the whole Connections Committee. (background laughter). I've been trying to talk to Timothy for awhile and I'm not getting an answer. I'm not sure if my emails are not reaching him or whatever about me presenting at Connections a seminar piece and also joining one of the working groups, and I haven't got any answers.

[12:35:54 Stephen] I think they were already full sometime back. but I will raise that topic tomorrow's meeting.

[12:36:00 Chuck] Very good. Matt wrote back we was very gracious and said we'd be glad to have

you (in schedule?) and to put me in charge of whoever's got the working group stuff.

[12:36:20 Stephen] Got it. Okay. Tim sometimes has to go for other reasons.

[12:36:31 Chuck] Understood. What do you think about some of the other tangential professional war-gaming groups that are out there? I'm thinking War on the Rocks or some of the others?

[12:36:51 Stephen] Send a press release to War on the Rocks with a link and let them decide whether to post it. Absolutely. You may also want to get a hold of the European / UK, Simulating War group.

[12:37:11 Chuck] Okay. There's a couple of our journals that kind of cover our area of interest, JDMS, MORS from the military and simulation side. Simulation and Gaming, more on the professional gaming development side. I don't know how to reach their readership. I'm not sure there is a way or if the more, online magazine approaches are a better route. (pause)

[12:37:52 Chuck] Okay, any other suggestions for places to send our survey? Either the simulation and technology world or the war-gaming world?

[12:38:07 Kevin] Can we do anything through Sim Australia?

[12:38:11 Chuck] I think it would be great to ask them.

[12:38:14 Kevin] Contact right? Phil Swadling works with Thales in Australia is certainly on the organization on there. I'm practically a member because I given them a few master classes there over the last couple years. Action me to speak to speak to SIM Australia.

[12:38:38 Chuck] Okay, good. And who is the Thales person?

[12:38:41 Kevin] This guy called Phil Swadling.

[12:38:44 Chuck] Phil Swadling (typing) All right, very good.

[12:38:49 Kevin] But I'll send him an e-mail. The other person that might, oh, David Ronnfeldt who's on the SAC. He works for the DA the Australian Defence Simulation, maybe he's a point of contact definitely.

[12:39:07 Chuck] You want to take this as an action item?

[12:39:10 Kevin] I will speak to the Australians leave it to me.

[12:39:23 Chuck] Any other suggestions? Mike how about a Dahlgren? Is there a is there a war-gaming community out there? Or a simulation ...

[12:39:36 Mike] Not at the moment, but I'm trying to change that. I just forward the invite for this meeting to one of my technical ... they can participate in this and I think he will be able to provide more people on the government side to bring to the equation child. So they Point good I will have something more later. Yeah.

[12:40:00 Chuck] Okay good. All right. If these various venues pan out I think we're off to a great start with a lot of good coverage. Excellent. Any other any other recommendations for new new? I've got a couple of updates from the world of war-gaming that are not necessarily related to this group. I can go over those if you guys want to hear them.

[12:40:34 Stephen] Go for it

[12:40:38 Chuck] A very small segment of the world of war-gaming. The MORS group of instructors that had been putting on their certificate courses have changed to online and I was able to participate last week Ed McGrady and Carl Weber (?sp?) talked cyber-warfare war-gaming, using cyber-warfare and war-games and information-ops and that kind of stuff. And it was pretty good, the first day was mostly Ed going over the basics of organizing and working designs just in general and then the

second day was Carl Weber weighing in on cyber and different techniques of doing cyber, and sort of this idea that's been floating around for a couple of years now about using cards, like the idea of magic cards, we have written up like attack and defense. Each card representing different cyber strategies for offense and defense. We talked about that but don't like that actually would make a really nice even even for a tabletop game, that would make a really nice little digital tool that you could do and enable it to operate inside of like a cell phone or an iPad or something like that where players would pick and choose from their available attack and defense options. Then it would send it into like a central clearing station that the adjudicators would have access to that might be an interesting little technology upgrade to using physical cards. You could you could have more information pop up on the screen you could count on things see, like the figure out more stuff about it, but the the actual gameplay wouldn't change any so I thought that was that was something that ran through my mind. That would be more, you know, interesting for this group.

[12:42:43 Tray] I recall that Otto did that for many of his games designs, he would hand write cards and issue to them to the players that they could use as their options, on the tabletop.

[12:42:55 Chuck] It works well. It's not bad. If the information is ?? inside. If you have several of you can kind of flip through them. Everybody could choose one and select and reveal at the same time. There's a lot of nice options to something like a card mechanism.

[12:43:13 Darold] My background is in user experience and user interface design for software in interactive media. One question I did have the group again. I'm familiar with which war-gaming but I'm also I grew up with video games kind of. Have you wondered what with the extent of current or modern technology involvement with the board gaming if there were any initiatives? Did I hear or what you just mention for example the cards ... several card based that are really tactile and can have some of the strategy tensile (?) and it seems that with the proliferation of mobile devices, is have it with a phone. That a real simple little app that embodies some of these principles for distributed war-gaming which would tend to be logical. Maybe I'm just used to growing-up with this. It is the way I think. That's one of the reasons I wanted to join because I'd be interested in pursuing such a project with others were interested, or if there was something that was planned as well.

[12:44:51 Chuck] Does anyone want to take a stab at the relationship between professional war-gaming and technology?

[12:45:02 Tracy] Well, I think Darryl I think Darold is the future here. I mean did in several years he may end up being the chair of this group.

[12:45:11 Curt] I mean there's a lot to be said for technology, but it's part of the problem is the expense and time to create these things. Now, it's interesting, there are a lot of of automations of card playing games, so one could imagine being able to create sort of a template or generic mechanisms that could be replicated in a lot of different games with with modifications to some of those mechanisms. I just don't know anybody doing you know, that kind of thing. So I you know, it may be that every automated card game at least in that type of example, you know is it's done pretty much on a custom basis, but I could be wrong about that. Beyond that moving into more elaborate kinds of virtual worlds for this type of gaming, it just starts to become really expensive unfortunately.

[12:46:32 Chuck] One of the limiting things Curt mentioned time and expense often when you're dealing with professional war-gaming, I mean this isn't always the case and someone else, you know, certainly weigh in on this that they have a different or better perspective. Each game is very different. That precludes the cost of the expense. Also, it's often very important for the players the referees and the and then the post game analysts to have easy transparent access to why certain things happen in the game how they happened and so on. So a computer game that might have like a an adjudication model or combat model that sort of black box or embedded in the software that gets unfortunately avoided because there doesn't seem to be a good good way yet to really make that very transparent to you know, sort of the layman, right? The players of the game who may not be programmers. So that's that's another problem. On the other hand having having a way to do cards, if you've already

accepted the fact that cards are a good way to go to present information and options, just doing them digitally doesn't seem to be a problem. Curt's mentioned to get to your idea of a standard presentation of a card format or card based game format or lots of other game formats. There's a couple of tools that exist already, at least on the hobby side. Things like Vassal and Tabletop Simulator and so on where you create a file describing a games and all the nuances of the game and it handles all the standard things like movement on a board, collection, and distribution of resources. Operation of a card deck, and hands of cards, and shuffling, and dice rolling, and all the kinds of things that are there tools go into whatever kind of game you want to.

[12:48:47 Darold] Another think I wanted to add, and you mention any other outlets for the survey. I'm not sure is anybody familiar with consimworld?

[12:49:03 Chuck] Consimworld? Yeah.

[12:49:05 Darold] I don't know if that's relevant but that might be another outlet for the Survey?

[12:49:15 Stephen] I certainly think so yeah.

[12:49:18 Tracy] I never got into consimworld because when consim-L evaporated and everybody went to consimworld, they sort of balkanized. But yeah, that's a good suggestion.

[12:49:38 Darold] Tiy gave to Nav. Forums and social... I mean it might be a good outreach.

[12:49:50 Tracy] Is anybody interested in the traditional war-gaming publishing houses like Avalanche Press or Decision Dames?

[12:50:00 Darold] That's why I mention it because it consimworld has a lot of those listed very extensive list of ...

[12:50:10 Tracy] The thing is they're just not they're not the professional war-amers that that we're looking at.

[12:50:18 Darold] That's why I hesitated to ...

[12:50:22 Tracy] Although some of the employees thereof have come out of them.

[12:50:27 Chuck] Professional war-gamers I'm not so sure in the business world but in the military world they will often use, or steal ideas, or borrow ideas if you will from many of the different publishers. Or use their game 'whole hat'. Supporting the Marine Corps we used (I forget who pubshed it) 'South China Seas' as a board game for several different events. You might find it in different ways to be different things.

[12:51:04 Kevin] I cut my teeth as a youngster ...?... on things like 'Squad Leader'. On fact, my latest war-game I picked up last week is Custer's Last Stand, which replays The Battle of the Little Big Horn and The Battle of Rosebud.

[12:51:27 Chuck] Nice. Good luck with that.

[12:51:29 Tracy] And I'm in the middle of SPI's 'Crete', the very first game they published in a magazine. I'm playing it with a co-worker every other day here at work. We're just still in the middle of setup. It's funny thing my coworker is also second generation Greek and he speaks it. He says his his Dad remembered World War II and the Germans.

[12:52:21 Kevin] Stephen, thank you for that link to the Naval War College War-gaming Department.

[12:52:30 Stephen] Might also want to do a search of the Naval War College review for war-gaming, but don't worry.

[12:52:37 Kevin] But don't worry I'm already on to it.

[12:52:47 Chuck] I'm not sure what's going on with relation to gaming. I know recently there was a John Curry article about professional war-gaming and I think the subtitle was something "A Flawed But Useful Tool". And he goes through and and calls out some of the the economy on pros and cons of professional working. You know, where it's good and where it has weaknesses and so on. So that's an interesting article. I'm not sure if anybody has access to it, I think on their website the journal article was kind of controlled. So you have like a university account or something. But that would link to a publication.

[12:53:42 Darold] Location-wise I reside here in California West Coast and about two hours from the Naval Postgraduate School. I know that they have a Postgraduate School of war-gaming program. ... They're one of the only schools that has a focus in modeling and simulation graduate program so they can proceed. ??? highlight program (trails off)

[12:54:48 Chuck] So Joe had asked me, and I don't know Curt if you knew any ??? . We have apparently a book that's in the professional review process at the publisher on the use of simulation with war-gaming that should be coming out later on this year. I owe them some some administrative information about chapter length. It seems like that but that's progressing.

[12:55:18 Curt] Yeah, I haven't heard anything about that for a while. So I was wondering how that was going.

[12:55:23 Chuck] Yeah, I have some (critiques) of the reviewer awhile back, sending all the files (fades) Kathleen, the project manager on their side. She just sent me a request for a spreadsheet with a list of all the authors and links to the chapters. I'm getting ready to get back to her. They said they were moving ahead and she said they were close to final review What else is going on? I know we are all that Georgia Tech here. There's a bunch of IRAD research money going around and I put in a proposal to study semantics of war-gaming scenarios or scenarios in general for war-gaming operations research and so on. Steven this might be of interest to you. I was looking at the semantics of scenario description for ways to validate or from a DoD perspective validated a scenario. Or what direction it's going to go. if I get I get the funding I certainly will let you know and kind of direction it is going to go. So anybody else? Any interesting projects on war-gaming or other stuff? If not we'll call this meeting good it and put it in the bed.

[12:56:59 Curt] That's good because I've got to slip out and set up for another meeting.

[12:57:04 Kevin] Like wise I'm going to cook dinner.

[12:57:10 Chuck] We covered a couple of good housekeeping things. We were wrapping up some stuff. We're getting ready to finalize the Survey. Maybe we can move on to research topics at that point Darold thank you for joining us Mike, thanks for calling in. All the usual. Thank you so much for contributing. And I will if I'm allowed to is the chair the meeting I'll move that we end the meeting.

[12:57:35 Darold] Thanks this has been an informative meeting. I look forward to the next one is contributing.

[12:57:40 Curt] Thanks for joining us today.

[12:57:42 Tracy] Per schedule. That should be in two weeks. Same time. Same channel.

[12:57:47 Chuck] Twenty-first I think? May 21.

[12:57:53 Tracy] That does remind me of something that Thomas Holland, said he was suggesting WebEx. For this conference call sometime in the future. We have to think about that.

[12:58:06 Kevin] WebEx or Zoom have security issues.

[12:58:13 Stephen] Zoom has upgraded all it's security issues.

[12:59"17 Kevin] Correct, Zoom is okay now yeah.

[12:58:18 Chuck] Zoom is OK, they've gone to end-to-end encryption and all that good stuff.

[12:58:22 Tracy] Only because he said SISO had an account.

[12:58:30 Stephen] It would only take ten years for the DoD IT people to wake up and read that memo.

[12:58:37 Chuck] What do mean it is not encrypted and it gets stored on Chinese servers?

[12:58:41 Tracy] What's with that? Yeah.

[12:59:44 Kevin] That WAS a problem, ten years ago

[12:58:48 Stephen] In the nineties, it must be the IT dept.

[12:58:55 Kevin] All your laptops are made in China, so I wouldn't worry too much about it.

[12:59:00 Chuck] And our light bulbs.

[12:59:04 Kevin] See you all in two weeks time and I'll get on with this literature review and get something out.

[12:59:20] Everyone signs off.