

## Pre-Session on Inclusivity

Charlie Hepton 05:55:48

Hi, everyone. Welcome to the first edition of the of the connections next generation. So we've just got a little pre inclusivity session before we start the actual conference. So we'll be doing an introductory session at a later date. But I'd just like to introduce our first two speakers. Jim Wallman is the director and professional gamer at stone paper scissors. He has over 30 years of experience in the serious game design field. And he's covered a variety of issues such as political crises, social media and influence, strategic planning, cyber and civil disorder. And he's particularly interested in the practical application of positive psychology to game structures and developing diverse, diverse, immersive and engaging gameplay, which is why we've asked him to talk today. And our other speaker, major tomra is an expert in manual and computer based simulations. At the moment, he runs a large scale military exercises for the British Army in which he's served for 45 years, he's been awarded both the chief of Defense's, Sorry, Chief of defense materials commendation for innovation, and the Chief Scientific officers commendation for his contribution to science and technology. And he's taken a particular interest in diversity and inclusion in gaming as well. So we're looking forward to what you have to say, so please, go ahead.

Tom Mouat Speaker 05:57:22

Okay. Hello, everyone. I'm Tom Mouat. I do find it particularly interesting that the opening conversation on diversity inclusion is from two old white guys. But hopefully, we're gonna get over that. And we want to open a conversation on diversity and inclusion. So I want to talk initially for a little bit, and then I'll hand over to Jim and he'll talk a bit and then hopefully we can start conversation. And the obvious stuff is that there is very good evidence from social science that diverse groups make better results. There's a McKinsey report showing statistically significant relationships between diverse leadership and better financial performance. And in the wisdom of crowds, James sort of wikis book shows the importance of diversity and independent thought, and that Deloitte review details how performance can be improved by diversity, and how to avoid it being a box ticking exercise. These slides will be available afterwards, and the links will take you to the appropriate articles.

However, there is no free lunch. So some of the stuff that people talk about with regards to diversity leaves out some things that don't always go right. Diverse teams feel less comfortable sharing the decision space with people who don't think like me have piercings and tattoos and and shave their heads or obviously transgender might make me feel uncomfortable. And therefore, I don't like that. Diversity can increase friction, lots of people who think very differently to the way I can, can take make it longer to reach a decision. Having just diversity without including those people properly in the decision making process can have a negative sort of backlash, because it smacks of mere tokenism. And the business case for diversity doesn't necessarily work. It's a complicated issue, and you need to look at it at various levels. And then, of course, there's the obvious complaint from people, and that recruiting should be based on merit, and not quoted. This is, of course, a very simplistic thinking that ignores underlying biases. And if we don't start by looking at quotas, and ensuring that we have

diversity, we will never get to a point where we can rely on it and gain the benefits of doing it. Okay, um, I want to talk about recreational games. And here we have lots of people playing with toy soldiers.

Professional war gamers need commercial hobby games, to get an understanding of the language of gaming systems or gaming mechanics. They are the part task trainers for professional war gamers. But while hobby games are extremely diverse, there are parts of the community who are extremely toxic. You know, we've all seen it. And a chance remark on the Wargaming website can result in a deluge of criticism, misogynistic comments, and violent attacks on anyone who's accused of being woke, or introducing politics into it. Now, playing with toy soldiers can be fun. I, you know, I do that occasionally, although I'm a bit older, and my eyesight is going. So I tend to use wooden meeples, which are brightly colored, because if you're using small toy soldiers that are painted, camouflage works, but that isn't going to help you in a professional Wargaming design sense. The greatest innovation and insight comes from board games, and indie role playing games. And here are a few examples. I particularly like black orchestra, a cooperative game on getting to kill Hitler, which is always good. So how can you help? Well, seek out mentors, people to help you learn facilitation, and adjudication, and encourage people to curate safe groups to practice with constructive criticism, don't form your own echo chamber of lovies. You want people to be able to say, that's, that's fine, but it would be better if it was done this way or whatever. But don't be too precious. War is about killing people. And if we do Wargaming, right, we can save lives. It's all very well having vegan uniforms. But if my boots leak, I you know, I'm sorry, it's not gonna work. And at the end of the day, don't give up. Really just reach out and get a bit of help, because the professional community is there to help you. Okay, that's enough for me over to Jim. Thank you.

Jim Wallman 06:03:18

So, Tom has outlined quite a lot of really important points around diversity inclusion that we are, you know, that we're all interested in, and I think particularly relevant for those of those people coming into professional Wargaming or serious gaming for the first time, or perhaps looking to see how they, how one develops and goes forward in a career in serious games. So I'm going to share some thoughts and this is very much the world according to Jim but some thoughts on the so what around diversity for us as we as we develop our skills as professionals all gamers, so just kind of hopefully, you can see this. Can I just check that everyone? Can anyone can see the disc? The?

So what I'm going to talk about here is the in four areas, the so wats for Wargaming of inclusion, and diversity has already spoken about how this is fundamentally important. But let's see what where we can go with it. And the four areas are in if you like the initiation, the design, development field facilitation adjudication, and finally reporting these four areas are not the only things that we do when we're designing games professionally, but they're, they're kind of really useful headings. So in the design and development, and I've got a few points here, clarity of purpose is very important. Now, it's important anyway, any game design, clarity of purpose is important. But that clarity needs to be as inclusive as inclusive as possible right from the outset.

And so, if you understand the purpose that really informs, who is involved, how they're involved, what their level of involvement is, and to ensure that you are including as many perspectives as you can. Secondly, understanding the audience. So for example, if you're designing a game, for academics, you might choose particular sort of language, if you are designing a game for people, older people have designing a game for children, or designing a game for people who, for whom English is a second language, all of these things are vital in understanding what sort of game to develop, and how you include the audience in your thinking. It's particularly prevalent in more technical areas, particularly in professional Wargaming, that there is an enormous alphabet soup of acronyms. But even the professionals don't know all the acronyms. And it's often a useful discipline to be clear in your language. And following on from Tom's thoughts on diverse thinking, diverse approaches, diversity in solving the problem of what sort of game you're designing, what are the technical problems in your game design? What are the things to include? One of the things not to include? What mechanisms are you using what processes are using consult widely, we particularly those who've done it for a while, may have a toolbox of things, and approaches and methods. But they're not the only methods. They're not the only ways of doing things. And it's astonishing how often someone who's not part of your silo part of your echo chamber can come into this process, and really sparks some originality, some creativity and some innovative solutions. So consult widely in your BI widely, I mean, across demographics, across backgrounds. Now, that's all practical. But keep this in mind, I find it really helps build your game for inclusion from the ground up. And ensure that you've in really a follow on from the point of bar, ensure that your game processes are relevant to including all of the aspects that needed to be included. One of the one of the interesting outcomes of recent research on diversity is that a major benefit of a diverse group in problem solving is not necessarily the problem is solved differently, though sometimes it is, but that it that fewer things are missed in considering the problem. So there's a massive value in design development to have somebody to ask the question you didn't think of asking and to include the thing you didn't think to include. I'm reminded of the phrase or the saying that stupid questions are better than stupid mistakes later. And finally, I was always told not to speak to strangers. But I think Steve speaking speaking to strangers in the design process is a really good one. If you can talk to someone who's no way related to what you're doing, who may have a completely different perspective. And this is quite an interesting one. And if it's somebody who is not have similar background to you, maybe not a similar ethnicity or gender or approach or perspective, even if what they say is, or this looks like a rubbish, speak to strangers, strangers perspective can be really, really helpful. So, moving on to facilitation. If you've heard me talk about facilitation before, you've heard me banging on about this before, but in the room when the game is on, every voice must be heard and considered. So it's not enough to say, Oh, yes, well, thank you for your input. Appreciate what you know, I appreciate what you're saying. or Yes, yeah, that that's really important. All of that is dogshit, you need to consider what's being said you to listen to what's being said. And especially if it's somebody who you don't necessarily agree with, who isn't like you, who doesn't speak like you who doesn't have same, maybe the same cultural background, same neurological background, whatever it is, and it can be really hard. But it's really important to listen carefully. And consider what's being said, genuinely consider what's being said.

As I said in the earlier slide, diverse thinking, reduces risk, it reduces the risk of missing something important. And where you can, you know, if it's in the facilitation role, identify and encourage thinking outside of the norm. It's, it's potentially quite a challenge, I found with certain hierarchy organizations were actually doctrine and doctrine and practice and training encourages particular routes of thinking. And so there's a, it's an uphill struggle if you're requiring for your game, some imagination or some creativity, to get people to step outside and be a little bit diverse. And that's why I'm mixed group as much as possible a mixed group, and outsiders and strangers make a difference. And finally, I think this good manners is related to inclusion, inclusivity, and recognizing diversity. And we have to self check and self police ourselves with regard to language with regard to attitudes. And the thing that can often trip one up is humor, you make it, you make a slightly off color joke, or you make a joke, which most of your mates would think is funny. And turns out, it's not that funny to everybody in the room. The and if you find yourself doing that, apologize, and move on. You don't have to make a production about it. But you need to recognize that you don't have permission, either in humor, or as a facilitator or in a game to be a jerk. And I think that's, that's one of the barriers to inclusion is often the use of language. Whether it's intentional or unintentional, doesn't matter. But abusive language can seriously alienate. If you're not sensitive to this. adjudication, and I separated this out from facilitation often these two things go together, and we're often doing both simultaneously and look at long series games. But in this one, I'm really looking at groupthink and also, the degree of cognitive bias cognitive biases that significant where not only in designing your adjudication methods, but but also how you adjudicate in a game. And so when, for example, you're using players to generate some adjudication, perhaps Shal you're getting consensus communication from people in the room. Groupthink actually can be unhelpful. Crowdsourcing opinions can be unhelpful. If there is a there's lack of diversity in the room for everybody knows what the right answer is, nobody's really going to consider serious alternatives. And groupthink can also be wrong or group unhelpful. So one has to be really sensitive to that, where you as control or control team are using their judgments. Again, watch out for the cognitive bias which which separates you from the widest possible useful adjudication. And then there's the this quote I just made up, they might be weird, but they might also be right. You have somebody who who perhaps is not using language in the way you use it comes from a different culture, different background. That's a different basis for their thinking. And they come out with something you can get them to say, these are just a weirdo. Well, they might be a weirdo. So that's not terribly helpful term. But they might also be right. And it's important when we are working in the professional environment, so that we really carefully look at, because that's my point about everyone being heard. But in adjudicating and assessing the outcomes of actions or games, it's very important not to be blinded by difference difference. This is where a difference needs to be really highlighted. And finally, in this on this slide, be very wary hippos that's the highest paid person in the room. opinion, the highest paid person's opinion and most experienced person's opinion, both high, the highest paid person in the room is not necessarily the best person to advise you on outcomes or, and so as a, and that also shuts down diverse thinking and shuts down inclusion.

Most experienced person also can do the same worst case is where somebody says, Well, I've been doing this for 40 years, and that's not going to work. Well, it may be they've not found it, I

found it possible to work it. But that doesn't mean it's not possible for somebody else to do. So. Keep that in mind that I'm reminded of the old saying of Frederick the Great mule. Frederick, the great mule was very experienced, it went on 100 campaigns, but people still mule after 100 campaigns. That's always you just be a little bit cautious about that.

And then finally reporting. There's a quote there that minutes after the meeting Minister, I don't know how many people know what that where that's from. But if you do, you can put something in the chat. But I wonder if there's there's an interesting example there of how an age demographic applies. Some of us are old. And remember old TV programs and their quotes, some of us might not have even heard of them. So when you're using references, and quotations, remember who your audience are, however, but a few quick points on reporting. In any game design dessert defining data collection early and clearly, and being open when you're defining what your data collection is, and whether that data collection is open to diverse inputs, you know, how flexible is it to what emerges in the game? Do you want it to be flexible and so on? Your methods are quite important. How do people report their experience outcomes? How do you collect observations, insights and lessons from a potentially diverse group? If you have somebody who's dyslexic for example, you might consider how you're how you're asking for written input. If you are collecting information from people who, who perhaps are much more comfortable with spoken reflection is are your methods appropriate? And asking questions to ensure that you're getting the most out of any game any serious game, the aim is to get the most out of the process to gain either gain observations or gain benefits. And so that really important to have, as I said, right at the start, inclusion of diversity built in. I've mentioned cognitive bias. But in the reporting phase, the reporters are also consciously or unconsciously, cognitively filtering the material that they're summarizing and collecting. And this is a self discipline of ensuring you're not inappropriately filtering information that has been collected. I'm quite keen on recognition and acknowledgement there is an old trope meme about how when a woman comes up with an idea, everybody waits until a man repeats it before their pay attention. It's understanding and acknowledging contribution of everybody. And and this goes back to sensitive listening, clarity, and include and inclusivity. And finally, minority reports in the reporting phase, even if you disagree what's being said. There is a place for a Minority Report. There is always a place for that diverse thinker who's been sitting in the corner going but yeah, but what about I'm reminded of seen in the old film a bridge too far, where the Airborne Corps commanders outlining the plan for plan at all Among the Polish generals sitting in the corner, and he says Yes, but But General, the Germans, what about the Germans? An example of a minority report. So I've counted through a fair bit on how or rather, how the so what for serious games and serious war games and diversity and inclusion, there's a lot, this is kind of our subject. There's a lot to talk about. But what I want to do now is to move on to a little bit of practical work. Because much as Tom and I would love to talk at you for hours. I think we, I quite like to get some conversational feedback go. So what I'm going to do some of you may have seen me do this before, I'm going to post some questions. And depending on how the team would like to handle this, and the numbers we've got, this could either be a discussion in in zoom, or a chat or one of the two. But I've got to put posts and what would you do questions? And I'll just put them up now. So these are some vaguely Inclusion, Diversity type questions. And if you think of yourself as the as the organizer, facilitator, or whatever other

professional, serious game, these are some issues that can crop up. And I'd be interested to get those assembled of whatever their level of experience their thoughts on what it might be like to be in that situation and how you might address it. There's, there are no right answers. Because we we kind of navigate the world as we see it. But if I can hand it back to our hosts, and and perhaps see if there's any feedback on these questions.

Charlie Hepton 06:21:04

Thank you, Jim. And, yes, so participants, please feel free to write in the chat. I'd put your camera on and just interact in any way possible. I'm sure Jim, Tom, don't mind if you go for issue four. If that's what inspires you rather than issue one. Just feel free to bring anything up that inspires.

Stefanie Game 06:21:33

You? Jim, also, if you prefer breakout rooms, we can set those up really quickly. And that might be easier for me.

Jim Wallman 06:21:43

I'm, I'm entirely in your hands depends on the numbers of people you've got. I mean, if people would like to do that, I think that's fine. I mean, I think the important part here is to just discuss what you think you would do. You know, how would you approach this out? What does this or does this resonate with your own experience?

Charlie Hepton 06:22:06

We've got a couple of comments coming in the chat for you, Jim, if you want to have a look at them. Yeah,

Unknown Speaker 06:22:18

good point by X. Issue one. Why do someone's reading your paper? I'd ignore them. Interesting. Anybody else got any thoughts on on that? And an issue too. So we've got a interesting point about splitting people up into groups so that they can contribute they can feel more involved. Yeah. Yeah,

Unknown Speaker 06:23:01

I mean, it's always good. If you've got in a game, somebody's spare. If you see what I mean, who can wander over? And and if there is someone sitting at the back reading a newspaper, can go them ask him or her? What's what's up? You know? Is it the game design? Is it something that they really, you know, it was completely different to what they thought it was going to be? That sort of thing. Because, of course, you can always learn, and you can always describe it more accurately, so that somebody who wouldn't be interested in that sort of game design doesn't come along. So there's always something to learn. Or it might be that they're just bored because they don't think the design is giving them enough decisions to make, in which case is useful feedback. But if you haven't designed the game that allows time or has enough people to do that, then you're going to have to ignore them.

Unknown Speaker 06:24:08

Any other salts? I mean, if you if we took him issue one, yet we got some Yes. Issue five is come up yes, the issue five is about, you're trying to design a game, but you can't actually, you've got you, you don't have direct knowledge of the thing you're representing, particularly run around culture. And and this, there is massive risks of stereotyping massive cognitive bias risks around Issue five. I'm not I that's an issue I faced and there isn't a right answer there. All you can do in the issue of bias, or you can do all I've managed to find a, we've managed to find an issue five is to acknowledge that this is a shortcoming in the game. But it's a it's a massive challenge.

Unknown Speaker 06:25:16

Yeah, I mean, it's a really important and very difficult, but you can separate that away from saying, If I have specific roles for participants to be in representing those countries, it doesn't invalidate the game design. If that person isn't from the country, you know, the spectrum of of humans is a very wide one. And just because you don't have a Russian to represent Russia, doesn't necessarily invalidate your game, because let's face it, Russia, or America, they're both big countries. And just because you've got an individual from there doesn't necessarily mean you've got someone that who can represent the entire country on their own. So, yeah, that's important. We're getting some and we're getting some great suggestions in the chat. I interest in your back on issue one is, is describes how to bring people in. I think that's a really good way of kind of drawing people in and it's some, you know, issue one community issue, if actually, you need everybody in the room to be contributing, you know, this is in a serious professional game, everybody in that room is there to they're not there for fun. We might produce games that are fun, but they are there to contribute to a serious exercise. And so I think that's a really good point about going about actually inviting them to to explicitly inviting participation.

Unknown Speaker 06:26:56

I, I do like X's point on issue five, engage the cultural content, read their books and films, I was on a course recently about playing Red. And in the evening, they had nine company, and they also had the death of Stalin, very useful in understanding how things work in Russia. They also had a number of other things, which, which I won't go into here.

Unknown Speaker 06:27:26

So I like to recent comments on issue three, about use of language. And I think there's some interesting approaches there. I think there's a there may be and I'm probably stereotactic serotyping too often an age factor, there might be some particularly older men tend to use the diminutive for women. And, but could be stereotyping, too. And I would say I've heard it. I've also heard it, you know, refer to young young anyone younger, as in those sorts of terms, young lad, and so on, for somebody in their 20s. It's not it. I think it's really important to call it out. I think this has been suggested.

Unknown Speaker 06:28:17

Jim, we have a couple of hands up. So X, are you speaking about Issue five, we also got X and X who put their hand up as well.

Unknown Speaker 06:28:27

Okay, I can't see the hands very easily. So please call them out.

Unknown Speaker 06:28:31

X, do you want to go ahead first?

Unknown Speaker 06:28:34

Hi. Thank you. This is really interesting that issue five has come up because this is directly what I'm dealing with. I'm designing civil war games for the X of Energy, like Matrix Games about the energy transition. And the specifically, like the issue is, you know, we want to represent indigenous groups as it's important to represent like, a pivotal important step is that in the energy transition, things like that, but when you don't have you don't have those people in the ministry. Right. There's issues of If you don't represent people, then maybe the results are invalid. On the other hand, there are sensitivities around non Indigenous people representing indigenous people, and, and so forth. And I just wanted to provide more context to why I was asking that question. So valuable, the feedback. And, and it runs to the core of a lot of inclusivity issues. In any environment where you're representing a group that you're not familiar with, and it can it, there is a potential for invalidating results. And you have, but I think there's a again, I'm happy to hear any better solutions. But in my limited experience, you kind of have to say, Well, we found out this these things, but we are aware that our there are clear boundaries to what we can understand from the project, given that we have not been able to engage key stakeholders or or include the correct perspectives or the wider perspective.

Charlie Hepton 06:30:15

Thanks, X, for that, and and X, for the additional explanation. X, I think you had your hand up next, do you want to come in?

Unknown Speaker 06:30:23

Thank you, Charlie, I just want to address issue number six, as Stefanie, I'm sure will smile right now, because she knows that it directly impacts her of having a younger inexperienced person on the design team who does not necessarily see things the way that I do. And they will repeatedly come up with clever ideas for games that, from my vast, vast experience from the dungeons of when I was 11, through two through now, I think won't work. And it is a perfect time for a teaching moment. That being said, it is a perfect time for Stefanie to teach me because I might be so stuck in my own head. Because I don't need someone who's like me to work for me, I need someone who doesn't think like me to work for me, so that we can grow the business into better directions now. So we will totally have that discussion. And, you know, I've gotten myself used to the idea not being the first young person that I've worked with that, in all likelihood, if they're coming with something coming up with something that is so completely off the wall of anything that I have thought and probably a better chance than even then it's a better idea or will put us into a direction that will lead to something good either right then and there for that project, or for another project. So I would say that issue six would really be who the old white men or the people can controlling the purse strings to flip that absolutely



on its head. Listen to your juniors listen to people who do not speak like you. Because it will grow your business.

Unknown Speaker 06:32:22

And X, if I might say as far as I'm concerned, you are a young whippersnapper. It's all relative, but absolutely, yeah. In furious agreement with with you on all of that,

Unknown Speaker 06:32:35

plus a plus or minus five years? I think so I think I think you do be too. I think you measure me too young.

Unknown Speaker 06:32:44

Thanks, X. I think we've also got X, who wants to speak and then X?

Unknown Speaker 06:32:51

Hello, everyone. Um, so I think Issue five kind of brought up what kind of happens a lot, I think at work, which is people ask for some good analysis. And then it gives you kind of a week to do it, whatever method you choose. So you've got this real big balance between best practice, you know, how do we get them as diverse, as we mentioned, make sure we're listening to them as much as possible. And kind of the real kind of bounce you've been given by kind of the wider work that's going on, you know, if you've got four days to come up with a way of analyzing a problem, how far can you recruit, how much kind of how wide can unit be cast? And I think my solution to it has always been, you know, if compromises need to be made, and I think they usually sometimes have to be done, then you can just make it very clear what compromises were made when you're doing your write ups. When you're actually kind of feeding that back. You can say, well, we could have had a better analysis if we vanished, go and get someone with more expertise in this area. We didn't we did our best shot. But you know, you as the decision maker needs to be very live to the facts that didn't give us enough time to do it. Probably best practice way. So I think that's kind of like how we've solved some of these problems is just kind of really flagging the compromises that we make at the end of the process. And hoping kind of that causes people to change how they kind of commissioned analysis next time

Unknown Speaker 06:34:08

Thank you.

Unknown Speaker 06:34:12

Thanks, X. X, do you want to come in? Very much sorry, camera here. Issue three, one of the terms we're looking at is, I don't like the term either. But I talk about being politically correct. And it's quite interesting since I'm a foreigner living in in Sweden, and I've been shunned, talk to X, about this, because once in Canada, I think I use the wrong term between First Nations and Aboriginal and using the wrong term industry guards. Now, what's interesting for terminology in Sweden, they have the concept of arm viewed Ceman. How many people familiar with that term? I think it's been taken over by the rest of the English speaking world or not? No. ombudsman? Have you heard that before? Anybody. So the basic notion from a cultural

structural perspective is that there's someone in the organization that's supposed to that you as a potential victim, or whatever someone has been hurt, they have the role to collect those things, and then present them. So you're in your design. So it's not me saying that I was upset that I was called an Aboriginal or instead of First Nations or something like that, there is someone that has that role in the game to be the person to receive that and maybe feed it back to the collective. Because the individual really doesn't have the power to say things. It's done that way. So you, you design in, it's someone who's an I'm someone who's a proxy, in a sense, so he's not represent I'm not representing myself, I'm not upset. But we know there are people that are upset. And maybe you're representing the collective rather than just the person in charge. So So institutionalizing, um, booted in the game, is something that's a structural way of dealing with that problem in terms of language.

Jim Wallman 06:36:07

Yeah, I think that's a, in a sense, that, that is part of the kind of comes back a little bit to our points around facilitation, you know, there's a responsibility in the room to ensure that that's covered in some way.

Unknown Speaker 06:36:27

Right. And it's interesting in a society again, or design, when there's actually someone who has that role. Yeah, then it's some incentive to not that every facility has, because some people aren't good at that role. The great controllers and stuff, but they're not good at being unbeatable. I mean, you know, they, they always try to represent their own opinion, rather than

Unknown Speaker 06:36:48

Yeah, understood.

Tom Mouat 06:36:51

One of the things that I experienced with issue three is I, you need to call out that behavior. But you need to be slightly careful. I was giving a lecture on Western approaches Tactical Unit, where a lot of the women involved were extremely young. And I refer to them deliberately as girls for a specific reason. And, and I was about to go to my next slide, where I would explain that one of them literally turned up in a school uniform, because she hadn't been issued with a Royal Navy uniform. And therefore I'd used the word girls deliberately. But I was called out for it immediately, in a very aggressive manner, which completely threw me off of the track. Now, perhaps I should have thought about it more and not relied on that transition. To make my point, and it goes back to Jim's point earlier about, if you make a joke that works for you, it may not work for other people. And the other thing that I'd like to mention very quickly, is to do with Issue five and X's point, that if you get someone who's supposed to be a representative of the country, and and they happen to represent a certain side that can be dangerous. I was involved in a war game about Libya. And we had a person from Libya, in the war game. But of course, they were representing the opposition. And they spent two hours discussing the relationships between the different organizations. And of course, we had a job to do, we had to get a result from the war game. And we were sitting there desperately not trying to be rude.

But of course, there's a big cultural issue in the fact that he was able to speak on the subject was a success. Whereas for us Westerners, we had to get a report out, that gave us the results of the game. And the two definitions of success, culturally were very different. So that can be tricky. Anyway, enough for me

Charlie Hepton 06:39:07

when now have about a minute left at this session. So Jim, Tom, is there anything you'd like to say as we wrap up? And for everyone else, you can still ask Jim and Tom any questions in the discord or even during? During the break? We have a 15 minute break following this?

Unknown Speaker 06:39:26

Yeah, no, I think nothing more from us. I think we've done enough for our session. Absolutely.

Charlie Hepton 06:39:33

You've definitely got the conversation going. And thank you so much for a funny and interesting presentation on diversity in all aspects of the way it can be called and thank you everyone, for your participation and really interesting chats this will be available at a later point after the conference will now be taking a 15 minute break before we start the day as a whole, during which we'll introduce our speakers and the rest of the day. So feel free to either leave the Zoom meeting or just mute yourself and and stop your video. Thank you

## **INTRODUCTION**

Charlie Hepton 06:56:34

So first of all, to everyone who wasn't there during the introduction by Tom and Jim to diversity in serious gaming. Welcome, thank you very much for attending the very first connections next generation conference. I'm Charlie Hampton, I'm one of your co hosts. She her be my pronouns, as Charlie is quite a gender neutral name. And I'm looking forward to a really exciting and interactive day. We're gonna make this as collaborative as possible. So anytime there aren't slides on your screen, please, I do encourage you to turn your cameras on if you feel comfortable with it. And if your bandwidth allows. We've got a few exciting speakers on today, including Sally Davies, Sebastian Bay, and Madeline Johnson. And, of course, a big thank you to Tom Murphy and Jim Wallman, who presented our previous session. And so just want to give you a little bit of background on how this all came about. So I'll hand over to Stefanie as it came from a conversation we had following connections UK back in September. Yeah. So

Stefanie Game 06:58:15

Charlie and I were in the same breakout room for bringing in the next generation at Connections UK run by Jim Wallman. We eventually brought our conversation past the conference. And there were a lot of discussions that we had, where we noticed we face a lot of the same difficulties in the industry, and we've identified a lot of the same issues and how difficult it is to find out about the industry if you're not already in it, which seems a bit counterintuitive. I then had a conversation with my boss Tom Fisher. And he encouraged Charlie and I to set up a conference and go with it and have the topic be diversity inclusion,

bringing in the next generation. And thanks to his support and his guidance in helping us navigate the planning waters of conference. running, we now have connections next generation. So I'm very thankful to my co hosts, Charlie Abbey, and will who have also been helping plan and of course, our sponsor, Tom. Another thing that we noticed is that most conferences are wargame oriented. And there's so much more to serious gaming than Wargaming. Although that is a huge portion of it. And Tom and I are working with various UN agencies, government branches, such as Canadian forestry services, global affairs, Canada, we're doing strategic planning, business resilience, policy foresight, there's so much more that you can do with gaming than just military oriented, although that is a super interesting area of serious gaming, and is really fun to do. Yeah, so I'm gonna pass it off to Abby to talk about a bit more about the goals of the conference. Yeah,

Abi Coskun 07:00:09

so I mean, just quickly about me, I'm a fast streamer. So a graduate in the UK civil service. And one of the things that drew me to serious gaming and got me involved in the conference was that I was interested, as Stef says, in doing some of the other things that it can be used for outside of, you know, more kind of military contexts. So our goals and aims really are to introduce young people to serious gaming, and to the opportunities that are available for them. And this is an industry to provide a networking platform for organizations to meet the next generation of interested gamers, and for the next generation indeed, to meet each other. And also really to highlight diversity and the darby house principles and provide a platform for us to all have a conversation about diversity, equality, and inclusion and and how we can better kind of promote these in serious gaming. So I'm going to hand over now to our final co host. Well, who will talk a bit more about some of the housekeeping bits and about Darby house principles.

Will Bone 07:01:18

Oh, well, so yep. Well, much like Abby and Charlie, I am a fast streamer. Yes, we do get everywhere. So I'm gonna talk a little bit about some general housekeeping. So, as I see, most you guys have done, we've done been doing this now for two years. So cameras off, mics off when we're not talking. If you wish to put your camera mic on, we want to talk feel free if you don't have a camera also feel free nightfalls comfortable being on camera all the time. But for myself. There you go. So let's talk about about some of the health cameras. When we have the diversity inclusion discussion, we're going to implement something called the Chatham House rule. For those of you who are unaware of the Chatham House rule, it means that after these meetings, feel free to discuss the content, the meeting the outside world, but please not sort of identify who made remarks, or sort of also who sort of may or may not have said certainly no, it was a bit of an anonymity. That way, we can have some treat an open and honest discussion, a little bit more sort of, sort of clarity over the Darby house principles. So five principles, number one, promoting inclusion and diversity in professional Wargaming. To the standards, we set the opportunity we offer an access to activities we organize. Number two, making it clear opposition to sexism, racism, homophobia, and other forms of discrimination across the board, as well as Wargaming. Number three, encouraging a greater role and high profile for colleagues from underrepresented groups in our professional activities. Number four, seeking out and listening to the concerns and suggestions of our colleagues as to how our commitment to

diversity and inclusion could be enhanced, and number five, demonstrating our commitment to diversity and inclusion to ongoing assessment of progress made and discussion of future steps. Okay, nice and clear, in terms of what we're going to do, talking about discord channels. Now, in terms of access to the main chat, this is obviously given the main zoom link. When it comes to going to break rooms, you'll be assigned to those automatically, please don't worry about that. We do have a speaker Q and A child as well. If you have any questions for the speakers after the sessions have ended, tag the speaker and what tag the Roman speaker put your question to him and they should answer in the fourth time. We also have specific Charles if you want to reach out to any of ostinatos vary it issues and again, we will try and get those sorted as quickly as possible. So a final point from myself about accessibility. Now we do have an accessibility questionnaire sent out and we have So read through. As you can see, we've got transcripts and video recording of the sessions. Those will be available on the web on the website after the conference ended. And we also have a closed caption as well. For those that I have the heart of hearing. And with that I'm going to hand off. I'm going to just finally go through what we're going to what the conference is going to look like over the next few days. So it's pretty simple. Obviously, this Introduction Hi, we are going to bounce from here straight into barriers industry in in the industry in which we presented by a variety of contributors reflecting on their personal and product experience in life asserting industry, you'll then get a 15 minute break, followed by the workshop or Barisan issue to like I said to be automatically assigned to breakout rooms, so don't worry about that that will be led by the participants. We also have discussion about housing breaking down, another 15 minute break follows, then we've got complicity in gaming, exploring the influences players face drinking experiences, that's going to be led by Sally Davis. And then finally, we'll finish up with networking. That is today. Tomorrow, we'll have a lot of introduction to the game sessions around two o'clock, GMT. How the next session of that we how the story works. Again, the buy side Davis, Zoom exploring what we have to learn from books, films and plays with going narrative creation and development. Now a 15 minute break. Then we've got game design 101, which will be led by Tom Fisher, and race Brian in the belief. And then we looking at the teachings of the base of games, you can two approaches to theoretical and practical, you have a 20 minute break before we get into the game design challenge, where we split into groups out of 16 verses on a basic game, based on the same topic, we've got a 30 minute break for everyone to relax, then you've got your Showcase, where we have the option to showcase your design challenge games, or game projects was all wrapped up with another bit of networking afterwards. And that will be the two days in which without further ado, I think it's time to start the barriers in industry. So I'm gonna hand over to Stef, to introduce our first speaker

## **Barriers Parts 1 &2 Have Been Removed**

### **Complicity in Gaming**

Abi Coskun 09:05:23

Just before I introduce Sally, to highlight the Google form to sign up for our game design challenge tomorrow is now in the Zoom chat. So if you're interested in that, please do click through and sign up. Great. So I'm really pleased to introduce our next speaker, Sally is Sally

Davis is a senior analyst at the Defense Science and Technology Lab laboratory, parts of the UK Ministry of Defense where she writes software in support of analysis, simulation, and Wargaming. She's an editor at PAX Sims Kerr and co author of the Darby house principles for diversity and inclusion in professional Wargaming. So over to you, Sally, and we were really looking forward to your presentation.

Sally Davis 09:06:07

Excellent. I dropped a link in the chat. And on Discord with a link to this, if you need a copy during the presentation, and also full of links, all of the games that I mentioned, I have included like 70. But if I've missed something, shall I can drop that in the discord, or something. So I don't have all the answers on this topic. These are some of the games that inspire me, they show me the art of the possible and challenge me to be a better game designer, and also that it can be. So what I really want to talk about is this is a space where serious games become art. So not just an art, but works of art. And really, it all comes down to meaning and understanding what you want to communicate in your game. So what's the purpose of your game, why you're doing it? What's the learning you want people to take away from it. And to do that you need to understand your system, and make good design choices that support that meaning. So what do I mean when we talk about complicity, there's really two things in the nicest possible way, getting people to do what you need them to. So you could call that manipulation, and getting people to reflect on their choices in the game. And you could call that experiential learning. And a really important word here. You could phrase this as reflecting on their experience in the game. But that's something passive, like it happened to them, it results in a responsibility. It's like the game made me do it, I was only following audits. And the purpose of complicity is to make people think about their responsibility. So we want them to make make choices so they can reflect on those choices, and how the choices are making the game but also how that applies to the real world. Through all aims, manipulation, rules, dry fly behavior, sign value, you're saying this or avoid that to win. And design will drive player behavior. So players follow the easiest path to victory they'll do they'll do what they do. And they'll do what maximizes their chances of victory. So they have to understand that they can do that thing. And they will do the most prominent thing on the board that has the biggest payoff. And you know, there's the same kind of like, jives, how they do product placement in supermarket shelves to make you buy the own brand equivalent of the market leader. So like things like risk is quietly telling you start in Australia, and nipple manipulative. So we're doing this stuff anyway, in games, even if we're not trying to make sense about or involving complicity. And kind of all it comes down to is when you only have a hammer or you can do is hit nail so people can only do your game things that you like to do, which means you need to make it possible and for them to do the things you want and less desirable or impossible to do the ones that you don't. And on the flip side, you can't really have a game Whose point is outside the players control? That's either not a game, or it's not a game about the thing you're trying to make a game. And what those things are really dependent on a message. So the point might be to make it hard to do, like, I know, me doing the right thing, but you make it difficult to make them think about the conversation about why is it so hard to do that? Can we fix it. And human beings are just so awesome at doing exactly what we tell them. If like, if you look at AI, that picture there of the spreadsheet, there's a marvelous literature search of all the crazy things that AI has done while following

orders. And AI is just such a distillation of how we define victory properly, when people kind of the same, and we need to be surprised when people do exam or whatever, it wasn't at all. So we're often very bad at translating intention into direct instruction, we assume people share our understanding of our perspective, and for many reasons, they won't. So sometimes, you can't just put it in the rules, because people won't get your interpretation of books. And also, even if you can articulate exactly what to do, the act of it can make people resistant to certain stubbornness, and it also promotes reflection. So it goes about this dumb thing. And really, you want people to think about maybe we shouldn't do that. pointing that out to the Derby, the game will prompt reflection. And they'll be like, that's done, we shouldn't do it, and they won't do it. So they'll kind of erase it from your games, which breaks the point of your game. And it's probably not challenging their real world behavior, because this question prompted response rather than an experience and emotion prompted one.

So manipulation in games is a spectrum from the rules under construction and all the way to the kind of indirect influencing players and pay it behavior at the other end. And this influencing and the means usually are served by nudging the players elbow rather than them feeding you railroading them, and telling them what to do. All games are unexperienced. So even back to games like chess, is like you're still having the experience of playing the game. And you're experiencing this battle of equal forces, and your opponent simulation and immersive games make that experience more explicit. But the lessons you learn from any game are learned because of the experience of playing the game. So you learn the strengths and weaknesses of a chess move, or abuse of power by making mistake and your opponent capitalizing on that. And it's the emotional stuff that you remember. And that's kind of gets encoded in your brain. So turning on the facts, or figures won't stick going into experience, the effects of those facts and figures is much more compelling and engaging, and it will stick with them. So Tom bots, migrate Deck, the back of the car, that statistics, nobody cares, nobody remembers front of the card as a human being. And it has much more meaning and generates lots more investment in the message that you're trying to get across. So experiential learning is always happening on your own, always, where you're ready, your honor all the time. And that's like trying to figure out their next move your next move, trying to take on their perspective to figure out how to beat them. So that's perspective taking is an act of empathy. I walking a mile in their shoes and trying to inhabit their thought process games that we call experiential learning. So simulation, and immersive games focus on that perspective taking elements.

So like, the message, and for that game to be, to put people into that perspective, very often, it's a different perspective to their own. So you have to really kind of make them behave in certain ways, particularly when it's contrary to their usual thinking or understanding of a situation. And this sort of game is usually making mistakes to see and making mistakes here and you won't make them see so you have to give people space to mess up so they can learn why that's a bad idea, or why that's not so where do you draw the boundary? Got players and pieces of rules and the game and the context you're playing the game in in the metagame of gaming the game, the rules and how it kind of comes into your game or doesn't. And every game is a system, a set of logical operations describe the actions a player can take and the resulting consequences and the rules codify that system. It's getting any game right means getting the

system right. Which means understanding cause and effect doing X should result in y happening. And it also means getting the friction, right? So it's not so much of a yes or no, do this thing. But how easy is it to do that thing? If like, it's in their power to do it, it's not a question. They can't do it. But how easy should it be for them to do it. And if it's too easy, people do it unrealistic. So fix that directly, is balancing the game. So when we're talking about complicity, we're fixing it by indirect means. And that's kind of what makes it count as real manipulation rather than just following the rules of the game. Where you draw the line around the system will depend on the kind of game that you're playing super simple abstract games, pieces, and the rules into negotiation or trading start to come into play. It's because you can make direct appeals to each other within the scope of the game, or the axis you do why collaborative storytelling games like d&d and Matrix Games, the players are cogs in the system of your game. So they become the pieces in a more literal sense than a chess player is their pieces. So not just making choices from a predetermined list of actions, they're steering, what moves are even possible within the game, and game involving are about complicity, not where the boundary is drawn, but it's the boundary becomes porous. So you can have games with real world information in them like Pokemon Go, or 911 simulator where it's taking OpenStreetMap data, so you're playing where you really are. But it's a very one directional kind of thing. So that you're influenced a little bit information for real or being gameplay, but it's, it's more like GoreTex, it's a breathable layer. It's not a two way exchange. And again, with complicity means the players emotions inside the system. And it's more than just, you make this move in just because you're backed into a corner, emotional response, it's that your emotions are a lever in the game. So the game influences your emotions, your emotions influence the game back. And this tends to look like game where the game is creating the system. So people get emotionally invested in the end, because you're literally world. Or games that are not what the system is not wholly rational machine. So computers will suck well, because it's not really about should when it's yes or no, it's all about the interpersonal dynamics, meat, sex come with emotions. So when actual people are part of your system, you need rather than just kind of abstract legals in a game, you really need to think about, do you have to represent that emotional side of things and emotion to be an accurate reflection of your system. Games where direct engagement of empathy is the point. So diversity, inclusion games and moral dilemma games set out to make you inhabit a perspective that isn't around. So you have to kind of nudge them over to make them think in the right kind of way. You need to understand them. And Rex, one are probably going to cover this much better than I could in one slide. So the wisdom of Mario is a form of manipulation, on how to play your game without writing any words down at all, just by looking at it. You've got something right. So if you look at the original Mario level design, it's just sneaky, good. Normally, you're in the center of the screen. But when you start the first level, you're on the right, and there's all this empty space. So it sort of implies go that way. And you do and then you get forced into situations where you do things that can't escape. So the first is a mash up, you can't not pick it up. So you find out that it's a good thing, one. And there's a hilarious historical worst marriage in the world level that illustrates exactly the opposite. It's very funny. And just a whole series of making the player pratfall basically, with Oh, you want us to jump right? We've got some hidden blocks, as you can see, until you try that Oof. Really funny. But it shows how experienced you're getting to have, like people shouldn't be stubbing their toes on your game, unless that's the point of your game.



So you need to send your message can forget What lessons do people need to learn? And what decisions you want people to reflect on. So I know Do you want to have the experience a different point of view to immerse themselves in and under military experience? So this is great for a model with Hawkeye, where the reader becomes hearing impaired by reading this comic. So whenever anybody speaks and you can't see their face, the speech bubbles are blank, or he miss lip reads quite a lot. And some of the comic is in sign language. So if you don't read sign language, or if you don't know what the signs are, you're sort of lost. And so worrying in this comic issue, and obstacles, congrats, welcome to having that's what like to do to illustrate the horrors of capitalism without explicitly explicitly saying, This is bad, by the way, but not looking away from the cost, which is literally the title of the game, about the asbestos industry, and the ultimately do cycle of exploitation, regulation, rejection. So serious games, we're serious messages can be really good fun, not didactic, like getting hit baseball. Do you want to give people the freedom to explore something and draw their own conclusions. So you don't actually have to give them the power to change the story, if you're giving them space to find and explore the story that you're putting before them. So in this game, in five minutes, you basically learn how the internet works, monkey see, monkey get polarized, and it will intolerably realize that the only correct move is not to play. Whatever it is that you need them to learn is heart has to be embodied in your game somehow as friction or obstacles or barriers. So how do we do this? It all comes back to why do you want to? What are you trying to communicate? What behavior do you need people to learn from? And what would achieve that without feeling railroaded? And it has to be a choice, they have to be free not to do it, while still more often than not doing it so that you can make your points. Very often, what you're trying to do is make indirect incentives, the game space, or in the meatspace, around the game, to drive out desired behavior. So Professor of mischief wrecks, Brian Brown, again with a Saudi Arabian naval collision, and it was an accident. But it was really important that the game embody the fact that the Saudis believed it was a deliberate attack. And the us not go to Iran to get their version of events and just buy into that Saudi version without question. So you can't just direct us, you know, absolute to Iran, that's like, neon sign hanging, you need to find out why not what's going on, go speak to Iran. So to to put the friction in the game expert, US and Saudis.

Union team have a different level of, oh, there was absolutely no direction about don't speak to them. But it was difficult for that communication to happen. So it didn't happen. And the US bought into the Saudi version of it, because it just didn't bother to ask the Iranians what was going on. So if you make that mechanic explicit, you're drawing attention to the fact that this is counter productive behavior going on. And people are more likely to question it, or attention to, so they'll be like, Oh, that's done, we should go talk to them. I'll fix it in the game, because they want to win the game, which is really lovely. Good. Is that representing the real world? And can you so easily capture the learning point from that, as you could if you let things go wrong? And then in the workshop, Iran can complain that the US allowed themselves to be misled? And are people going to learn, oh, our behavior in the real world is really stupid, we should change that, where they're going to think game was broken, we fixed it. So you have to make the game mechanics thinking yes, to get the behavior that you want out of people. And I

think what's really good about the way Rex did this one is that even if people tried to fix that, in the game, it doesn't work, because it's still more effort to go to the other floor to speak to the Iranian. So they're trying to do it, but it still takes more effort. And again, so I can't actually negate your deviousness. And on the flip side, it's a really serious consideration. Whatever effects you want to have in your game, like remote stability could make it too difficult for two people to speak that really needs to speak in the game. And are you accidentally introducing manipulations of the game for irrelevant reasons for that shouldn't be there at all. So what you're looking for is indirect ways to incentivize behavior that you want. And what you're trying to do usually is design again, friction. So what are the stresses and frustrations and choke points?

And you're, you're making a point in communicating your message by what you make easier and less costly for people to do in the game. Who do you want Let's talk to each other who do not want to talk to each other. Make an abstract taking an abstraction and make it concrete. So another bit of mischief, you put the authority figure or the privilege faction, in a room with coffee and doughnuts, and you put the knots in as legit or the marginalized faction in a room without. And you speak in this subtle sense, privilege, do players and it drives all sorts of let's go to feats of that group, baby food cultivation, and all of the stumbling upon success opportunities that are out there that are being handed to one side, but not to the other. So how do you make a faction seem more important in tangible ways you give them donuts.

And how do we communicate, we got by one side free pizza restaurant you have to buy your food with in game currency. So if you put a sign on the front of your game, you guys are less valuable than those guys, people are gonna kind of We hold these truths to be self evident, and protest the injustice of this and defy you. But if you just make them feel deprived, instead, they're going to feel that way and behave like a marginalized group, without you ever having to say out loud, often you're taking a literal and making it literal. So and I hear that Palestinian refugee population in the game literally displaced and roaming the halls without a home base. So it was hard for other players to find it in the game. And the negotiators didn't really coordinate with them, because it was too difficult to find them. So there was no stakeholder support. And you can't just direct a team not to do the thing that they should be doing. Because that's too big a clue of you should probably do that. You want people to learn the value of stakeholder engagement, it like so they don't even think about it, you have to make it difficult. So they have to think about it. And then if they mess up, you can have that conversation about so why did it go wrong. So everything about complexity is instilling a specific perspective, how you frame the game information, is really obvious way to do it. So it's kind of a spectrum from giving players 100% of the same information, say words saying knowledge, everybody knows everything. And at the other end, has a hidden information games, asymmetric games, or giving people slightly different versions of the same information, or sort of propaganda ish way to give them a different perspective on the situation. So what you tell the players is important, what levers you give them the pool, what resources they have access to, and how much information they have about the other players, objectives and resources. It all changes the nature of the game, and what it's possible for them to do in the game, and what they'll try to do, how they'll try to do it. And sometimes, this is really good. And people will inhabit a role because it's a

cultural touchstone, sometimes that's less helpful. So there's a whole presentation at Connections north, about red versus blue, and how sometimes you have to do things to take people out of their default interpretation of the perspective. And this is quite true with real world and historical games. When people know the history, they bring all of that assumption to the table with them. And it works both ways. Sometimes you need them to not see the truth, so they'll behave in ways that take them to the truth. So Jim woman has a game we come obese, and on the surface, its first contact between alien species. And it's masking a hidden game of colonial first contact. Because if the game set up front, hi, yo Cortez, these people have gotten it don't know its value, that would change how you play the game. And for the game to work, neither side can properly understand each other's resources or abilities or language. And as soon as you frame it with the culturally familiar ideas of indigenous people and conquistadors that lack of understanding disappears, the players have too much information in the system. So they don't need to communicate anymore they understand everything that's going on. X are the same but the language is complete, or the cost 600 shift tents. Mistakes for AIDS with expert were hiding who did it or why they did it. And you can one in the spin. And on the other end, this is obfuscation and erasure and just nastiness. So you can frame the exact same situation completely differently to different factions within your game. And you can positively or negatively influence how the same thing is perceived by different people in the game. You could do your players but reflect the real world. So refugees, it's probably rather than that People really well, between how much empathy is due white civilized, Western refugees fleeing the Ukraine, folks from Africa and Asia, and the Middle East. So you have to understand who your players are to understand their thinking and participate in your system so that you can poke them in the right direction for good oil. So how you frame it is challenging assumptions by diverting people's faces. So Tamera has a wonderful game where he gets you to question your assumptions. So he hands to people rules and says, go read these.

So they sit down, and immediately one of them starts trying to move this piece in a way that you can't. And then without talking, which is kind of fun. And so why did you assume you both had the same rules. And it's like, not giving people the same rules. That's how asymmetrical games work. Where literally, people are playing by different rules, even though they're playing the same game. So that's sort of the definition of guerrilla warfare, really, that you're not fighting the enemy on their terms, because you look, you can you can infer people play by doing the game. But also, you can do things like using index to literally change the rules of game mid game. So like, if you're trying to teach no plan survives first contact with the enemy kind of thing. So there's magus, only 39, RF stuff, college will game where it's designed to finding out operations, and it begins to face and then some days of error, ask aircraft and they get, they give you information about what's happening on the envelope. And having spent like a couple of days planning what you're going to do, the game begins with an indexing rolls, you don't have those aircraft anymore. So like, this is literally arbitrarily changing the rules under people's feet. To sort of teach that point, like man plans, God laughs. And what's so powerful about all these subversions expectations is it makes the player question their assumptions. So they assumed x. And then Y happens in like, oh, wow, well, that led me to presume that that wasn't a possibility. And it's most powerful when that assumption is part of a construction that the player made for themselves, rather than being directly told, x, and then y happened. So this is

something that film theater and I had to do really, really well. So there's a certified copy, you should definitely watch the just how much play there is in the system to work with people's assumptions. So you never tell them explicitly, but that's the meaning they take. So then when you flip it on the head, it's like well, isn't actually say that blows all on you. So learning people kind of join the dots makes them complicit invested in the game. So then changing their assumption or challenging their assumptions. So when you get people to make this, like a huge driver of their investment in the system, and like when when people aren't just beholden to the system, when they've actually built it and the police, complicity becomes the game. And Brenda Romero talks about the deliberate decision choice she made in keeping the rules of train really vague, to force the players to interpret to make them complicit in her train of the game where you asked me pulls a drink, moving down the track, and when you get to the end, you turn over the destination that says Auschwitz, or Dachau, or Bergen Belsen. And the game is asking, how did this happen? Like, how did ordinary people participate? And the answer is in how the rules are really vague and open to interpretation so that you engage in rules lawyering, and then you're invested in the system. So when you really like before you realize what the system is? And then it's like, oh, do I buy investment in the system? Or do I college? I did that. And it's a really interesting dynamic. And Lambert's Doggy Dog is another game that plays on exactly the same idea. So it's about Western colonial occupation of Pacific Islands, and it's a rulemaking and in this game, the system is that there are rules in society, you have to follow these rules. So the first rule is that the natives are inferior to the occupation. And everything follows from this row. After each round, the occupation wards, handles and punishes players who didn't follow the rules. And then the native like, the bit that it absolutely will systemic distance That relation is that the natives come up with a new rule based on what they just learned. So the first of this is how human beings learn, right? You have a bad experience, you rationalize it, you come up with a plan to avoid it happening to, again the future. And this is exactly how marginalized people. And the second is like everybody's actions are responsible, these rules are all complicit in the system, you're, you've built it, you codify that ideal policing app. So you're responsible for the system that you feel powerless within. And like you're complicit in racist emissions not being explicitly anti racist. So when you when you make space in the game for the players to insert themselves with an act of creation, it's like you have this huge amount of player investment, which means action on any actions or decisions they make him, then the signal, what has what's possible in the world. Asymmetric gains are one way to make people behave one way and not the other. So you only give them hammers and roots, a really terrific example of how you can make different things matter to different people in terms of their own survival. And also how replay rewards figuring out how you can best Disrupt. And you know, what's important to that faction. Whenever you need somebody to make a choice in your game, that sort of wrong or counterproductive, there has to be a positive reason to do it. In real life, people don't do self destructive or counterproductive things just for the roles or because they couldn't help themselves, or stupidity, it's because the alternative of not doing it was worse for the game has to capture that people won't be forced to make the same choice. They have to be in the game. In the game currency, it can be in the meatspace around the game, like with the food. And on the flip side, if you make two actions in the game, like the effects are equivalent, but one involves filling out paperwork. And the other one involves just playing your cards, I guarantee you people will do the card one more often because it's when you have to think

exists to do the action isn't adding cost to that action, which would influence how desirable it isn't action for all the wrong reasons. So if you have to go to discord and fill in this form, or something that's got nothing to do with your game or your learning. And sometimes failure is the lesson you want to teach. And nobody can win, or giving them impossible points. So dyslexia game, you're probably having flashbacks at this point, we'll have a little bit of audience participation, grab a piece of paper and a pen, or open up another window on your computer or in the chat, whatever. I want you to sort these words for me, but we're not going to do it alphabetically, because that's too easy. I want you to sort these words, by the pitch of their vowel sounds, though, boo, B double Oh, that's the lowest pitch word, and B, the double E is the highest pitch. And all the other words in the blue boxes fit somewhere in between. So I'll give you a couple of minutes. Just to write those all down in the right order. It's super easy, short, won't take you very long.

And you can watch everybody making fish faces on their cameras, are they trying to figure out? So you all agree, right? superduper easy. I guarantee nobody could do this task. It's really hard. We're not used to thinking of words in that term. And you probably couldn't hear the difference in pitch between a lot of the words. And the point of this game is that you have to sit there and not know. But you can hear these words, you know what they mean? But you can't make judgments about the order they should go in. So once you've experienced that kind of, I don't get it. Then we can talk about phonemic awareness. So people with dyslexia find it really difficult to spell because they can hear the words and they understand that words. They can't make judgments about the order of the sounds within the word to turn it into what letters to write down. And it's a really crazy simple notion that some people can't do a thing that you just take for granted. So I have to put you in that space of this is impossible. I can't do it. So that you can engage emotionally. If I just tell you the facts or figures it doesn't really stick.

So as an empathy mission, and you read the game to dinner certain kinds of behavior. So aftershock does this magnificently with all sorts of asymmetric victory conditions. So it's a semi opt in game about disaster response in the fictional country of Corona. So loosely based on the Haiti earthquake, and everybody is rewarded when good stuff happens. But the NGO player gets this extra award for being seemed to do awesome this.

It's dangerous, Chrono but to promote them doing the fix over anybody to six. And it's brilliantly devious, because it sneaks in all sorts of kind of racist colonial behavior. But if you asked a bunch of people, should you do this? They'll give you the altruistic answer, no, of course. But you put like actual humanitarians with best intentions in the same and they forget themselves completely, and sideline boots all over the local and do go out, they do what loosens up the skull Jack. And it's the way the game is saying, Look how easy it is to let your objective cloud what's really important. And at the same time, it's reflecting the reality that NGOs do need to be seen to be doing good to get paid, so that he can continue to be good. And what a fine line it is to balance that and not lose sight of your real purpose. I could gush about shock all day. But what it does so well is understanding the moral dilemmas. And I'll talk a bit more about this tomorrow. So there's an obvious right answer and obvious romance. That's not a choice. It's a calculation, because you got to do that thing. Otherwise, you're being stupid. But

it also meaningful choices have to be mutually exclusive. If doing a means I also get a B, why am I going to choose just to do B, so I can have it by doing a and so aftershock is different parts of and I have different needs to me. And you can meet kind of half the needs on the board in a turn. And the mechanism of Aftershock because you don't know which district is going to resolve each term. So you can either choose to meet easy needs that you can meet within one term. And yeah, you'll be guaranteed the points if it results. Or you can spend a number of times investing in a more deprived or more damaged area with no it won't resolve before you're done, you get no reward for this massive incentive to meet the short need short term needs. And quick wins over long term investment addressing entrenched needs. So the game is asking you like do you wanna help the neediest? Or do you want to help the people that need the most help? And then showing you all the ways the real world has it's done on that scale, in real life. And the thing with impossible choices as mechanic for reflection is that they do. If you don't get to choose, and you were just following orders, and you'll hold the game responsible, rather than reflecting on what that really means about you. So SpecOps, is cited as triple A game in questioning itself as a game. And that's not really how I see it at all. So when a first person shooter is saying, like, do you want to do a war crime or not, but it won't actually let you agree.

Have agency here you do things like you just have to hit the continue Game button and carry on playing. And then make your sort of thing that this is the makers argue that the player is complicit in any company, but I don't really think that's a valid choice. Like if your only option is not to play the game, then, like you're ending the conversation rather than reflecting on your choices. So good more than ever, I want and they don't want at the same time. So for the buyer, knowing that this is probably going to mean destruction of the world, and the Shire, or he can travel to model knowing that's probably going to mean destruction of him. SpecOps his choice is like it's gaslighting, no morality, you can choose not to play the game. But we really, really want you to play our game. It's like it's you compare that to train where the question is answering asking you as the same.

Choice is giving you a really different but your play, but you have this much more meaningful conversation because remember, he doesn't force your hand or slap you for doing what she just asked you to do. Like there's space in train, to refuse to do war crimes while still playing the game. And actually, people derail the trains and they straight up rules lawyer lawyering say saving the Jews because the game gives them space to do that. So you can have this whole conversation we're trying to understand reality. So you can totally make players complicit into them. But should you That's probably two questions do you need to? And how should you if you need to? So, like, to what extent is complicity determining the answer before you even play by saying I want this behavior and manipulating it people? Have you predetermined the answers to your game? Through design? Well, yes. But I don't think that's a problem. Because by not doing that, you just predetermined a different answer. And all decision based evidence making arguments apply to all games. So like the question instead is, would my game be sufficiently representative if I didn't do this? Because sometimes the point of the game is literally to say, look at this behavior, is that a good idea or not? And then, on the flip side, is it even possible to remove complexity from your game? Because everybody's coming to it with

these hard to quantify assumptions and assumptions? And have you really put enough thought into the things you didn't plan in to the game that people are bringing anyway? And can you remove all of that. And to the extent that this sort of manipulation supports the purpose, your game, it supports the purpose of your game. So if you understand your system and the frictions you need in your system, you understand where you need to drive behavior, or where you don't? James, that confront complicity front center, difficult subject matter, uncomfortable emotions, and you have to be really careful. You don't want to trivialize serious issues. You don't want to re traumatize people who've been through this kind of stuff. You don't want to ignore a whitewash the difficult stuff is dead, because that can sometimes get worse. And you don't know who's in the room that has personal experience of this stuff in their past or right now. So it can be really tricky territory, or what country okay for one group is not necessarily culturally okay for another group. So, for example, when I was playing dog eat dog with people from dscl, we used a whole bunch of different scenarios. So we did occupation versus natives and kind of Western invading Pacific islands. But we also did so. Like heteronormative society does the LGBT community and ableist society but disability community and men versus women kind of patriarchy stuffs. And, like I had this conversation about am I being completely is this just wildly inflammatory and insulting and offensive to people in the vanilla game, and they do character can get killed by the occupation. And to white British Western me, like this is all very colonial history. And I think it's hurried. And the British Empire is responsible for an awful lot of suffering. But it's far away in time and space. And I sort of understand killing a character like you're dead in Mario. Like it's not, it doesn't feel real to me, in the sense that when we played the other scenarios, they were in the present day. And it was, like killing a character over misogyny is like most workplaces. massagin ism was mansplaining, Alberta. And like it felt much more visceral and extreme. And also, like, so we have this conversation about, should we change killing to exit the narrative, because like lynching and suicide and physical violence are absolutely real consequences for LGBT people. And I didn't want to trivialize that, or erase it for being uncomfortable, but I didn't want to re traumatize people, or to make people play stuff that was the wrong kind of uncomfortable.

So if we change the words, there's so people to engage with if they want to, but they're not forced into it, if that's not okay for them. But this whole visceral discomfort for LGBT suicide, it's like, really made me stop and think about why does it feel less visceral to me when it's claimed by history? And well hang on a minute, how historical is it for black people and indigenous people? Like, it's really real for them still, every day? And if the point of the game is to confront you with these really difficult, uncomfortable emotions, how much should dominant groups come for the forefront of that conversation? Like how comfortable should they be feeling? Well, we're discussing how minority folks literally died and are still dying as a result of these behaviors and mechanisms. And another kind of tricky thing to navigate is that laughter is a natural stress reaction. And difficult games create tension. And people laugh, not because they find it funny, but because like that's how you deal with things sometimes. And the line between horror and black comedy is basically invisible. There's an adage in playwriting about you have to give them space to laugh, because otherwise you're going to do it, we don't want to. So Shakespeare's plays always have silly moments after really dark moments. And the biggest uncomfortable about playing Doggy Dog actually, is that you find yourself wanting to ask

because it's so horrible, and then just freaking out internally that people will think you're laughing because you think it's funny, not because you're so uncomfortable. And inclusion, like a fair amount of experiential learning. Games are empathy machines for Diversity and Inclusion purposes. So getting people to experience a minority perspective through the game design. So in other words, game design can literally embody discrimination, and marginalization. And these are some of the most inspiring games to be like people have real come to Jesus moments, playing this sort of game, realizing the humanity of folks that are just putting in other books, like actual feedback from my dyslexia game was this saved my marriage, I thought my husband was doing that stuff. But on the flip side of that coin, your game can literally embody marginalization and discrimination. So you have to be really careful that you're not baking it in, by accident, or by not thinking or not knowing. So like, who is visible in your game? Who's invisible? And like, who like what are the barriers to even getting to the table to play your game? And what like, are these barriers impacting people differently than others? And do you have playtesters, with diversity to let you know, about the scenes you didn't even know that you should know. And you also need to be aware that when you bring players inside your system, you're bringing all their bad behavior inside your system do? And sometimes good design is as much about keeping the bad behavior out as designing in the behavior that you want. So like, do we ever need to have people rooting for Nazis in our game? And if we do, how are we going to manage that? So that game is thought provoking, not provoking. And if mechanic can be the message of your game, mechanic is always the message you're getting. And what your game is not about is just as important as what it is about. So like what it says about all the pieces as part of the message that you're getting, communicates, and scramble for Africa, it was a really bad idea, because it put the indigenous population to this thing box, where things were done to them, and they had no agent while discussing something of just monumental consequence to their existence. So when you look at the demographics of who's designing games, is it any wonder that sometimes they suffer from these narrow perspectives? And why would people want to engage with games that don't consider them fully human? And is your game thought provoking? Or is it provoking and alienating, and it all comes down to that message of what your game is trying to communicate and whether the mechanics support that message.

So Brenda Romero uses this phrase mechanic his message to describe her games about difficult subjects. And there's also an extra credits YouTube about this command with narrative as metaphor. And I think most games centring complicity are some form of mechanic is the message games. And like I wrote this whole essay about how Wargaming can be art about aftershock. And in that I quoted Andrey Tarkovsky saying, the allotted function of art is not as often assumed to put across ideas, to propagate thoughts to serve. In this example, the aim of art is to prepare a person for death, to plough and harrow his soul, rendering it capable of turning to good. So art is not reason based and emotion, inflation based, it's emotion based, like it's about your soul. It's not about your thoughts. And, like, it's not about telling someone to do X, it's rendering them capable of turning to get it's, there's some agency in that it's showing them and letting them draw their own conclusions. So this is adage from screenwriting and playwriting about two plus two equals five. So you put the pieces on the table, and you let the audience join the dots. And then it is much more meaningful. So like the most engaging films,



and games or whatever, are ones where they don't tell you the answer. They show you all the pieces that you can for yourself. And that's why these mechanics message and experiential learning games can be so powerful, because they cause this profound reflection. And they don't tell you think X, they show you something and trust you to form that conclusion for yourself. So you might not be making super profound game, or like capital S serious game, or even really wanting to make players complicit in your game. But is this giant metaphor? And you like all your choices have meaning? You can choose to make that meaning really support your game, and like, make it sing with the message that you're trying to convey. So if you look at train, where the people are deliberately slightly too large, easy to put in the train cars, and you start off the game, stuffing them and getting really frustrated with this, and then you realize what's going on. And you're like, wow, what have I been doing? And you start to treat the pieces with much more reverence now that you understand exactly what's going on. So game design is all about. And all of those decisions have the potential to support the message of your game. So make good decisions.

And everything for me. Over to you guys for questions. I haven't been following the chat. So it might take me a minute to scroll back to the top and get through all of that.

Abi Coskun:55:04

Amazing. Thank you so so much, Sally. That was incredibly interesting. And I've jotted myself down all sorts of little notes. While you're talking. I think there are starting to be a couple of questions in the chat. That is one right at the bottom from Marshall. How should we incorporate concern into games that intentionally subvert expectations or guide placed towards a message that's not obvious at the outset?

Sally Davis 09:55:33

concern as in people knowing what they're getting into? Yeah, yes, he says, that's a really good question. To some extent, you have to provide spoilers, that doesn't mean that you spoil the game completely. But yeah, if you're going to make people feel uncomfortable, they need to know what they're getting into that there's another great screenwriting adage about, you can take the audience to an uncomfortable place, or you can do uncomfortable things to the audience. But you cannot take them to an uncomfortable place with by doing uncomfortable things to them. So like you can, you can have a game that messes with the audience. Or you can have a game that discusses really difficult topics. But if you do both at once, you really, really need to tell people, this is going to be a unpleasant experience for you. Because otherwise, they're going to be really unhappy at you, and maybe not hear anything that you're trying to say. And I had another thought, and it's just disappeared my brain.

Abi Coskun 09:56:50

Yeah, that that is unfortunately something that happens to us all, I think. Are there any other questions in the chat? Please shout out to me if I've missed any. Or if you have any questions that you would like to ask, you know, also feel free to stick your hand up and come on camera and ask them.

Sally Davis 09:57:26

Definitely silence, deathly silence. I should also say if anyone has any kind of other reflections that answer any questions, I think we'd be happy to hear those as well. Rex, you got your hand up?

Rex Brynen 09:57:45

Yeah, yeah. And it's not a question. It's just Sally, the great, great presentation. And what you don't know is that some of the things you said have sparked very fascinating private discussions of us are in in the chat. So don't take the absence of questions in the chat as indicative of lack of impact. It's kind of the opposite, because I mean, multiple side discussions in the chat, but privately because they're not really for public consumption about exactly the issues you face.

Sally Davis 09:58:10

Well, and also, I find a lot of people say, it'll take a while to calculate through brains and turn into things to talk about. I think there's gonna be a copy of the transcript for accessibility reasons. So that will get posted somewhere at some point.

Rex Brynen 09:58:27

Yeah, I'll just make one point because Stefanie sort of mentioned it in passing in the chat openly as well. I mean, I do a lot of games in which a the topic is really uncomfortable. Ethnic atrocity, war crimes, bigotry, etc, etc. And as Sally mentioned, I do quite a few games in which I'm trying to psychologically manipulate my participants into certain mental states to enhance the game experience. And I will say you really have to know your audience. So you know, the, the I mentioned in the chat the Palestinian refugees wandering around a room without a breakout room feeling really marginalized. I only did it because I knew them all. And I absolutely would not have done it with a random collection of Palestinians. refugee leaders who I hadn't known for years, I'll do stuff with McGill students, which they will understand in the context of the course, which I would never do with other kinds of audiences. So this is, when you're when you're trying to get game effects through that kind of engaging the player in certain ways, and invoking that complicity, you really, really have to know who your audience is, and obviously, play it safely.

Sally Davis 09:59:39

Yeah, and it's definitely a thing that you do without an audience. So I give clients some of the Doggy Dog games we videoed so people that didn't have someone to play with or didn't want to play could still see it. And that was the point where people start to think, I'm not sure I want to say this, because out of context, it'll look horrific. I absolutely do not mean this. But the game requires me to do this at this point. So we had big disclaimers at the front of the video, like people are role playing, they don't mean these things, do not presume that they are racist people, or whatever. Charlie's question in the chat about managing the effects of making the audience uncomfortable. So my dyslexia game is like an hour of making people feel just the most uncomfortable, inadequate people. So I, I make a roomful of people dyslexic, so I get them really stressed out. And then I give them tasks that they just can't do, because I've rigged the rules completely. And part of how it works is because it's just really funny, and people are

having a good time. And all of the nervous energy is coming out as after. So depending on what you're gaming, if you can make it kind of funny, you can make it like you can sugar, the pill. But at the same time, the kind of things you wouldn't want to make funny, so won't necessarily play everywhere. And then we have a whole conversation afterwards and during about how that feels and contextualizing it. So it's not just me being hard. It's I'm putting into a situation so that you understand the perplexing behavior you've seen from other people. X?

Unknown Speaker 10:01:20

Yeah, thanks. Okay, this might be more of a point. But I really got the thinking during our presentation with everything that's going on. But I guess, atrocity is really coming up now as a topic for also serious gaming with recent events. Because now we see that this still happens. Of course, it's been happening all the time. But it's really now Europe is facing this right next to it. And we're now moving into the planning phase of what's going to happen with the peace operations in Ukraine, possibly after a ceasefire. And really integrating this. The events here of the last couple of weeks into the planning of those is really something that I'm thinking really heavily at the moment. I don't have a point here, but maybe building on what Rex just said that, I guess there's there's really room for somebody to look into gaming atrocities in the, in the, let's say, in planning games and analytical games. Of course, there's a clear pedagogical interest in putting people into those uncomfortable situations. But when you're doing some policy gaming for for planning a potential mission, how do you do that? How do you incorporate atrocities in the sense that they're not just a metric? Bit of a ramble there, but really got me thinking, thanks. Yeah,

Sally Davis 10:02:48

it's a little bit outside of my scope. But Rex is really good person to talk to outside of the presentation. Tom, your hand is up.

Tom Fisher 10:02:56

Thank you, Sally. Just want to reflect on what you just said right there for a second. Rex is a good person to contact not that he has actually committed any atrocities just to make that 100% Clear.

And just to reflect, you know, at the very end of when you were speaking before, Sally, you referred to you know, having a contextualizing discussion afterwards. And I think that something that you know, this newbies, especially we should take away Stef is about to be confronted with this when we run our supply in emergency game for a UN agency later on. As a training game when you get into things that are really stressful. Could be very, very uncomfortable. It is absolutely fundamental that the game process does not end with the last turn, but the debrief and having the space to discuss it, put everything into its proper context and be able to release some of that, you know, whether it is emotion or the, you know, from the intellectual side, all the questions that, that come up for it, and, you know, especially when this is a training game, that's where you really, you know, bring it bring the learning together with the with the game experience to put it into the prod that proper context otherwise, you

know, you very much risk either giving the wrong impression, or leaving people stranded, which, which could be almost worse in terms of left alone to deal with their stresses.

Sally Davis 10:04:56

Yeah, so, with my playwriting hat on, I have been involved in theater projects that has dealt with really difficult issues. And part of the rehearsal process was, the theater is funding a psychologist for if you need to go and talk about this stuff that you're doing, so you don't take it home to your family after rehearsals. X, your hand is up.

Unknown Speaker 10:05:22

Yes, sorry. First, I think it was a great presentation. So you'll see that and I play I'm looking at the wrong monitor. So yes. Good. So I know you have a question. So about the role of emotionality in the entire process. So I have run session, a simulation, we call them with a group of 100 people, but I get to see they hang out for an entire year because they are performing education program. And one thing that I have seen very interesting is that a lot of the material that they cover during the simulation that takes one week at the beginning of the program only starts making sense months after that, and then they start remembering the sense of frustration and emotion and like all like how that all comes together only a long time afterwards. So my question is, is there a way to start addressing this in a meaningful way to for example, during our debrief, so that they they are sort of like given for warning or so

Sally Davis 10:06:24

integrate what specifically

Unknown Speaker 10:06:26

integrate the the notion that some of the experiences that they had during the sessions during during the game are going to take a long time to sink in. Because if you know if they are experiencing for example, a difficult conversation or they were very frustrated during the game, as was designed that could pamper the learning that they are taking from it.

Sally Davis 10:06:57

Right so to communicate you're frustrated because the game was supposed to be frustrating rather than because games are bad and rubbish.

Unknown Speaker 10:07:05

Yeah, as part of the learning experience essentially. Um

Sally Davis 10:07:10

That's really interesting question. I guess a lot of it is just having that conversation right and it's anyone else have any thoughts on this? Well, I call it kind of dribbles through my brain there is a chance that it's only going to make sense in a couple of months. So while so that's, that's absolutely possible. And it's going to be so to my experience at university was like that, but different. So when we were doing thermodynamics and things, so my degree is not in Wargaming. It's in rocket science. And we had lectures going on one track and then we had the

practical lab experiments going on a different track. And because there was only so much equipment, there was sort of like a rotation. So you, everybody in the class did the experiments in a different order. So quite often, you encountered the experiment before we'd covered the theory in class, and that was just maddeningly frustrating. Of I get I don't know what I'm trying to achieve. I don't know what I'm learning. What am I? Why am I measuring these things? But like, there wasn't any way to have taught all the theory upfront and then do the experiments in the right order. So I guess that might just be inherent in a university system of limited time resources can't can't put everything in your head in one go. For free

Abi Coskun 10:08:45

Well, thanks so much, everyone. I think if you have any further questions, Sally as to use her phrase is it continue to dribble through our brains because I think a lot of a lot of what you brought up I think a lot of us going to take away and really think more deeply about if you could, you know, pop them in the chat later or Put them into the discord. That'd be fantastic. Obviously, Sally will be speaking again tomorrow on a slightly different subject. So we'll very, very much looking forward to that. The last part of our day that we're going to be moving into is some networking time, we're going to have a number of different breakout rooms set up. Tom, if when I give you the knowledge, if you're ready to do that, that'd be great, but not just a second. So we're going to have rooms for UI, UX design, mechanics, research, military policy, or for foresight, humanitarian analysis and training. But those are just kind of guide topics to help you choose what conversations might interest you, please feel free to move between them. Come and go. And, you know, try and meet people, the next generation with the more experienced and hopefully people from all around the world as well. And just one last piece of housekeeping for me. We'll be meeting tomorrow to start at two o'clock, GMT, that's 10am, Easton. And a reminder to everyone who's joining us from North America that the clocks are going forwards. So the time will change by one hour for you. So just just to make sure that no one forgets that. I think if I was in that situation that would trip me up. Tom, do we have the networking Breakout Rooms ready?

Tom Fisher 10:10:45

they are ready to go the minute you you say go ahead and people can choose whatever room and should be able to bounce between them themselves.

Abi Coskun 10:10:55

Amazing. So before I send you all into networking, and you know that we'll close out the day, I just like saying a huge thank you to all of our speakers for such incredible insights and for sharing their knowledge and expertise with us and for everyone who has participated and made this you know so much more of a conversation than just kind of people talking at you for so many hours. So thank you very much Tom if you could hit the breakout rooms and I look forward to getting to chat with some of you a bit more there we go the rooms are open if people are unsure how to enter a breakout room then please go ahead and turn on your microphones and go ahead and ask the question or if there's a particular room you would like to be placed into then we can we can put you right in there and game mechanics is filling up fast; policy foresight is there, anyone here who would like to be put into a specific room or any

topic that you would like to discuss but you're not sure how to put yourself into a breakout room?