

IFIP TC14 Business Meeting April 27, 2014

Hilton DoubleTree, Toronto, Canada

Officers

Chair: Matthias RAUTERBERG [MR]

Vice-chair: Hyun Seung YANG [HY]

Secretary: Erik VAN DER SPEK [ES]

Participants

<i>Present</i>	<i>Video Link</i>
Matthias RAUTERBERG [MR] (TC Chair, rep Netherlands) Rainer MALAKA [RM] (rep Germany) David GEERTS [DG] (rep Belgium) Piotr GAWRYSIAK [PG] (rep Poland) Henry DUH [HD] (rep Singapore) Clement PILLIAS [CP] (proxy France) Gail RODNEY [GR] (Observer) Erik VAN DER SPEK [ES] (ex-officio Secretary)	Tim MARSH [TM] (WG 14.8 chair) Ricardo NAKAMURA [RN] (proxy Brazil) Nikitas SGOUROS [NS] (rep Greece) Helmut HLAVACS [HH] (rep Austria) Letizia JACCHERI [LJ] (rep Norway)

Action items

None

Agenda

- 1) Welcome, approval of agenda
- 2) Approval of minutes
- 3) Update from ICEC 2014
- 4) ICEC 2015 bid 1 (Austria)
- 5) ICEC 2015 bid 2 (Norway)
- 6) Discussion and selection of bid
- 7) Handbook project
- 8) Discussion of COST Action
- 9) Dagstuhl Seminar
- 10) TC14 Meetings
- 11) Any other business

Meeting started 9:40

1+2. Approval of agenda and minutes

No comments on the agenda. Minutes approved.

Note from ES: the Agenda changed somewhat as the discussion went along. Impromptu additions were:

6b. Future and scope of ICEC

6c. Scope of ENTCOM journal

3. Update from ICEC 2014

TM is representing YF who has the flu. Not many submissions yet (8), deadline will be extended. GR would send it out to Elsevier EntCom list. ES: paper deadline coincides with a big European project call deadline; extension would be a good idea. HD: DiGRA has a symposium on May 1, could be a good source for extra submissions. NS stresses that TC14 members should actively participate in ICEC.

TM: ICEC2014 will have a variable pricing schedule; 200, 600, 750 and 900AUD based on time. No venue yet, probably UTS.

Then the bids for ICEC 2015 were discussed, first Vienna, Austria (HH), then Trondheim, Norway (LJ). Both were deemed very good bids, already with detailed breakdowns of prospective costs. Following is an excerpt of the bids and comments.

4. ICEC Austria bid

ICEC in Austria would be held at the University of Vienna, in the main building or aula on the campus. The University of Vienna is the oldest university in the German speaking world and it would coincide with its 650th year anniversary. Very big university, 90k students. Maximum capacity of celebration hall is 200, enough for ICEC. Possible sponsors game companies, faculty sponsor, Austrian Computer Society. RN: In Brazil it also coincided with an anniversary, which led to rooms being booked. HH: festivities are spread out, wouldn't be a problem if booked in advance.

5. ICEC Norway bid

ICEC in Norway would be organized by the Norwegian University of Science and Technology in Trondheim, 22k students, very much a student town. Has a master program in computer games. Sobah Petersen and Jannicke Hauge of SGDA willing to help and connect conference publics. Looking for someone from Asia or US to also help and improve ties. The university will sponsor the conference for 6000 euro and likely other Norwegian scientific societies and government will sponsor as well, looking for a sponsor chair. Conference is in the middle of the semester, so the conference will be held in a hotel in town, outside of the campus. MR: Why in town, costs extra? LJ: We think big and can host it together with a national event of computer game companies called JOINGAME.

6. Discussion and selection of bids

Both bids were considered very good and relatively equal. After some discussion, there was an anonymous vote, and the choice fell on ICEC 2015 being hosted in Trondheim, Norway.

6b. Future and scope of ICEC

After the selection of the next conference, an impromptu discussion started about the future of ICEC. ICEC in Bremen was big, but Brazil and likely Australia saw a decline in attendants.

RM: Either we grow or we die. Should have a roadmap for consolidating conferences and maybe joining others, e.g. SGDA, GALA, GameDays. CHI PLAY is going to be a strong competitor, and ACE too.

NG: Compare ourselves with other conferences and stress differences. If there are no differences, create them. DG: So far we're very games focused, but ENTCOM is much bigger than that. RN agrees.

RN: Could help to have a bigger webpresence with a history and summary of events. NS: Can also look at what industry wants, shift focus from creating content to also incorporate managing content.

MR: I'd like to go back to when the TC14 was founded. We had 3 main objectives: an international

conference, a worldwide scientific organization of entertainment computing and to set up a journal. These were achieved. I never considered organizing the ICEC conference as the most interesting action for TC14. At the start scope was unknown, therefore was set very wide not to miss anything. Some of the initiatives are more promising than others. Actually content management--computer science, is on board, but content producers aren't. The TC should be a discussion platform on a global level how to harmonize the different fields, a strategic discussion, not really running an event. But this is my personal opinion. In my opinion, ICEC should be a WG activity, but of which one? Additionally, we see more instead of less conferences, only the unsuccessful ones would want to join. DG highlighted that delegating it to a WG would make the scope smaller and removes the cross-pollination we have now. MR: Already you have to be a member of the computer society. You can be a world famous designer or artist, and not get into TC14. NG: We publish in paper, which is actually dead serious and not entertaining. Is it possible to host videos and create links that stay online? GR: Definitely possible with Elsevier (you do need text to accompany it, also for indexing), conference proceedings are hosted by Springer though. HD mentioned again that ICEC has a problem in Asian countries for not being an A level conference. Only CHI really allowed.

RM: We may need to formulate plans for the best joining options, where ENTCOM isn't subsumed by others, and do a feasibility study. NS: We can create a platform/website for discussions on the ENTCOM topic, with the future of the conference as a logical result. HD: Maybe we need a permanent steering committee for the ICEC instead of alternating between members.

MR: It looks like we have three options:

- 1) Join events to gain more tractions (and become A-tier)
- 2) Make scope smaller and relegate ICEC to one of the WGs
- 3) Stop with ICEC

Can we vote?

ES pointed out that too few members were present to form a quorum. According to the TC14 Handbook, a new meeting would have to be convened within three months to vote on the matter. After the meeting, a video conference meeting was scheduled for June 23rd, 2014, to mention the discussion on ICEC and discuss the matter of quora and TC14 meetings.

6c. Scope of ENTCOM journal

GR: Slightly better result than last year (last year 33 submissions now 39 submissions). NG: We need to find a way to increase our reader potential. It's very academically oriented, it's an applied field. Maybe advertise it to other communities. Animation people from Pixar for instance may want to write a paper. MR: when we had these people as associate editors, they said they had their own publication outlets and events anyhow, was no added value for this kind of journal (NG: how many have you talked to?) five, maybe the wrong people. NG: Look at SIGGRAPH, see if any papers would be applicable to EC, and contact them. MR: We have special issues for them. If any of you have an idea for a special issue, send the proposal to me. So far I never refused any proposal. GR: Very few people subscribe to the journal directly, more in bundles, right now the journal is not making a profit but also not losing it. We were hoping to make a bit more revenue, but that's fine. In

computer science we see a big increase in open access uptake. If there is a demand from the community we could flip. HD: Open access not encouraged in Singapore and Australia. RM: There's some funding from research agencies and libraries. Success rate pretty good. But not common practice. PC: Don't know about France. DG: In Belgium preferred to budget during the grant proposal. PG: Same in Poland. NG: Usually also out of the grant in USA. GR: Okay maybe not appropriate for this community, but could be something to think about.

GR: We need help writing the application for Thomson-Reuters ISI journal citation index. They want a scientific application, not publisher marketing fluff. MR: Do you have a successful proposal, so that we know what they want to know GR: I can ask. RM: Editorial chiefs should write the draft, send it to editorial board for revisions and then maybe send it to TC14.

RM: How many special issues are on the schedule? GR: Just one 'virtual puppetry'. Sometimes papers are holding up the others, we could in the future publish these at a later date with a footnote 'part of the special issue'.

7. Handbook project

MR: Handbook title is Handbook of Digital Games and Entertainment Technologies. We have more sections than working groups (e.g. Brain Computer Interfaces for games). We have eleven sections. Then we were looking for section editors. If we couldn't find them we either closed the idea for a section or looked further. This we finalized in the last three months. Now Springer is sending out instructions for authors.

HD: Regarding the publication, I've been appointed by Springer as the editor of a new book series Gaming, Media and Social Effects. Right now we have eight books lined up. Four books per year. I'm setting up an editorial board; I will try to include TC14 members. If you want to have a book, please submit a proposal. Don't know if it's appropriate or not, but can I have an endorsement of the TC14.

MR: Write a short proposal and put it on the agenda for the meeting in Australia.

8. Cost proposal

A lot of people said to join, so far lacking in common goal that can sufficiently be advanced.

DG: Could be serious games. ES: Yes, tallying the main research topics, most people are engaged in serious games research. RM points out that this may have too much overlap with GALA.

RM (*after discussion of dagstuhl*): Find a core of methodologies, theory, for the foundation of Entertainment Computing. We are all working on our own field with our own methodologies, need to come together to discover commonalities etc.

DG: One deliverable could be a structured repository of the research that is done. MR: Setting up a benchmark database.

9. Dagstuhl

Dagstuhl is a community in Germany where all the computer science groups of Germany come together in seminars Sunday-Friday focused on discussions, roadmaps, advancing the field. A lot of seminars, usually attracts hotshots.

MR was proposed by someone who was turned down. People he invited were not renowned enough.

MR said we could take over, have it about ENTCOM and then there would be enough bigwigs. It's a lobbying event, European lobbyists are invited to listen in and maybe future calls are written in this direction. It could also feed into the COST action.

RM: I would decouple the COST action scope from the Dagstuhl, because it takes two years to get it. The goal of the Dagstuhl seminar would be more ambitious than the COST action, more a roadmap for ten years.

MR: Agree that would delay it. I will set up the draft for the Dagstuhl meeting.

10. TC14 meetings

The question was posed whether we should continue these physical business meetings, as they required a lot of money and effort.

DG: For the fall meeting it's logical to have it at the location, but the spring meeting can be virtual.

MR expressed disappointment that the Canadian and USA representatives could not attend. In HD's experience more than six people teleconferencing is a problem. And what is the best time period?

NG: I participate in lots of skype meetings and they're fine.

The meeting ended on the conclusion that there were no large objections to having the spring meetings for now (until cost) virtual.

Meeting ended 16:41 EDT

New Actions Items

1401 [ES] Convene new TC14 meeting (video conference) to discuss matters of quorum.

1402 [MR] Send the list of identified sections in the Handbook project and section editors that agreed.

1403 [HD] Write a proposal for TC14 endorsement of book series on Gaming, Media and Social Effects.

1404 [MR] Setup draft for the Dagstuhl meeting.

Appendix 1: TC14 Meetings Attendance

Nation	Year	02	03/1	03/2	04/1	05/1	06/1	06/2	07/1	07/2	08/1	08/2	09/1	09/2	10/1	10/2	11/1	11/2	12/1	12/2	13/1	13/2	14/1	Total
Australia											-	+	-	-	-	-	-	p	P					3
Austria					-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	4
Belgium																			-	+	+	-	+	3
Brazil																			+	+	+	+	P	5
Bulgaria					-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	3
Canada		-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	9
China			-	-	-	+	-	+	-	p	+	p	-	-	+	p	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	8
Czech				-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	7
Finland					+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	4
France				-	+	-	-	-	-	-	p	+	+	+	-	+	p	+	+	+	+	+	P	13
Germany													+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	11
Greece																				+	+	+	+	4
Hungary					-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
Ireland				-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	1
Italy			-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	p	-	+	+	+	+	-	9
Japan		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	p	p	p	+	+	-	-	20
Korea			-	-	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	14
Netherlands		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	22
Norway				-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	p	+	+	5
Poland																			p	+	+	-	+	4
Portugal					-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	3
Singapore		-	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	p	p	p	p	p	+	+	+	-	+	14
Spain						-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	3
Thailand					-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
United Kingdom		+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	p	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10
USA-ACM		+	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	p	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-				11
USA-IEEE									+	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-				5
USA																						+	-	1
Zambia							-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-				0

TC14 Business Meeting April 27, 2014

WG14.1 Chair	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	p	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10
WG14.2 Chair	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	p	p	p	-	+	+	-	+	-	14
WG14.3 Chair	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	20
WG14.4 Chair				+	+	-	+	-	p	-	p	-	+	p	p	p	+	+	+	+	+	P	15
WG14.5 Chair				+	+	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
WG14.6 Chair								+	p	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	6
WG14.7 Chair								+	+	p	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	P	-	-	12
WG14.8 Chair																					+	+	2
	02/1	03/1	03/2	04/1	05/1	06/1	06/2	07/1	07/2	08/1	08/2	09/1	09/2	10/1	10/2	11/1	11/2	12/1	12/2	13/1	13/2	14/1	Total

— + representative attended — - representative absent — p proxy— o observer