IFIP TC14 Entertainment Computing
Minutes of the TC14 Meeting
Held at UBC, Vancouver, 19th May 2011

Author: Tim Marsh (TC 14 Secretary)

Participants

Officers:
Chair: Ryohei NAKATSU [RN]
Vice-Chair: Matthias RAUTERBERG [MR]
Secretary: Tim MARSH [TM]

Members:
Canada: Sidney FELS [SF]
Germany: Rainer MALAKA [RM]
Korea: Hyun YANG [HY]
Spain: Magy Seif El-NASER [MEL] (Proxy)
IEEE Representative: Nahum Gershon [NG]

Working Group Chairs:
WG14.3: Matthias RAUTERBERG [MR]
WG14.7: Naoko TOSA [NT]

Agenda
1. Acceptance of the minutes of the previous meeting
2. Change of officers and members
3. Progress of ICEC2011 - paper reviews, keynote speakers, banquet and events, workshops, other issues
4. Host for ICEC 2012 - proposals: Magy Seif El-Naser (Spain), Rainer Malaka (Germany)
5. Potential host for ICEC 2013
6. Working groups activities
7. Any other business (AOB)

1. Acceptance of the minutes of the previous meeting
[SF] Proposes to reject the minutes of the meeting as the minutes were a shortened version of what was discussed in the TC14 meeting. [TM] highlighted that as the meeting was conducted in a noisy restaurant, members on one side of the table found it difficult to hear what was being discussed on the other side of the table. At the beginning of the meeting, the Secretary [TM] raised this concern, adding that this may effect the taking of the minutes, and on several occasions during the meeting several other members also reiterated that they couldn't hear what was being discussed, including [NT] [JH].

Members agree to reject the minutes based on the fact that they were not a full enough version of discussions. [SF] Calls for proposals to resolve the present situation and to ensure that this doesn't happen again in future TC14 meetings. [SF] Suggests one way forward could be to get each member to go over the minutes and add what they remember to have discussed. [NG] suggests using Google Docs for this purpose. [TM] Proposes that it would be helpful if the audio of all future meetings could be recorded as a copy of what was discussed

and for transcribing at a later stage. Members agreed that we go ahead with the recording of the present TC14 meeting for transcribing of minutes and revisit the issue at a later time. Members also agree with [MR] that all meetings henceforth should be conducted in closed rooms with relative quiet surroundings. [MR] Stresses that the meal and hospitality provided by Professor Yang [HY] chair of ICEC2011 was excellent and this by no means reflects any problem on his part.

Audio recording of minutes commences
2. Change of officers and members
[RN] As raised in the last meeting, as [RN] is now chair of IFIP, a new TC14 representative should take over the Japanese membership. [RN] nominated new Japanese member to take over this role and he has accepted. Members agree to accept new Japanese member. [RN] further outlines that as there has been no reply from the TC14 representative for Australia, [RN] was in touch with IFIP for suggestion for a new TC14 representative for Australia. Kevin Wong was suggested and was invited to take over as new TC14 representative for Australia, however, [RN] has received no reply to his invitation. [RN][MR] Discussion ensues about TC14 members who take no part in meetings. [MR] Suggests he will work on a strategy to identify and contact these members, and if this situation continues remove them from TC14. [RN] Asks [MR] if a database of members can be compiled for later discussion by TC14 members and course of action.

3. Progress of ICEC2011 - paper reviews, keynote speakers, banquet and events, workshops, other issues [SF] provides overview of current situation of ICEC2011 submissions: 98 paper total submissions in the system and 2 that are not in the system (short papers). This breaks down into 65 full-paper submissions, 15 short papers, 10 posters, 5 demos, 1 tutorial and 2 workshop proposals in the system. The 2 additional workshop proposals are from TC14 members [NT] and [RN and MR]. [SF] A potential of 4 workshops. [RM] Reminds members that last year (ICEC2010) we had 101 submissions. [SF] So the number of submissions for this year (ICEC2011) is about the same. [SF] In terms of our budget, we are expecting somewhere between CAN$50-80K expenditures, plus there is the IFIP 6000 Euros expected. [SF] Year before last year (2009) it was 2500 Euros (from an estimate from someone) so for some reason it's a much bigger number this year. [MR] Suggests to [SF] that maybe he should have a look at the business model of IFIP. [MR] Outlines the procedures and financial arrangements between IFIP and host organization for organizing IFIP conferences; what is the income for this Technical and IFIP organization; there are two main incomes from IFIP events - royalties from proceedings and participation fees; emphasizing that this is negotiated between conference hosting organization and IFIP; the organizers take full responsibility and IFIP don't take any responsibility for the events and IFIP don't interfere.

[MR] Asks [SF] for comparison of similar state of affairs for IEEE and ACM. [SF] Confirms it's the same; it's complicated for SIGGRAPH and SIGCHI. MR] Asks how much ACM or IEEE asks to pay for using their name. [SF] Replies that he doesn't know how much, but just knows that you need to pay a certain amount. [SF] Repeats question to IEEE representative [NG], asks how much ACM or IEEE charges for using their name. [NG] Replies that IEEE Computer Society asks for technical incorporation which means that they're not responsible for the finances, but charge US$350 to use their name. [MR] Asks for confirmation that this is the total amount. [NR] Confirms that this is the total, but emphases that the whole process is very long winded because of the difficulty in filling-out a PDF form and then saving it. [MR] Stresses that the amount is very cheap in comparison to IFIP. Agreement from [SF]. [NR] In IEEE Computer Society if you try to do a cross sponsorship, they usually take around 65% of

the revenues. [SF] emphasizes that he has no problem with that if they would also be responsible for any loses. [NR] and 35% usually go to the organizing technical committee.

Discussion continues about revenues from conferences and who takes risks. [SF] Highlights he doesn't think that for ICEC2011 they would lose any money, but the important thing is who assumes the risk; the higher the risk the higher the share from the profits. For ICEC2011, [MEL] Magi and himself [SF] take responsibility; [SF] grants will have to cover any shortfall and any shortfall in grants has to be covered by his department, which then goes to the University. [MR] Suggests this is always the case. [SF] disagrees and suggests that it depends on the conference. [SF] Outlines a preferred model whereby TC14 could sponsor ICEC conferences, taking the higher risks for any loses, and subsequently receives higher profits; organizers would then only have to be concerned with organizing the conference, however this is not the model for IFIP. [HY] Outlines the financial arrangements for ICEC2010, as total expenditure $100K, $77 and $203 personal account; so officially there was a deficit. [SF] Asks, should Magi [MEL] and himself [SF] should sign the contract from IFIP. [MR] yes, sign it. [SF] Suggests he was thinking to scratch out the 6000 Euros and then sign it. [MR] Recommends to sign and write "as negotiated with TC14".

[MR] The regular part is the income is from ICEC publication by Springer, IFIP saves the copyright of the event to Springer, and Springer pays back between 3 to 4 Euros per page. [MR] Raises suggestion from IFIP secretary to increase number of pages. Some suggestions followed about how to increase the number of pages to increase profits – [MR] suggested by increasing number of pages of full-paper from 12 to say 18, posters increased from 2 to 4 pages, short papers from 8 to 10 pages, and so increasing the number of pages. [MR] This money goes directly from Springer to the TC account.

[SF] States that they preferred to stick with the amount allocated in the budget, which was $2500 goes to IFIP, because they [SF] [MEL] had planned around that and because that's what was done in the past. [RN] Asks to confirm if this is a contract and [MR] and [SF] confirm it's a contract, a standard fee for the "brand". [MR] Outlines preference to negotiate the implementation of a model whereby if there is a loss, you don't pay at all and if there is a profit then there is a certain share. [SF] Agrees, so that it will ease the pressure on the organizers. [MR] Discussion on the payment to IFIP should be between TC14 members but not sure if we can make this official. [MR] Suggests to sign the contact but to leave it open and to write "as determined by TC14". [SF] Suggests that for future chairs of ICEC in their budgeting process that they are made aware of that form; otherwise the event is not technically an IFIP event. [MR] Reaffirms this, and goes on to say, in this case, we cannot send the proceedings to Springer and we don't get Royalties - so last year's proceedings are not officially IFIP because no contract was signed. [SF] Agrees to make changes to the contract and sign it so it's an IFIP event.

[SF] Summarizes expenditure as: estimating between CAN$50-80K, expecting revenue around $70K for 175 attendees, 1 sponsor from Grand NCE of up to $10,000, applied for additional funding from Simon Frazer; so they are taking on part of the risk. [MEL] We have also tried to find other sponsors. [SF] Asks members to pass on any names of companies who would like to be sponsors and have their name associated with ICEC2011.

[SF] Conference site, is the Joseph and Rosalie Segal Center, that can be divided into three smaller rooms, [SF] shows powerpoints of possible configurations, depending on registration; dinner is going to be at a restaurant. [RM] Asks about parallel sessions. [SF] Responds that there will be no parallel sessions, because looking at the program there is not

the need for parallel sessions; 60% acceptance of 100 submissions still gives us program space; over 3 days, workshop is 1 day and 3 days for the full program. After going over configurations, [SF] and [MEL] suggest they will check the conference center room is appropriate for the number of participants. [SF] Negotiated downtown conference 4* hotel subsidizes of around $189 – one block from conference. [SF] Reviewing is currently in progress. [RN] when is the deadline? [SF] June 3rd. 68% of papers have one review and 1 paper has 3 reviews. Keynotes organized by [MEL]. [NR] How many people from Vancouver itself may come to ICEC2011, [MEL] my students 15 + whatever, maybe 30. [NR] emphasizes the Electronic Arts Industry in Vancouver who might be interested in attending.

There followed a long discussion about the optimum number of keynotes and speakers, ICEC as a single track conference, and improving the quality of ICEC. Essentially, there were two philosophies, [SF][MEL] advocating 3 to 4 keynotes/speakers and single track program, to allow the ICEC community to come together for discussion, while on the other hand [HY][RN] suggest parallel tracks, allowing more keynotes/speakers, so that ICEC participants can choose to attend either the accepted program or keynotes/speakers. Most of this discussion is as follows. [HY] Asks how many keynotes, [SF] replies 3 at present and another 1 potentially. [HY] Emphasizes the potential advantages of inviting keynotes from Universities and Industry in North America and California in attracting participants and suggests he has a potentially useful contact at USC. [MEL] Confirms that she has contacts at USC. [HY] ICEC 2010 had 20 speakers for the purpose of promoting ICEC2010. [SF] States that they don't want more than 3 keynotes, 3 or 4 is the maximum. [HY] Emphasizes the he likes to see variety in speakers. [MEL] Explains that the possible 4th keynote is from the games industry and is based in California so this will cover the California, North America angle. [RM] Outlines that ICEC has been parallel sessions in the past and the advantage of this being participants can make a choice about what is more interesting for them; either attending parallel sessions of the program or keynotes/speakers. [RM] So participants are free to plan around what they see as potentially weak parts of the program. [SF] states that he sees that people have different philosophies and reiterated that single track allows the ICEC community to come together for discussion and we are not big enough as a community for parallel sessions. [HY] reiterates his philosophy using ICEC 2010 as an example that keynotes attract participation and therefore a large number of keynotes will attract greater attendance. [MEL] rather than having larger number of keynotes, keeping the registration cost down will attract greater attendance. [SF] says he is not convinced that having high caliber keynotes will necessarily attract high attendance and a large number of keynotes from outside will not help grow the community. [HY] asks about the number of keynotes at CHI. [SF] replies two, one at the beginning and one at the end. [RN] emphasizes that ICEC has always had parallel tracks. [SF] replies that if you are a strong community then parallel tracks works, but if you are a small community single track is better. [RM] states that the best conferences he has been to are single track. [HY] Enquires about the number of accepted submissions. [SF] In terms of acceptance rate, we're expecting 20-30% for full papers. [MEL] We were thinking of having 18 full papers, plus short and posters. [MR] Emphases a very simple standard formula as accept only a small amount of quality full papers and the rest as short papers, and then just announce your high selected papers. [SF] and [MEL] agree. [SF] So then out of the total ~60 acceptances, providing a potential ratio of 2 to 3 participants making potentially around 160 attendance, plus local people and students, giving around 200 people. [SF] Confirms that ICEC2011 will have fully parallel sessions, closer to Paris which only had some parallel sessions. [MR] asks where the poster session will fit in. [SF][MEL] state that the poster session will be like a CHI madness activity. [SF] concludes that there is a high variance in the quality and the way for your community to improve quality is that you work together, and it has to come from within, it doesn't come

from outside. [MR] Emphasizes the need for discussion time, after presentations, during breaks and keynotes should take part and keynotes should remain for the whole of the conference duration. [SF] Agrees. [RN] Emphasizes that still it is a big decision [to have single track] so if there is any strong objection, it must be heard/put forward. [RM] Succeed, grow and be competitive as a conference then increasing quality is a key issue because otherwise the good people won't go. [RM] asks if [SF] wants to introduce some standards to improve quality of programme committee and paper acceptance? [SF] replies yes, the community is only as strong as its members who watch over it and the programme committee is a key part of that, how to get them engaged and make sure they do their reviews well and review the reviews, there is no standards set in our community yet. For example, there is no policy around managing our reviewers, don't have policy around the rebuttal process (if we want to go in that route), don't have a policy around the journal. We could for example, use the journal as the main venue for the quality and that any journal papers appeared this year those authors are invited to give presentations at ICEC; so it goes through a peer process that is much more rigorous, SIGGRAPH does that. [MR] we can't do it that way because the journal has only been in existence for two years, in its third year. [SF] that was just a brainstorm idea. [MR] no it's possible, we discussed it last year; but submitting authors are not interested in extending their submissions, they're happy to get their 12 page paper accepted and published by Springer but they are not interested in extending their papers. [SF] but what if you do it the other way around, if you get a paper accepted then it's accepted at ICEC? [MEL] asks is it really the community, giving example of FDG in which all chosen authors were asked to extend their submission as a journal paper, in which [MEL] was Special Editor, and they did. [SF] highlights a similar example in which he had been Special Editor and people didn't extend their submissions, and so they just rejected them. [MEL] asks, didn't the authors see the value of extending their submissions. [SF] replies, we asked for 30% extra material, and for whatever reason, they didn't extend their submissions. [SF] Ent Com is not a recognized journal, so there is no support for it, it' not an SCI. [MR] it has to going for some years to go into SCI. [SF] so quality is the key and unfortunately I didn't add this to the agenda, what our committee as a steering group is going to do about improving the quality.

[MR] from my personal impression looking back at the conference and the scope of the journal, is that it's too broad coving everything from gaming up to robots. [MEL] adds that CHI is also broad. [MR][RN] disagree entertainment is far broader. [SF] agrees with [MEL] that CHI is much broader. [RM] so entertainment is a sub-set of CHI. [SF][MEL] agree. [SF] highlights this through example, if an author has high quality human-entertainment paper they would choose to submit to CHI before ICEC, because CHI covers everything we do and if rejected then submit to ICEC. [SF] there are things we can do in our community to improve the quality and then people will want to submit first to ICEC instead of CHI or INTERACT or whatever. [MEL] building the community is part of this. [SF] it's the key, without that there's no point. [HY] asks was CHI always big. [SF] answers, no it started small. [HY] so the vision for ICEC is to increase size is OK but this expansion requires a special effort as was attempted in ICEC2010.

[TM] suggests there may be some difficulty in defining Entertainment in comparison to CHI because CHI has established methods and frameworks whereas Entertainment Computing doesn't have established theories, methods, frameworks, guidelines. [SF] but this doesn't mean that it's broader. [TM] agreed, but it makes it easier to define the scope of CHI whereas Ent. Com is more difficult. As a consequence, Ent Com & ICEC accepts submissions from many different areas including entertainment, CHI, programming & computing [computer science], whereas CHI doesn't. [SF] disagrees suggesting that CHI does but it's not

in the main track, a conscious decision was made to have a separate entity and tracks that accepts everything, The practitioners track. [TM] But that's a small area in comparison to the whole CHI conference. [SF] No it's a big area, it's going the same way as SIGGRAPH. But there are tons of other stuff but their quality is variable. [MEL] The CHI community defined itself, which is the same thing here [Ent. Com.] to let the community define itself.

[RN][MR][NT] Talk briefly about the role of the working groups.
[SF] calls discussion on ICEC2011 to a close.

4. Host for ICEC 2012 - proposals: Magy Seif El-Naser (Spain), Rainer Malaka (Germany)
[MEL] Presenting presentation on Pedro's behalf. Proposing the conference is held at the university where he is in Spain and be held over four days 26th – 28th September. He's proposing the first days be tourism workshops and three days will be half days with the conference. There will be exhibitions in parallel and it will be in the computer science department at the university. [NG] why the conference can't be in Barcelona rather than Madrid and [MEL] replies because Pedro is based in Madrid and it's more of a tourist attraction. [MEL] will work with games and he has 15 staff members. The university is very near downtown so that is another attraction. It has 20 faculties and six university colleges. He previously ran another conference in the computer science building where he is proposing they hold the conference. They have sixteen classrooms, a conference hall and projection system. From 2009-2011 he has held Local gamejam at the university with around 200 people. Madrid is the capital of Spain and has great transport (train/plane) connections and there is great cultural life. Also lots of accommodation downtown near the university. There are museums, gardens, shopping, restaurants, music shows, etc. The subway system connects to just about everywhere, in the city and farther afield like Barcelona and Malaga. In terms of visa requirements, the European Union, the US and Japan do not require a visa. Hotels are the same sort of range as they are in Vancouver. Four star hotels in downtown are about 100 Euros a night. There are flamenco music shows every night and 2852 restaurants and tapas places. He has been working with a number of game companies so has access to several people in Madrid. The weather will be pleasant and doesn't get too hot.

[RM] Alternative proposed city is Bremen. It is much smaller than Madrid, and much cosier. You may not know Bremen but may know things that come from Bremen – Supper club, Brothers Grimm, beer. The hosting organization would be the centre for computing technologies which is an Institute of the University of Bremen, where he is the director. There are 13 professors and 150 researchers. They do ICT research and transfer in a huge number of national/international projects. Technology transfer is an important part of these. They have a number of spin-offs around campus, creating jobs around campus. Active in an educational programme called Digital Media which is run together with the University of Arts and so their design students are together with computer science students; the computer science people have to go to the University of Arts and vice versa. He has been a professor since 2006. He's has been the German representative for the TC14 for around two and a half years. Been involved in a number of things like conferences, organized a smart graphics symposium [AAAI] in Bremen, was co-programme chair of ICEC 2010 and has served on number programme committees.

His own research group is called Digital Media with around 20 researchers and the focus of the group is around digital media and entertaining, visual computation, spatial media. They have recently done a dance performance with digital media with the students from performing arts. Robocop 2006 was one of the biggest conferences that TCI has organized in Bremen; they have done a number of variable conferences and have a number of people

who are quite experienced in conference organization. Also did the local gamesjam twice and the students are running that now. The university is much smaller than the one in Madrid, about 20,000 students and is very compact. There is a science museum on campus and an astronomy tower where they do zero gravity. There are 500,000 inhabitants in Bremen so it's not a big city. There are multiple options for a conference site – he suggests during September the university would be a good place as there are no classes then, and plenty of available lecture rooms. Other benefits are that it would be cheap, there would be cheap food, rooms, facilities, etc. and that would mean low prices for registration. The university is still central to Bremen, about 20 minutes by tram to the city centre. The alternative would be the professional conference centre. The conference centre is right in the city centre near the main station and flexible for events of all sizes from a few hundred to a few thousand. Bremen is the second largest city in Northern Germany by a river and has a centre which is a UNESCO heritage site. The city has been named the city of Science, it's metropolitan but with everything within walking distance. The airport is 15 mins by tram to the city centre. There are 70 hotels and the most expensive is a five star hotel at 107 Euros per night. And three star for around 50 euros per night, so economical accommodation. The German computer science society would be the main supporting organization and are associated with the German chapter of ACM and have a high interest in bringing conferences to Bremen. There's a number of multi-media game industry around. The German gaming market is the biggest in Europe and they have other organizations that would help in the conference.

Suggests a maximum of 500 euros for registration. In September the weather is very nice around 20 degrees. The semester starts mid October so there are no students around. The food is good and there are excellent restaurants especially the seafood and great wine too. City Hall has one of the biggest collections of wine in Germany. Says 2013 would not be a good year for the conference as he is organizing a HCI one around the same time that this one would be held.

Submissions for this year from Germany are 33 authors and from Spain there are none. So what does this mean? That it's important to have in Spain to get them involved, or why have it there because they are not involved? Suggests there is not a huge commitment from Spain but on the other hand perhaps by hosting in Spain it would get more commitment. There is a definite commitment to ICEC from Germany.

[RM] says there is a growing community in computing in this area in Germany, so would be good to have conference there and would get the German community together. [MEL] says in Spain she spoke in 3 different universities and there are a number of competing conferences in games and so by having it in Madrid might attract people in.

[NT] asks reasons why Pedro himself didn't go to Vancouver to propose being host for ICEC2012; [MEL] suggests that possibly it's because of funding.

Short discussion about who should be to vote for host of ICEC2012. [RM] says he should be able to vote because he is a regular member of TC14 and a national representative. If this is so then [MEL] as proxy for ICEC2012 Spain proposal should also be allowed to vote.

[SF] argues that if you are at a conference and you are discussing a paper from your own university you have to leave the room, even if you don't know the people.
[SF] Wants to have more discussion before voting and suggests the proposers leave the room as it would be perceived by the community as a more appropriate way of proceeding.

[MEL] reaffirms that it would be ok to hold the conference in Spain in 2013. [RM] Not OK in Bremen for 2013.

[MR] asked proposers for ICEC2012 to leave the room because of conflict of interest while the vote is held. Pedro is not there so would not be fair to him. Discussion about who should be able to vote and if the proposing parties should be in the room. [RM] and [MEL] both leave the room and discussion continues.

[MR] says it's simple/obvious that it should be Germany and then Spain. [SF] says why is it obvious and asks for an explanation. It may not go automatically to Spain in 2013 as that is a discussion for the future. [NG] opportunity to bring in the Spanish if it's in Spain and people from south America. And the weather is nicer than Bremen. It may be easier to organize a conference in Bremen rather than Spain because of the culture. [NG] an attractive location is likely to attract more people to the conference. [MR] however, similarly we thought this for Paris, that it would attract many people, but it didn't work. Discussion continues about which city is the more attractive location. [SF] says if it's in Bremen then he is less likely to go – if Madrid more likely to attend. If he has no paper not likely to go to Bremen has have to pay his own way. Spain has proposed twice now. [MR] suggests Spain can do the year after. First Germany and then Spain. [SF] conference has to move around and shouldn't be twice in Europe. [SF] Perhaps it should be Spain/Germany for 2012 and then the other for 2014. [MR] They should vote for 2012 only. The rest will be decided at a later date. [SF] says he prefers Madrid but asks what for the community of the group is the best decision – he is not sure. In Spain more Spanish will be aware of conference. But in Germany it will build on the community and make it stronger.

Discussion about language issue. Will there be enough people who can speak in English? Flight connections between Spain and Germany are relatively cheap so the Spanish can go to Germany if they are interested. [SF] Madrid is the favourite city of the two but is it better for the community? [TM] Agrees that Madrid is more attractive city but the support for ICEC from Germany is huge. Committee votes and ICEC2012 proposers/potential hosts come back into the room.
Vote results: four for Spain and five for Germany.

5. Potential host for ICEC 2013
[SF] Potential hosts for 2013 – asks if Spain would put itself forward. Suggests, to communicate to Pedro. Brazil, Australia/Asia are also options. [RM] China also an option. [NT] says she expresses an interest in hosting the conference in the future. [TM] asks if they should write a list for potential hosts for ICEC 2013. [MR] Brazil, China, Spain, Japan.

6. Working groups activities
[MR] working group one – no report.
Working group two – proposing a workshop for ICEC2011.
Working group three – [RN] email sent twice to ask for contribution.
Lots of activities and separate discussions follow.
[SF] there is no obvious way to make something part of the working group how do they do that? [NG] what is the reason for having working groups? What is it that they do? Do they have a specific job? [MR] They should do the work of organizing events according to the activities of ICEC. [NG] it should be stated clearly what is expected of working groups so they know what they should do.
[RM] proposes that perhaps we should install working groups for a certain number of years so there is an expiration date for the group. Should do a report once a year, have meetings

once in a while, give them guidelines and then after installing a working group for, say four years, then meet to discuss if they have fulfilled their requirements and if not close the group. Be standard procedure to close after four years, and give a good argument if they want to continue/justify existence. Thinks most of the working groups haven't done anything and should close.

[MR] says some of them have been very active. [RM] says some do something but don't know how to deliver to the group. [MR] who can make a decision about closing a working group? Can they do it or can they just propose that it closes? [MEL] asks if the leadership in working groups change? [MR] yes you have to stand down after a certain amount of time – six years in total. [SF] asks what the benefit is of being the chair of a working group? [TM] many people treat it as a medal. [SF] something to go on the CV. [MR] Build structures and have official structure on their subject. This needs to be emphasized. Need to offer something to working groups or they may end up with few/none. Have offered them their own part in the editorial journal which they appreciated. [SF] Suggestion about budget money. Could use that to pay for flights etc for workshops. At this point there's no reporting from the working groups. [NT] Outlines work connected with Art and Media and asks about proposing Working groups events. [SF] replies fill out the form.

[TM] says in Seoul we discussed the Serious Games working group. Asks if it is going to happen as it's very important? [RM] Wanted to form something but wasn't sure what the official last status was. [MR] As long as we have a working group that's close to it, for example, Stephan Atkin, they can take over them.

[TM] says he had an article in EntCom on purpose of serious games/defining serious games (SG) and says SG are different from games for entertainment. [MR] Serious games is a sub-section of games – but still part of games. [TM] says he doesn't accept that because it's serious games for purpose along a continuum, from games for purpose, through simulations, augmented/mixed reality to experiential environments. They are environments for experience and the experience is the purpose. This is different to games for entertainment. Only some part of the community think that serious games are just for games. [TM] points out that [MR] had a paper in ICEC 2010 on digital entertainment and his group presented it as a serious game. [MR] says serious games are a subsection of games. [SF] it must be a subsection. There are entertaining games and there are serious games. Both have the adjective "game" in the title. [MEL] if it's not a game then it's a different story. [SF] agrees, if it's not a game then it's not a game. [TM] asks so what about the terms virtual reality and artificial intelligence, isn't this the same? [RM] says he proposed the serious games issue years ago, perhaps as a SIG. Some discussion followed. [TM] asks again about serious games and about getting a SG working group. [SF] says that a proposal needs to be made. [RM] Satellite workshop at Vancouver on the first day and then they can meet on the first day and discuss serious games topics and see how /who wants to organize something. [RM] Says he would be happy to support Tim on that. [SF] need to give guidance to working groups on who to make a proposal; we don't have a template.

Journal of Ent Com strategy meeting:
[MR] Provides overview - we started two and a half years ago and there were a lot of promises. In the first year not enough submissions, but this year there is some effort from community. The journal was not financially viable and so agreed to change the structure into something similar to the TC structure. Sticking to communities but people didn't want to do something. [MR] provides some example contributions and proposals, such as, SI on serious gaming. Adding that the younger people are more active. Lot of special issues in the

pipeline. Accepted what was put forward in Paris one and a half years ago but they didn't deliver. [SF] They can't get a workshop organized, let alone a special issue. [MR] Have one year left.

[MEL] asks how many articles per issue. [MR] about 70-80 print pages means five articles per issue. We also have short papers. [RM] commends the progress of the journal and the advantages to accessing it on-line. But says the editorial process takes time and the 30 page length has its limitations. [MEL] asks if it has to be 30 pages? [MR] No can be shorter. [RM] Asks if they have competitors? [MR] ACM CiE. [MEL] says she was part of the journal of game development that closed 3 years ago. There were articles and there were issues but it was the same thing, people did not want to submit their articles to something that had not been around for a while. [SF] Perhaps the journal should be a niche one where articles are submitted that can't go anywhere else, or consider if it's even important to have a journal. Find an area that is not covered in any other journal and leverage off that, and slowly expand. Pick something that won't be published anywhere else. Otherwise doomed. Suggest adult entertainment world. Pornography, dating etc. which is an untouched niche. It should be an academic dialogue around technology and adult entertainment. [RM] Likes the subject more than military training. Should this been the trend of the whole journal or just a part of it? [SF] no should be a special issue perhaps or just part of the journal.

7 Any other business (AOB)
[RM] can these meetings be more structured? Unclear at times who the chair of the meeting. Too much time spent going from one point to another and at times turning into a get together/soul meeting in a restaurant. Need to know who is doing what after each point in the discussion. Difficult to take minutes otherwise. Needs to be more business-like. [SF] Agrees that a summary of the action items is necessary or people will leave meeting uncertain of their roles/what they are doing. Need to know action items.

[RM] Should write down action item, due date, responsibility etc. Or get action items with minutes.

[SF] Talks about what the action items should be: with regard to acceptance of minutes – available or next meeting. When should there be a decision on the minutes?

Action Items:
- Action item: for [SF][MEL] ICEC 2011 – look at the room and see if appropriate, etc.
- Action item: Host for 2012 (decided) so official notification needs to be made. Encourage Spain to apply for next year.
- Action item: would be planning for 2012. [RM] Formal planning done. Should have a clear plan and promotional material.
- Action item: Form for IFIP from [MR] has to reach the chair. That must be filled in and there are budget implications.
- Action item: 2013 hosts. Need to notify groups and say they need to have proposal in by Sept 30th. Four candidates for 2013 and should send a personal email. Say bids should be sent in for 2013. The website needs to be updated – IFIP TC14 dates updated
- Action item: [SF][MEL] ICEC 2011 contract needs to be sent in.
- Action item: [MR] Working group activity – form for conference? Golden rules for working groups and [MR] should perhaps do this? Remind chairs of their benefits and obligations. [MR] For the chairs of the working groups there will be consequences after a couple of years if they haven't fulfilled their role appropriately to step down.

- Action item: For the journal, [TC14] encouragement to submit papers. Identify strategic niche areas that won't be accepted in other journals.
- Action item: [TM] wants to organize something on serious games for ICEC.
- Action item: [TM] submit proposal for working group on Serious Games.
- Action item: [MR] wants to maintain editorial board.
- Action item: [MR][RN] Next meeting provide budget report. What to do with the budget? Do we support working groups, support ICEC? Usually each meeting has an agenda item on the budget. That should be an action item. Want to know what the budget is, what is the best thing to do with the money that TC14 has? Can use to waive conference fee of TC members? It's a shame if there are people who come to TC but not to conference because they can't afford it. Don't want to open up discussion about the budget right now. Need to discuss and put on the agenda next time.
- Action item: Needs to be discussed - underwriting for the conference. Who is responsible? The conference chair signs the event form. Who is taking financial risk? The institution? Currently it's the institution. Is that the model we want?

[NT] asks if they will be recording the keynote speakers.
[SF] yes and publish in the journal. And recording of ICEC2011 if they get permission from speakers.
[MR] provides short tutorial of editor and review process in Ent Com on-line.
Close of Meeting.

--- end of minutes ---