# IFIP TC14 Entertainment Computing
## TC14 Meeting
*Held at UBC, Vancouver, 5th October 2011: ~1pm – 5:30pm*

Author: Tim Marsh (TC14 Secretary)

**Participants**

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

**Members:**
Canada: Sidney FELS [SF]
Czech: David OBDRZALEK [DO]
Germany: Rainer MALAKA [RM]
Korea: Hyun YANG [HY]
The Netherlands: Matthias RAUTERBERG [MR]
USA-ACM: Don MARINELLI [DM]
Nahum Gershon [NG]

**Agenda**
1. Acceptance of the minutes of the previous meeting(s)
1.1  Action Items
2. Change of officers and members
3. Progress of ICEC2011 - paper reviews, keynote speakers, banquet and events, workshops, other issues (Sidney Fels, Canada)
4. Progress of ICEC2012 (Rainer Malaka, Germany)
5. Potential host for ICEC 2013
6. Working groups activities
7. Any other business (AOB)

1. Acceptance of minutes
Members' general feeling that in future minutes from last business meeting were too long and in future should be shortened/summarized.

1.1. Action items from minutes.
- MR: reads out and checks through with members the action items from last business meeting – 19th May, Vancouver.
- SF: Talks around some of the organization issues. Recommends that as part of the official notification a package should be given to the organizers from IFIP stating "that you are now organizing ICEC" and provide advice, guidelines, links, etc. SF confirms that he signed the agreement for ICEC. He stating that there is a lot of risk involved in organizing ICEC. UBC has responsibility for costs. So perhaps profits should go to UBC. Similarly, if TC14 takes the risk, then perhaps profits go to TC14. MR: If this is the case then we need Auditor and Treasurer. MR explains that 6 members have organized ICEC – all experiences are different. The current process/procedures for organizing ICEC allows for this freedom.

2. Change of officers and members
- RN: Tim moved from Singapore to Australia. Kevin Wong was invited to join TC14 as Australia member. MR: but Kevin Wong is not a member of IFIP. He is a member of ACS [Australian Computer Society] and IEEE. MR: suggests that Tim could join ACS and possibly put himself

forward as Australian representative. RN: Brazil Computing Society (exact society name unknown) recommended a proxy representative for TC14. Invited to attend this meeting but didn't attend.

3. Progress of ICEC2011
- SF: Provides overview of ICEC 2011 organization. Emphasizing that promoting of ICEC is the key to successful conference. Around 100 submissions, 20 long paper, 18 short papers, 24 posters, 3 demos, 2 workshops. Paper chairs ended up doing a lot of work with reviews, meta-reviews, and big effort with proceedings. Trying a little experiment with 9 sessions, single track; with discussion around posters. Quality reviews difficult to get, some had one/two lines. 10/15% didn't reach the standard required. Acceptance decision delayed as a consequence. Preparation for Springer difficult; lots of ambiguity, word templates, etc; no latex so hard to transfer to Microsoft word. The only thing Springer did was print the proceedings from the PDF sent to them. Decision was taken to have proceedings on thumbdrive and hard copies available at extra cost. 30 printed copies were shipped. Only 6 attendees wanted printed copy of proceedings at a cost of $50. SF asks members is there an alternative, say by providing proceedings on-line, as this makes a difference to registration? MR: Good idea, postpone decision to later. Shipping is the cost; if no shipping, then cost reduced. SF asks members, firstly, do we need printed copies of proceedings and secondly, should we go with Springer? RM: for next year ICEC 2012 will go with Springer. SF: for marketing / branding purposes of ICEC should we go with someone else, e.g. IEEE, ACM? Some discussion followed. MR: Confirms copyright is with IFIP. Springer just a production company – they do not own the content. So have to find another publisher to accept that if we want to change.
- SF: banquet in revolving restaurant in the same building as conference; drinks around poster reception; workshop – find their own attendance; tutorials – no-one has signed-up. Chairs not aware of marketing required. Should part of their responsibility be this? Some discussion on workshops organization perused. MR: alternative – run workshop on invitation. SF: do we charge for workshops? RM: if free (cost absorbed by conference) and people will attend workshops. DO: model of his university, attendees pay one cost and participate in workshops. SF: states that just like ACM, CHI and SIGGRAPH - as price increases there are fewer people.
- SF: For best paper award: certificate to be made. Decision to be made after the presentations. How to arrange the prize money. Pay personally and get reimbursed probably easiest way. SM recommends 500 euros for best paper award. MR: postpone decision to at later point.

4. Progress of 2012
- RM: Provides overview of organization of ICEC 2012 to date. Blocked rooms for social. Website done, but not yet up. In discussions to have German Computing Society (GI) join ICEC organization. If so, then they can underwrite risks. RM calls for any suggestions from members to help improve ICEC. RM suggests he likes idea of connecting WG with workshops. Idea to reduce number of PCs to less than 20 and have these assign reviewers. MR: advises that PC numbers typically depend on paper submissions and the number of reviews required.

5. Potential host for ICEC 2013
- RN: Based on the rule for ICEC going between Asia/US/Europe, a request has been received to organize next ICEC 2013 in China. Discussion of joint organization with ACM ACE; Adrian Cheok, founder agrees. Some discussion followed on options to join ACE and arguments against. RN: one suggestion to run ACE and ICEC side-by-side ACE. RM: raises point that each conference would then be competing against each other for submissions and attendees. MR: Enquiries have

been made from Australia to host ICEC; if interested they should prepare a proposal. MR: So we have three candidates: China, Japan, Australia. All three candidates will be informed to prepare proposal and invited to the next business meeting. SF: solicit as many as possible; allows us to choose consecutive years for ICEC hosts. RM: Spain is also interested. MR: Brazil also interested. So China, Japan, Australia, Brazil, Spain to be invited to show-up at the next business meeting.

6.    Working Groups Activities
- MR: presents slides and provides an overview of TC14 working groups: 14.1 Digital storytelling - CIT, IEEE, AI related events but no space for WG; 14.2. Entertainment Robot – running events but unrelated to WG; 14.3 Theoretical Entertainment - proposal to replace/change name to become 14.3 Serious gaming; 14.4 Games and Entertainment Computing – suggest to change name to Entertainment Games or Commercial Games to distinguish for 14.4, no plans for activities; 14.5 Social and Ethical issues – active organizing events but linked to WG; 14.6 Interactive TV – running own conferences but doesn't respond to emails and not active in context of the WG; 14.7 Art and Entertainment – active also in area of culture as well.
- MR circulates handout on TC14 finances and provides overview of this and IFIP business model, including: IFIP's role in supporting TC14 and events, Springer's publishing role, about Ent Com paying royalties to IFIP - Ent Com Journal wouldn't exist without IFIP. Some discussion followed about IFIP as branding and relevance in comparison to ACM or ACM as potential alternatives.
- SF: raises point about who should take the risk in organizing ICEC - suggests that a huge difference/help for TC14 to provide around $5000 upfront as a loan - in exchange TC14 receives back $5000 + an amount/interest, say $1000. But if there is a loss then TC14 assumes some of the risk and the loan is not paid back in full. RM provides alternative scenario that concurs roughly with this. TM: continuing discussions from last business meeting, asks if any possibility of TC14 members being subsidized to attend ICEC and TC14 meetings?
- Some discussion followed about budget, assuming risk of conference, charging fee,

7. Any other business (AOB)
- Long discussion on kind of award for best paper. Some suggestion as follows: NG: award to have free registration the following year; DO: free registration or money award; SF: $500 for presenting author. Put to vote, decision $500 award.
- MR: members agree to creation of Serious Games WG and to being alternative for TC14.3