

### **Breakout Topic #1: Planning for analysis (Host: Fred Cameron)**

#### Background:

Once a war game is over, the builders want to know more than just who won and who lost.

Apart from simply declaring a winner and a loser, how good or bad were the results? Are casualty counts enough to characterize the results? What about ground gained or lost? Which side accomplished the assigned objectives? Did the scenario allow for exploration of all the issues that might have led to winning or to losing?

Like military historians analyzing battles of the past, wargamers will want to know: What decisions were made? Were they good or bad decisions? When confronted with various problems, how did players respond and how did the responses affect the outcomes? Were there particular tactics or equipment that were more effective than expected, or less effective? Did the scenario allow for the players to encounter these sorts of issues? Was the scenario rich enough to provide the necessary detail in the results?

War game teams would be embarrassed to finish a game and find that the scenario was incomplete in pursuing some of the most intriguing aspects of a battle. “Ahh, the deception plan.... we sort of neglected to allow for one in the scenario.” “Ahh, logistics were certainly key in this battle.... But we never put a logistics component into the scenario.” “Oops!”

#### Objective:

Discuss various ways scenarios can be crafted to ensure that the analysis of the results will be both (fairly) easy, and also credible.

### **Breakout Topic #2: Ensuring your scenario stresses your problem – scenarios for break point analysis (Host: Fred Bowden)**

#### Background:

When evidence-based analysis is needed to support a key decision, scenario builders must consider the context in which to gather and generate that evidence. If one source of your evidence is a wargame, you must consider how key factors around that decision can be explored as part of the wargame. Hence you must carefully select/design the right scenario.

What are processes that can be used to ensure your scenario examines the key factors? How do you have this discussion with your stakeholders? How do you characterize the differences between scenarios? Are there ways of understanding how results of a given scenario can be transferred to another one? What is the relationship between your scenario and finding break points relevant to the decision you are supporting?

#### Objective:

Discuss various ways of considering how to account for key decision variables in scenario design.

### **Breakout Topic #3: Achieving fit-for-purpose scenario-building (Host: Hiro Akutsu)**

#### Background:

Writing fit-for-purpose scenarios is important but is often challenging in wargame design. This breakout group is intended as a forum for interested participants to exchange their best practice in achieving fit-for-purpose scenario-building. Participants are expected to respond to such question as:

What is the very first thing to consider in achieving fit-for-purpose?

What checkpoints do you use to make sure your scenario is fit for the purpose?

Objective:

Participants will be encouraged to discuss what constitutes a fit-for-purpose scenario and how to approach writing one.

**Breakout Topic #4: Exploring scenario space dimensions (Host: d Brandon Pincombe)**

Background:

In any scenario based analysis the first step is considering the dimensions of the context being explored. It is through the definition of these dimensions that you are able to provide a framework to ensure that you don't miss any key aspects of the problem.

The importance of a given dimension depends on the purpose of the wargaming being designed. Failing to consider the scenario dimension during design can mean that key aspects are missed resulting in poor analysis for analytical wargaming or limited enjoyment for entertainment wargaming.

An example scenario space dimensionalisation is given in Pincombe *et. al.*<sup>1</sup> where they defined the dimensions of the future land battle space. In this paper the dimensions were defined as Own Force Capabilities, Physical Environment, Human Terrain, Operational Partnerships, Socio-political Issues and the Nature, Diversity and Intensity of Threat.

Some questions considered in this breakout group include: Do these dimensions translate to other contexts such as business wargaming? Are these dimensions complete given the changing nature of warfare? What are possible drivers for key dimensions? How do you test that you've covered the right dimensions within a game?

Objective:

Using the dimensions defined as a starting point consider how these need to be extended, added to or removed as part of designing different wargame scenarios.

---

<sup>1</sup> B Pincombe *et. al.* (2013), **Ascertaining a hierarchy of dimensions from time-poor experts: Linking tactical vignettes to strategic scenarios**, *Technological Forecasting & Social Change*, 80, 584-598