CONNECTIONS UK GAMES FAIR 2017

Agricola – Roman Campaign in Britain, AD 82-84 – Decision Games
Hosted by Professor Philip Sabin
Evening Session Only

This is a significantly tweaked version of Joe Miranda's hobby game from the latest issue of *Strategy & Tactics* magazine. It shows how some recreational games can capture quite elegantly and effectively the enduring dynamics and dilemmas of military operations, and also how easily manual wargames may be tweaked by users to create simpler and better tailored game systems. Agricola's campaigns in Scotland offer a classic example of an asymmetric confrontation, with the Romans being dominant in open field battle, field engineering, command and control, logistics and naval power, while the Caledonians emphasise guerrilla tactics, ambush, and the exploitation of their native wilderness terrain. This is also a case study in imperial overstretch, with Rome never being able to complete or sustain the conquest of Scotland due to inadequate surplus forces and the lack of economic returns.

The game captures well the supply and intelligence problems inherent in pre-modern campaigns, and the role of roads and fortifications in changing strategic geography. It also illustrates the potential and problems of joint warfare, via the logistic and transport capabilities of the Roman fleet. Some recent insurgency games are rather abstract in their depictions of reality, but *Agricola* simply but effectively models real military trade-offs such as the tension between bold advances and slow but steady 'engineering campaigns', especially when one's time in command is slipping inexorably by. It has considerable potential as an educative tool for military personnel, particularly given the British connection. In Tacitus's famous words, 'ubi solitudinem faciunt, pacem appellant'....

Report
We had several players per side, producing interesting councils of war and lots of excitement. The Romans sent auxiliary cohorts to patrol nearby tribal centres, while basing their advance on three task forces, each of a single legion with auxiliary support. The Caledonians gathered their main forces in the northern highlands, but held back from engaging except by sending chariot raiders to attack the lagging baggage trains of the Roman columns. The Romans nevertheless made steady progress beyond the river Forth, though suffering some losses when assaulting stubbornly resisting tribal oppida. They launched a bold amphibious stroke against Calgacus's main forces by sailing the IX Hispana up the west coast to modern Lochalsh, but the Caledonians got the better of the inland battle in favourable terrain, and the mauled Roman expedition had to beat a hasty retreat. Calgacus followed up south and stormed a Roman coastal fort in modern Argyll, but many tribesmen drifted away to their homes and the XIV Gemina abandoned its baggage train and made a forced march across from the east coast to seek revenge. This time the Caledonians were overwhelmed, and Calgacus and his remaining forces were killed before they could withdraw to safety. We had completed only 2 of the 3 years

of the game in the time available, but it was obvious that the Romans would win a game victory after breaking the tribal army and killing its charismatic leader. The game neatly illustrated the dynamics of asymmetric warfare and the dangers for the underdogs of getting cocky and exposing themselves to conventional defeat. (Note that the game needed significant modification from its published version, in which it is the Caledonians rather than the Romans who enjoy conventional force superiority!)

Camberley Kriegsspiel - Centre for Historical Analysis and Conflict Research, British Army.
Hosted by Lt Col Ivor Gardiner in room K4.31
Afternoon Session only, from 1600-1700

The Camberley Kriegsspiel is a low complexity adversarial wargame designed as a training tool for planning and executing operations from battlegroup up to brigade level. Participants plan and conduct operations against live opposition over standard maps to allow for force-on-force, Excon controlled, free play. The focus is on command, intelligence, manoeuvre and combat. Fog of war and chance are essential elements. Both sides plan from a Scenario Briefing and play over their own map. Once planning is complete and Excon has updated the Master Map, the Execution Phase commences in a sequence of overlapping player turns with each side running an Action-Reaction-Counteraction sequence during their Execution. Excon updates players on spotted enemy. It requires a minimum of two players and an umpire, but can also be played as teams with a primary umpire and Red and Blue Team umpires. It is a flexible and adaptable toolkit allowing users to set up battles between forces of their choice anywhere in the world. Col Gardiner will give an illustrated talk on the Kriegsspiel, and answer questions.

Caudillo & Brief Border Wars-BTR Games
Hosted by Brian Train
Afternoon Session only

CAUDILLO: In the unruly city of Maracas, capital of the Republic of Virtualia (somewhere in Latin America), the strongman leader Jesus Shaves (pron. "hay-sus sha-bezz") has vacated his seat of power. The struggle to succeed him begins… as players work through this multiplayer (3-5) card game of power politics.

The game is semi-cooperative and semi-competitive, and plays up the constant tension between these two urges. As players vie to create the largest and most durable personal power base (scored periodically throughout the game), the card deck delivers more and more social, economic and political crises that players must deal with collectively (and collect small rewards immediately), or the country will collapse. Coups d'etat provide another quick way to score!

BRIEF BORDER WARS SERIES A collection of relatively simple, chaotic mini-games on 20th century brief border conflicts. Small maps, <50 counters each, action driven by a deck of cards.

Current titles include: - The Football War (El Salvador – Honduras 1969) - Third Indochina War (China – Vietnam 1979) - Operation Attila (Turkey invades Cyprus 1974) – Second Lebanon War (Israel vs Hezbollah 2006). The set will be sold like an old-style SPI "Quadrigame". Likely to be published professionally by Compass Games in 2018.

Report
One session of Caudillo was held, with a full complement of five players. Bob Cordery has provided an excellent and well-illustrated off-side report of his experience playing it at https://wargamingmiscellany.blogspot.co.uk/2017/09/connections-uk-2017-day-2.html. It was pleasing how quickly and well people seemed to become engaged with the game. There is little down-time between player actions, and the game moved pretty briskly (about an hour). Best of all was having two students from Venezuela participating in the game, who weren't fooled at all by the talk of the capital city of "Maracas" and filling the shoes of "Jesus Shaves"!

A day or two after the conference the game was played through again with Dr. Richard Barbrook and some of his colleagues from Class Wargames, with a view to testing some possible rules tweaks. One thing they suggested was deepening and varying the "role playing" aspect of the game (as an optional rule, players may take the role of one of 14 different characters who have slightly different exceptions and advantages in the game – this was not done in the Games Fair game as no one had played before).

Colonial Twilight: The French-Algerian War, 1954-62 - BTR Games
Hosted by Brian Train
Evening Session only

This latest instalment in GMT's popular COIN Series system is the first to be designed for two players. You must consider carefully just what you want to do, and how much of it, before the initiative will slip from your fingers.

The insurgent Front de Liberation Nationale (FLN), starting from modest beginnings, must build massive and enduring popular support for its cause, and organize to assume power when Algeria finally gains its independence. The Government, representing both the colonial authorities and France's military leadership, must engage the nationalist insurgency decisively while striving to preserve the support and commitment of the civilian government.

Players will enter the "heart of darkness" as they use military, political, and economic actions and exploit events to build and maneuver forces to influence or control the population or otherwise achieve their aims along the twisting route to independence.

This session will run the brief but intense Short Scenario, covering the last two years of the war.

Rules and playbook are available for download at
https://boardgamegeek.com/boardgame/180199/colonial-twilight-french-algerian-war-1954-62/files
InsideGMT posts describing aspects of this game are at:
http://www.insidegmt.com/?tag=colonial-twilight

Report

Two sessions were held, one during the informal game night on Tuesday and one in the evening Games Fair session. In the first there was a pair of experienced COIN game players, so they dove right in after learning some of this design's eccentricities (one challenge during playtesting was disciplining testers away from unconsciously porting over rules from other COIN system games they had played to this one, especially those who had worked on *A Distant Plain*). They found the game to move very fast compared to the 4-faction games, therefore the action was more intense and it was easier to see how operations joined up. They liked the Initiative Track too (the mechanism that handles the order of players taking their turn, and what they may choose to do during that turn). The second game was with five players, three FLN and two Government, who would discuss each move and decide collectively (one had to leave early as well). Two players had not played any COIN system games before, so we had a rather slow start while they got used to the idea of operations, special activities etc. There was also a bit of a language barrier sometimes. We got to the end of the first campaign (10 cards) as it was time to pack up, but these players were also impressed by the game.

Cyber Strategy Wargame - Royal Holloway, University of London
Hosted by Andreas Haggman
Both Sessions

This is an educational game based on the UK National Cyber Security Strategy, created as part of ongoing PhD research. The target audience are senior policy- and decision-makers or people in influencing positions, but anyone can play the game and get something out of it.

The game involves teams of players managing limited resources to achieve conflicting objectives. It is structured around five fundamental constituents of cyberspace: government, business, people (these three form a core trinity in the Strategy), military/intelligence, and critical infrastructure; each of which must attack, defend, and prosper. Additional game components include: individual player briefings, a black market, and random event cards. Players engage with key cyber security concepts and terminology to understand interactions, at a strategic level, between the constituents and some of the fog and friction inherent in navigating cyberspace.

A game session comprises about 90 minutes playtime, followed by a discussion to draw out lessons learned. The game has been played at the UK Defence Academy (Shrivenham), German Command and Staff College (Hamburg), Swedish Defence University (Stockholm), NATO Centre of Excellence for Defence Against Terrorism (Ankara), Foreign and

Commonwealth Office (London), Defence School of Communications and Information Systems (Blandford), plus numerous private companies and organisations.

Report
The afternoon game started quietly, with the UK deterring Russian attacks by using defensive assets. Some black market bidding in the mid-game saw both teams acquire new assets, though no arms race developed. The UK came under repeated ransomware attacks but survived despite refusing to pay ransoms. By the end, attack vectors targeting both teams' critical national infrastructures had been opened, with full-scale cyber war imminent if the game had not reached the final turn. The result was a narrow 31-27 points victory to Russia.

The evening game also started quietly, with Russia assuming a cautious stance despite the UK being open to attack. The action picked up in the mid-game when a desirable black market asset became available, but unfortunately Russia was simultaneously embargoed and unable to compete for the asset. Conceding defeat in the arms race, Russia instead went on the offensive with their online trolls, launching three successful attacks in a row, including a paralysing ransomware attack. With the UK refusing to pay the ransom and left defenceless, a roll of 6 with the final attack took out both the electorate and UK government while EDF Energy were left clinging to life. The game ended prematurely with a 28-25 points victory to Russia, the UK's face only saved by a strong performance early in the game.

CyberStrike– Roke Manor Research
Hosted by Jonathan Hodges, in room K4U.04
Both Sessions

CyberStrike is unique in that it combines cyber and electronic warfare effects with military activity at the *tactical* level. It is designed to understand the interaction between Cyber/EW and tactical activityin the future connected battlespace. The Blue player represents a NATO style force deploying into a failing city, attempting to defeat an insurgent adversary- Red. Red can use commercially available cyber and EW technologies to remove many Blue advantages cheaply and effectively, whilst Blue must try to use its own cyber and EW technologies to defeat Red countermeasures, without turning local opinion against them and losing the influence battle.

This cyber enabled struggle is played out as an open board game, with Red and Blue players supporting the capture of ground with cyber and EW effects, played as cards. These effects are bought using resources, which can be increased by capturing city blocks, and lost by being driven from the city by the opposition.

Red and Blue can also seek to capture key elements of the city's infrastructure, which will give them either influence or cyber advantage once they are secured. The goal of Red is simply to remain as an actor of influence within the city, whilst Blue needs to defeat Red before support for the deployment is lost.

Dogfight - King's College London
Hosted by Professor Philip Sabin
Afternoon Session only

This is a simple grand tactical sim of WW2 fighter combat between escorts and interceptors as they seek to protect or assail a formation of bombers. Each turn represents 10-15 seconds, and each counter represents a flight of 4-6 fighters. The game highlights especially the importance of altitude and the utility of covering tactics to protect other fighter or bomber formations. Escorts can easily cover the bombers, but in doing so they become predictable and expose themselves to attack. Interceptors need to balance their efforts carefully between engaging the bombers and dogfighting with the escorts. The result is a swirling contest of manoeuvre which provides important insights into the enduring mechanics of aerial combat and the importance of teamwork and tactical cooperation.

More generally, the sim offers a valuable case study in how even a complex multi-dimensional phenomenon such as aerial combat may be captured in a simple and fast-moving manual game, through judicious use of abstraction to focus on the essentials without getting bogged down in technical details. It also showcases the flexibility of manual wargame design. The system evolved as a simpler spin-off of Phil Sabin's *Angels One Five* sim as used in his air power teaching over many years, and it is designed to use the same map and counters as in Lee Brimmicombe-Wood's *Wing Leader* sims. It shows how easily users can adapt existing manual game systems and components to meet their own individual requirements.There will be time for at least two complete games, with different scenarios. The full rules and two illustrated sample games may be found by Googling 'Wing Leader BGG'.

Report
We completed two full games, despite the need for significant initial explanation of the abstract 2D representation of the corridor of airspace around the bombers (complicated by the use of model aircraft stands on a large sloping board instead of the smaller side view counters in the *Wing Leader* sims). In the first game, each of the 7 players took command of one fighter flight as British Hurricanes and Spitfires intercepted Dornier 17s escorted by Bf-109s in 1940. The escorts were drawn out of position as they attempted to engage the approaching interceptors, and the British inflicted significantly more hits than they suffered. In the second game, some players left to attend their booked Camberley Kriegsspiel talk, but the remainder simply took command of 2 flights each. This time the escorts learnt from previous experience and established an early advantage in hits, but the RAF fighters persisted and managed to even the score before they had to break off the engagement. It was very satisfying that the games moved so swiftly, but a key lesson was that it is important for players to be able to visualise more easily the 3D representation. With fewer people, it will be possible to use the smaller original board and side view counters, and to use towers of transparent Lego bricks to raise the counters above the board to make the third lateral dimension easier to grasp.

Future of Global Salafi Jihad - ICONS Project (University of Maryland) – Support to the United States National Counter Terrorism Center
Hosted by Devin Ellis, in room K4U.04
Afternoon Session only

This medium-term strategy game is designed to explore possible trajectories for major Salafi Jihadist organizations in a Post-Fall of Raqqa setting. The game mechanics focus on strategy and resource trade-offs that groups must make between local and global objectives, and how and why they may choose to operate in different geographic regions around the globe.

This game is under development to support the US National Counter Terrorism Center's Directorate of Strategic and Operational Planning as they carry out a series of Net Assessment activities focused on the future of global Salafi Jihad.

HOSPEX Tabletop - A Field Hospital Simulation - HQ Army Medical Services
Hosted by Colonel David Vassallo
Afternoon Session only

The HOSPEX Tabletop is a low tech but high impact military medical wargame drawing on many years' experience of field hospital deployments and major incidents in combat zones. It has elicited a lot of interest from many NATO Defence Forces as a way of preparing medical staff before full scale exercises or deployments, and also has civilian relevance for terrorist incidents.

The HOSPEX Tabletop is normally undertaken as a morning or an afternoon Workshop. It normally uses two to five tabletop areas representing deployed NATO Hospitals during a contingency operation (including for interest the renowned Camp Bastion Hospital in Afghanistan). A maximum of two playboards will be used during this Conference.

Each playboard has cards representing each member of the medical staff on location. Casualties are represented by sets of cards in plastic wallets, replicating particular scenarios, from single trauma cases up to a variety of major incidents, including terrorist bombings. There are other visual aids with a light hearted touch. Participants learn and practise the principles of command and control, safety, communication, assessment, triage, treatment and transport (CSCATTT), testing their decision skills, in an enjoyable and interactive learning environment during a session lasting up to two hours.

Maillot Jaune
Hosted by Charles Vasey
Afternoon Session only

Maillot Jaune is an attempt to recreate a major three-week cycling tour with flat, broken and mountain stages and time trials. Each player represents the DirecteurSportif of a cycling team. All teams are exactly the same, with their abilities reduced to a number of tactics cards for each kind of stage. This allows a five to six hour stage to be covered by a single card play, or by three in the prestigious mountain stages. Although by the end of the game each team will have received the same cards, they are not all available at the start of the Tour, with new cards being received each rest day. The system is double-blind bidding. The challenge is to see if players can derive enough data to build a successful strategy and ride into Paris drinking the champers. No cycling knowledge is needed, but it will not harm your chances.

Report

This is a game designed to knock out a cycling three-week grand tour in about two hours. Still under playtest, the aim of playing it was to see how players could handle a multi blind bidding system (MBB). MDB means that you play your cards/choose your plays against other players without seeing what they are doing first. It can lead to claims that one might as well play your cards randomly - a claim notably made by those unable to spot any patterns in the play of others. In its double form MDB was first encountered by me in Tom Shaw's excellent Football Strategy on the NFL where you call an offensive play and your opponent reveals his defence card. The two are compared and the result applied. Those who knew little of the game did indeed play randomly, but the repeated prevalence of victory by certain players suggested to me that one can play blind yet play with skill.

At Connections I had three players (and I ran a random fourth), each playing the *directeur sportif* of a Team as we rode the 2010 Giro de France - not the Tour of course because that might give me horrid legal problems. Over the game each player has the same deck of cards split into Flat/Broken, Mountain and Time Trial stages. Each player does not get all his cards at once however, with more being added each Rest Day until by the third week all have been available. The Flat/Broken stages are single-card with the eternal war between the breakaway and the Peloton. If the Peloton wins there is a sprint finish. The mountain stages are each raced over three climbs with a mixture of Climbers, Domestiques, Chasers and Descenders. Time Trials are simply the application of speed cards: perhaps the last design area to be considered.

I was surprised by how quickly the players got into the choices. The Broken stages caused few "disasters" (*chutes*, mechanicals, punctures, crosswinds), but the mountains had more than enough, leaving the French Team of *Gâteaux Délicieux* to win a mighty four mountain stages. The game generated a lot of narrative, but I was not sure of how it would appeal to some players who find they cannot accept the horrors of double-blind playing. The players were kind enough to say they found they could develop strategies but (curses) the random team did win. On reflection I might make the *maillot à pois* and *maillot vert* optional, though I enjoy the way that with no dice and the same cards there can be major differences in result.

Maritime Operations Decision Exploration game - Naval Undersea Warfare Center
Hosted by Paul Vebber
Evening Session only

The game is a "hex and counter" style wargame designed to introduce players to maritime operations and the capabilities that enable successful maritime warfighting. It uses a limited framework of rules and promotes eliciting player discussion of why they believe their capabilities will achieve the objectives they set.

There are 4 learning objectives the game is designed to teach players:

1). Describe the relations between combat forces operating in the 6 warfare domains: Aerospace, Sea Surface, Undersea, Land, Electromagnetic spectrum (EMS) and cyberspace.

2) Describe the relationships between the operational dimensions of Time, Space, and Force in a major theater conflict.

3) Describe basic concepts of operation (CONOPS) in a major theater war and related planning factors.

4) Describe the relationship between technological capabilities and operational warfighting effects.

The game will use the South China Sea as the sandbox for a generic scenario that uses notional forces from mythical countries.

Matrix Game Construction Kit
Hosted by Professor Rex Brynen and Major Tom Mouat, in room K4U.04
Both Sessions

The Matrix Game Construction Kitprovides everything you need to design and play matrix games. This includes a set of basic and advanced game rules, guidance on game facilitation and design, over 250 reusable tokens, almost 800 unit stickers, isomorphic map tiles, other markers, marker tracks, dice, and two complete matrix games. Purchasers of the kit also have access to online resources, allowing them to print additional stickers as required. Development of MaGCK was supported by Dstl.

Two demonstration games will be offered. In the afternoon session, we will run A RECKONING OF VULTURES (included with MaGCK), a game of coup plotting and political intrigue in the fictional Republic of Matrixia. In the evening session, ISRAEL-HIZBULLAH WAR 201? (developed with MaGCK) will explore a possible future conflict between Israel and Hizbullah.

RCAT –A Year in Iraq, 2004-2005 - Cranfield University
Hosted by Jeremy Smith and Graham Longley-Brown
Both Sessions

RCAT – Iraq 2003-2009 was produced as an historical test during the formal Verification & Validation process of RCAT by Dstl. The aim of the test was 'to compare an RCAT simulation of the post-kinetic phases of the Iraq War from 2003-2009 to the historical reality, identify variances and examine the reasons for these in order to improve the validity of the RCAT system.'

The game explores the Iraq War in turns of 6-months, starting after the initial invasion had been resolved, and concentrating on the COIN, stabilisation and security sector reform aspects of the campaign. There are four player cells to start: Coalition (Blue); Iraqi Government (Green); Sunni (Red); and Shi'a (Orange). Each player cells requires two people. If factions split, other cells can be added as needed e.g. AQ, a Shi'a Iraqi Government etc.

Force Elements are represented at the brigade (or equivalent) level. Being an operational level wargame, the reactions and perspectives of population groups, and regional and international actors are crucial. These are modelled using the 'Marker Track' system integral to all RCAT games, and are where the game is won or lost.

Report
Both games simulated a 12-month period, from April 2004 – April 2005. This was deliberately selected to cover the period of the Battles of Fallujah 1 and 2. Hence both games started with an inject that depicted the deteriorating situation in Fallujah: US over-reaction to protests and local attacks leading to the 'Blackwater Incident' and the appearance of formed Sunni insurgent groups in Fallujah.

In the afternoon game, both Sunni and Shi'a insurgent players rapidly recruited insurgents in Fallujah and Sadr City respectively. Spectacular attacks were mounted against Coalition forces, and sectarian violence and looting spread throughout Baghdad and the Sunni Triangle. The Coalition reacted to the newly formed insurgent groups with force – too much force. Air strikes supported large-scale attacks by US marines in Fallujah and the 1st Armoured Division in Baghdad. Lasting weeks, none of these attacks achieved clear success against either insurgent grouping, and caused considerable collateral damage that led to internally displaced persons leaving Fallujah and Sadr City in great numbers. Support for the Coalition among the international community and regional countries slumped, leaving the US and her allies in a precarious position. Taking advantage of these distractions, the Kurds established themselves in the Mosul/Kirkuk area. They quickly started rebuilding critical national infrastructure in Kurdistan and recruited new Peshmerga fighters. By April 2005 they were well on their way to an autonomous Kurdistan in northern Iraq. All the time, the Iraqi Interim Governing Council (IGC) found itself paralysed by internal divisions and wholly reliant on the Coalition for resources with which to achieve its objectives; it did little. At the end of the game, things looked desperate

for the Coalition, which was struggling to contain the insurgency militarily and quickly losing the support of local groups, across the region and among the international community. The Shi'a insurgents were satisfied with progress, while the Sunni insurgents 'could not have envisaged things going any better.'

In complete contrast, in the evening game, neither Sunni nor Shi'a insurgents recruited fighters or confronted the Coalition in any way initially; both concentrated on providing basic SWET (sewerage, water, electricity and trash removal), messaging key regional players and striking local deals with the Coalition and Interim Governing Council. In the case of the Shi'a, this 'live and let live' with the Coalition in southern Iraq allowed the rapid establishment of a genuine alternative government to that of the IGC, which looked on helpless as its 'allies' made concession after concession around Basrah, Al Amara and Karbala. The Kurds again easily took control of Mosul and Kirkuk, this time starting a campaign of coercion against the Arab populations, intended to force them out of the area. In this, they were at best ignored and, at worst, actively assisted, by the Coalition, who seemed content to let the Kurds become their proxies in northern Iraq. An eerie sense of calm and unlikely cooperation spread over Iraq… until spontaneous trouble erupted in Fallujah. In contrast to their strategy to date, the Coalition responded with force, attempting to seek out and destroy Sunni insurgents wherever they materialised. In this, they achieved some success – but at the cost of questions at home and among the international community concerning the levels of violence and collateral damage caused. They also failed to quell a rising by the Mahdi Army in East Baghdad. By April 2005, the Shi'a were well on their way to a state-within-a-state in southern Iraq, with formed groups roaming freely in Basrah, Karbala and Al Amara and trade routes to Iran opening up for exporting oil. The same was true for the Kurds in the north around Mosul, Kirkuk and Erbil. The Coalition seemed content to let this happen, despite condemnation from home and the international community; trouble lay ahead…

Strategic Level Decision Making in Disaster Management - Netherlands
Organisation for applied scientific research TNO.
        Hosted by Anja van der Hulst
Both Sessions

The DRIVER Strategic Level Decision Making game aims at training higher level commanders in decision making in disaster management. The current version employs a flooding scenario. It presents the players in a pressure cooker session with a number of really hard dilemmas. For each of the dilemmas, there will be advisors that can be consulted, providing, for example, a political, technical, financial or legal perspective. The game session is fairly short: a 20 minute game session and a (in this case 10 minute) reflection. We'll run a number of sessions during a Games Fair session. The game was developed within the EU project DRIVER and we are testing the game for that project.

Winged Exile–Air Warfare School, Cranwell
Hosted by Flight Lieutenant Colin Bell
Both Sessions

Winged Exile is an Operational Level Air War Game. It has been utilised with Air Cadets and Officer Cadets. A more advanced version will be trialled on Basic Air Warfare Course 50 in September for introduction into the BAWC as part of initial officer training. Winged Exile allows two teams to compete as opposing JFACs with asymmetric missions. The game focuses on the broad brush capabilities of RAF aircraft and how they will operate in a contested environment. Command and Control in an air environment is significantly important and both teams will have different considerations to factor into their planning. Featuring simultaneous planning phases and movement phases for both teams, the game tries to bring the dynamic nature of air combat into reality, forcing both sides to consider the use of Air Power in both time and space. It is a significant training tool to teach how the RAF operates, and the fundamental capabilities of some of the aircraft. Designed for two teams, it can be played by only two. It requires nothing more than access to a printer, and has been designed to be a standalone pdf that can be printed and utilised by any interested groups as a way of running an Operational Air War, displaying some of the challenges faced by a real JFAC.

Report
Since the game's main target audience is Officer Cadets, some of whom will never have played wargames at all, the Games Fair tested its scalability for greater experience. There was some excellent feedback, including suggestions for how the game could be developed further, for example to bring in fuel and ammunition. The components were praised and the game received more attention during the conference when people had seen my presentation as part of the first panel earlier that morning.

The fact that both Red and Blue sides utilised the same RAF assets seemed quite novel to many attending, although as an aid to training the fundamentals were largely complimented. The biggest difference was watching gamers playing to win, regardless of the fact that those based in their Air Defence Operations Centre would have been obliterated, because of the method of scoring used in the game. This has further provided some significant layers of feedback in how this could be modified to create friction between the offensive and defensive aspects for both opposing forces. The game demonstrated an overall robustness in design and playability, as I had hoped it would.