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Abstract

Via the use of applied games design methodologies, based on analytical grounding, this paper examines the possibility of developing a new type of Policy Game, Wicked Games, as Participatory Design method for use when working with multiple stakeholders on Critical, Crucial, Complex and Wicked Problems (Rittel & Webber 1973). This paper approaches this topic from a Games Design Research perspective, to shed new light on the qualities of medium for participatory designers. This paper provides a definition of, design heuristics for, and an example of a Wicked Game as a starting point for further work within the topic, as well as providing an analysis of a Formal Analysis as a methodology for extracting tacit knowledge from games, Distributed Playtests as a means for gathering information to allow rapid iteration within games design.
Activist Game: Are games of a political nature, concerned with raising issues of social concern and challenging the current hegemony, they do not necessarily follow any specific rhetorical or pedagogical form, they are grouped by the topic of their content.

Characteristics: Are the facets of any given game, that help describe that game and how it operates. Things like how many players does the game require, is it competitive or cooperative, etc.

Distributed Playtesting: Is playtesting conducted by someone other than the core games design team, on behalf of the core games design team, without any of the core games design team being present to observe the playtest.

Empathy Game: If we take empathy as the ability to understand the situation another is in, Empathy Games can be described as those games that seek to use the medium of games as a means to make us feel, or understand the situation of another, either by directly putting players in the position of the other, or by allowing players to view the impacts on another, as their primary goal.

Explorative Play: Is the structured, or guided exploration of an object (where objects can be material, immaterial or a collection of objects linked together by a space) via play.

Game: Games are ‘play’ activities defined and constrained by the following four traits, goals internal to the activity itself, rules that govern how play should be conducted, a feedback system that allows players to observe the state of play, and voluntary participation.

Hybrid Game: Is a game that contains both digital and physical elements, other than controllers or input devices required for the operation of digital games only.

Hyperobjects: Are objects so vast, and distributed in time and space as to defy spatiotemporal specificity (Morton 2013). Hyperobjects have five characteristics, they are Viscous (other objects become attached to them), Molten (they refute the idea that spacetime is fixed, concrete, and consistent), Nonlocal (they exist in more spaces and times at once, and can’t therefore be viewed in their entirety), Phased (occupy a higher-dimensional space than we can observe) and Interobjective (are formed by relations between more than one object).

Magic Circle: Is the protective frame that surrounds a person, or multiple people in a playful state of mind (psychological bubble), the social contract that constitutes the action of playing a game (social borders) and the spatial or temporal cultural situation the play is located (arena)(Stenros 2012).

Medium: Is the intervening substance through which sensory impressions are conveyed or physical forces are transmitted.
**Participatory Design**: is an approach to the assessment, design, and development of an artefact via the engagement of, and active involvement of potential or current end-users of the artefact within the design and decision-making processes.

**Persuasive Game**: Are games that use procedural rhetoric to deliberatively persuade another to a point of view or action unidirectionally.

**Play**: Is engaging in activity for purely enjoyment and recreational purposes as an expression of freedom (it is not freedom itself) using whatever materials are available, rather than an activity which is serious or has a practical purpose, or goal.

**Playcentric**: An activity that is conducted via the medium of play, but where play itself is not the focus of the outcome necessarily.

**Playtesting**: Is the assessment of the interaction between players and game as an activity, to gain insight into how players experience the game, and how the game performs.

**Policy Games**: These are games of any nature (Serious, Persuasive, Simulation etc) that expressly deal with Public Policy issues.

**Serious Game**: Are a form of videogame pedagogy that seeks to teach people about how things ‘are’ within the current hegemony, or how to do things within pre-existing systems, or practice.

**Simulation**: Are representations of one system through the use of another, that don’t have specific repetitive and goal-oriented activities, and no specific predefined patterns in time. There’s no set structure to a simulation, and no ‘end’ or ‘win’ state within a simulation, which is required for classification as a game.

**Wicked Game**: Use Explorative Play of a simulated Public Policy situation or perspective, with exposed, simplified and modifiable rules and mechanics to allow players to safely explore and iterate policy interventions via game modification or development. They should be a Rhetoric free zone, and encourage a dialogue between players, or players and the game.

**Wicked Problem**: This definition is based on Rittel & Webber (1973) which states Wicked Problems are problems that are difficult, or impossible to solve because of incomplete, contradictory, and changing requirements, that make the problems either difficult to recognize, or frame, but with Head & Alford’s (2015) caveat that Wicked Problems can be tackled by addressing their ‘degrees of wickedness’, if these degrees can be extracted and made abstract.
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1.0 Introduction

The work contained within this thesis, is analytically grounded, and seeks to develop a knowledge contribution via the application of a games design process (Löwgren 2007). This process is expressly concerned with developing and examining games design methodologies, as tools for Participatory Designers to use within difficult Public Policy development contexts, namely Critical, Crucial, Complex and Wicked Problems. There’s a history of doing Participatory Design (PD hereafter) through games’ (Muller et al 1994), although commonly it appears to be used as a method for enabling communication, either as boundary object (Leigh Star & Griesemer 1989) in a group workshop setting, or as a direct communicative element. The idea being to use off-the-shelf games to learn about users or participants, and for developing a mutual understanding of the development task (Brandt & Messeter 2004).

However, there’s acknowledgement that ‘games’ can offer far more than just a means of facilitating communication, or ‘warm-up’ exercises within workshop settings (Brandt 2006). Brandt describes the possibility of designing exploratory design games as an entertaining and engaging framework for participation within PD, to increase participation, but also to address certain aspects of the PD process (Brandt 2006). These approaches include:

- **Games to Conceptualize Designing**: Are games that are purposefully abstracted and stylized to eliminate functional knowledge. The idea is to learn about the concepts the game makers and the game players hold.
- **The Exchange Perspective Games**: Are thought experiments and techniques that are playful procedures for inquiry to access the subconscious mind. An example would be the Exquisite Corps game.
- **Negotiation and Work-flow Oriented Design Games**: Are focused on creating a mutual understanding of the work context to design for. It involves simulations of worlds or practices, with participants playing themselves.
- **Scenario Oriented Design Games**: Are enacted scenario constructions, which can be viewed as an exploratory design game, because it involves a play with props.

What Brandt describes as design games often fall short of meeting the criteria for being called games, they’re more play, or roleplay. Brandt does identify many of the medium’s characteristics that make games such a potentially powerful tool within PD, like the ability to build and engage with speculative futures, their ability to allow people to view the world from other perspectives, and to do so safely (Brandt 2006), it’s just that the approaches described don’t use these qualities fully. Ultimately, games are relegated to a tool, or technique for engaging, telling or enacting within PD (Brandt et al 2013, pg.170-173).

The research focus so far hasn’t been from a games design perspective, much of what is defined as games within the PD literature would be defined as play within games design research. Brandt’s work is from a Wittgensteinian language game perspective, it hasn’t been about maximising the effectiveness of the medium. This project seeks to address this by taking a games design perspective, for the following reasons:

- The timeframe for the thesis work meant entering any meaningful PD process was nigh on impossible.
- The work conducted thus far has focussed on the PD aspect, leaving an opening to generate some useful knowledge for the field from a games design stance.
- The use of games, or more accurately play, within PD is not used as a means of direct problem solving, it’s often deployed as an ancillary tool.
When talking about games, even within other contexts, it’s more productive to do so acknowledging the full breadth and depth of the Medium.

The work within PD does point towards the potential of using games, and games design more fully within PD.

1.1 The Challenges We Face: Wicked Problems

The term ‘Wicked Problems’ was first used, and defined by Rittel & Webber (1973), they were described as problems that are difficult, or impossible to solve because of incomplete, contradictory, and changing requirements, that make the problems either difficult to recognize, or frame. These Wicked Problems that we currently face within, and between our societies are of such a scale as to be termed ‘hyperobjects’ (Morton 2013, pg.27-32), meaning they’re often so large in scale as to be impossible to view within their entirety. Hyperobjects often ‘suck-in’ further problems changing their shape and dimensions, meaning they evolve and never stand still. Such Wicked Problems often require multiple fields of expertise to fully understand them, and multiple perspectives to define their shape. So, to be able to tackle such problems we require either the ability, or opportunities to be able to view them from multiple perspectives, and to tackle them in a coordinated fashion from those same perspectives.

Climate Change, Refugees, Poverty, Inequality and many more societal issues, are commonly described as Wicked Problems, and standard governmental policy interventions such as unidirectional policy and implementation / service delivery are ill-equipped to deal with such issues (kettl 2009), and standardised approaches are unable to effectively deal with these multi-faceted complex issues (Head & Alford 2015). We have entered the age of the Anthropocene (Bonneuil & Fressoz 2016) where we can say with certainty that it’s human activity that’s the largest factor on determining the nature of the earths biosphere and climate, where capitalism is leading to wider inequality, and poverty is increasing despite traditional wealth redistribution methods (Streeck 2016). We’re faced with, and beset on all sides by Wicked Problems, where there are no easy answers, and where the problems appear so large, that knowing where to start is a daunting task (Kolko 2012, pg.10-11).

1.1.1 Defining Wicked Problems

What exactly are Wicked Problems, and how are they defined? Rittel & Webber (1973) defined ‘Wicked Problems’ as having ten characteristics:

1. No clear or definitive formulation.
2. They have no definitive solution.
3. Their solutions are viewed as good or bad, not true or false.
4. Wicked Problems have no immediate or final test of a solution.
5. Every Wicked Problem, because of its complex and mutable nature, are unique.
6. Every Wicked Problem is a symptom of another problem, or a wider systemic failure.
7. Every policy intervention to a Wicked Problem is a one-off attempt, it can’t be undone, and there is no scope for trial and error approaches normally adopted by policy makers.
8. Discrepancies that represent a Wicked Problem can be explained form numerous perspectives, and in varied ways.
9. Wicked Problems don’t have enumerable solutions, or an endless amount of interventions, yet the interventions there are, aren’t easily described or easy to document.
10. The Policy Officer, or Strategist doesn’t have the option to be “right” or “wrong”, because public tolerance of failure is low, and the public discourse around Wicked Problems is at best dichotomous, and more often multivariate.
Although the definition has been expanded upon, and further explored, those are the defining characteristics of Wicked Problems. Below is a simplified visual representation of the nature of wicked problems as defined by Rittel & Webber:

The simple reality is that Governmental, and Public Bodies are not well equipped to respond, or deal with effectively nonroutine, and nonstandard service requests and policy challenges (Head & Alford 2015). Head & Alford (2015) also argue that there are ‘degrees of wickedness’ that can be understood as multiple dimensions of the same thing, yet conversely systems theory precludes the possibility that social and economic problems can be addressed in isolation (Ackoff 1974, pg.21-22). Rittel & Webber’s definition also states that Wicked Problems are grounded within value perspectives, as such the general rational scientific approaches characterised by most Public Policy intervention styles, which are rational-technical based, are not wholly sufficient to tackle their entirety (Rein 1976). It’s these competing, and often contradictory elements that lead researchers, policy workers and indeed Rittel & Webber to conclude that Wicked Problems are unsolvable.

Head & Alford (2015) disagree with Rittel & Webber (1973) that there are no reliable criteria with which to assess the success, or otherwise, of different interventions, and that by extension learning by experience isn’t possible with policy interventions in Wicked Problems. Head & Alford (2015) argue that although the solutions dealing with any given Wicked Problem is open to further interrogation and adaptation, this isn’t necessarily ‘a bad thing’, and Wicked Problems can be tackled by addressing their ‘degrees of wickedness’, if these degrees can be extracted and made abstract. It’s this definition of ‘Wicked Problems’ that is used within this research, that they can been abstracted, and recontextualized into more manageable components, if we develop the tools and methodologies for doing so (Head 2008). For example, if part of the Wicked Problem is stakeholder disagreement, based on conflicting values or perceptions, then this suggests a solution of reducing conflict through dialog (Innes & Booher 1999), if the issue is insufficient knowledge, then the solution would imply further research and data collection (Petticrew & Roberts 2005).

1.1.2 Critical, Crucial and Complex Problems

There are of course serious problems facing society, policy makers and participatory designers that choose to work with them, that aren’t exactly ‘Wicked’ in the Rittel & Webber (1973) sense of the phrase, but nevertheless pose complex, critical and crucial problems of public concern:
**Critical Problems**: have serious and known consequences, with clear solutions, but require multiple stakeholders to agree with the solution and enact it, even though it might be detrimental to some stakeholders.

**Crucial Problems**: can affect multiple stakeholders, but invariably only adversely affect specific stakeholders and not others. The solution to these problems are not always clear, and often require coordination with multiple and often conflicting stakeholders.

**Complex Problems**: are problems, questions or issues that cannot be answered through simple logical procedures. They generally require abstract reasoning to be applied through multiple frames of reference, integrating multiple stakeholder input into the solution, normally leading to the creation of a new body or stakeholder.

The proposals contained in this work will be relevant to these classifications of policy problems too.

### 1.1.3 Public Policy Responses & the Policy Development Process

Public policy responses to Wicked Problems have been tokenistic at best, especially around climate change (Collins & Ison 2009), and at worst, abject paralysis (Termeer et al 2012, pg.27-39). The standard model of policy intervention is that of rational-technical theory, and the waterfall development model, that’s usually depicted like this:

![Policy Development Process](image_url)

Fig.2 Policy Development Process

The start of any policy management or development cycle begins with an ‘issue’ (Howlett & Giest 2013, pg.18-19). This is followed by a period of ‘Analysis’ and ‘Definition’, where the phenomenon, or issue is fully explored and researched, it’s within this stage that Wicked Problems present their first challenge, namely that the issue is normally so large, multi-faceted, and changing, that the process often gets ‘stuck’ at this stage (Levin et al 2007), and without these two stages being completed moving onto designing policy interventions is nigh on impossible. There isn’t even the possibility of falling back on well-trodden policy designs and heuristics (Schneider 2013, pg.225) given the unique nature of each problem. This waterfall model, with ‘milestones’, followed by a ‘period of specification’ which leads to a ‘project plan’ and ‘planned production’ was the normal mode of development employed within the games industry (Niedenthal 2007).

The emergent nature of gameplay, and the design of games themselves could very well be described as a Wicked Problem, especially given that game development is itself a complex and multidisciplinary activity (Petrillo & Pimenta 2010). Game development isn’t a linear form of production, it’s both generative and iterative, and the games industry has moved towards new models of production such as ‘Agile’ (Koepke et al 2013), that focus on constant iteration, adaptive and multi-level planning, continuous testing and cross-functional teams to move work forward, without the need to focus on specific goals, or sequential development. These qualities would be of benefit within the
policy development process, there have already been moves towards such concepts via ‘interactive policy making’ (Torfingm & Triantafillou 2013, pg.4). While the methodologies might be useful in terms of developing policy, this paper is proposing taking it one step further, and abstracting and recontextualizing the process as games development, taking the problem and using the games development process as a means for exploring policy issues, then using the product of that process, games, to further iterate policy.

1.2 Design and Wicked Problems

Designers have attempted to work with Wicked Problems, and the concept before; Richard Buchanan (1992) first identified the linkages between design thinking, and Rittel & Webber’s concept of Wicked Problems. Buchanan (1992) proposed that not only were designers increasingly faced with dealing with Wicked Problems, but that the process of design was often a Wicked Problem, as it’s tasked with combining the different and not entirely compatible value propositions and knowledge of the natural and social sciences, as well as aspects of the humanities into products, or solutions. However, the history of design and Wicked Problems hasn’t been altogether productive, initial design methods focus on automation, and efficiency led to design being another conflicting value proposition within the milieu of already conflicting value propositions, itself another form of rational-technical thinking. Yet, latterly design has tended to answer the questions posed by Wicked Problems with more questions (Coyne 2005). So, what’s the use of designers pointing to problems with attempted solutions, rather than offering any real solutions themselves?

When faced with unpredictability Wolfgang Jonas argues that design needs accept the limits of what’s knowable, rather than try to expand rationality in such situations, accept that designers will be operating from a perspective of “not-knowing” (Jonas, 2003). Once designers have accepted this it should be possible, with scientific and rational backing, to generatively explore the unknown safely (Jonas, 2003). PD takes this one step further, by allowing designers to work with experts who hold the knowledge required, evolving ideas collaboratively from the bottom-up by infrastructuring within agonistic spaces (Björgvinsson et al 2010). So, there are generative qualities to design thinking that could, and should be of value in tackling Wicked Problems. Yet for all the qualities, and benefits that taking a generative designerly approach to Wicked Problems could afford us, as opposed to more traditional rational-technical approaches, there stubbornly remains the problem of uncertain outcomes:

“If we cannot predict the outcome of a certain action, but the possibility remains that it may have potentially disastrous side effects, we should refrain from that action, or, at the very least, experiment on a scale and with the appropriate measures of protection that would keep negative effects to an absolute minimum. It is time to drop old habits of indiscriminate and worldwide application of what is technically possible and economically marketable.”

(Wahl 2005, p.6)

Wahl’s acceptance of, and understanding that the uncertainty problem expressed by Rittel & Webber (1973) is correct, and that we can’t just go ahead and ‘generate’ and ‘experiment’ on a mass societal scale, and nor should we, is correct. There are implications to what we do as designers, what we propose and create changes reality, and this raises ethical considerations we need to take account of, we shouldn’t use reality as a laboratory, potentially making things much worse than they already are, and we should explore as much as possible how our design artefacts will change reality, and for whom. Yet, to do nothing and to continue with design and policy paralysis raises other ethical considerations, namely don’t we have a responsibility to try and make things better? And if we aren’t, then what’s the point? Wahl’s assertion that we should seek to “experiment on a scale and with the appropriate
measures of protection” is correct, and using games, play or simulations to safely experiment with ideas before implementing them could be of immense value.

1.3 What Could Games Offer?

The two design proposals (section 1.5) set out broadly the concepts for how games could potentially be used within a participatory policy development context, however these proposals need further technical clarifications and explanation. Firstly, what are games, and how do we describe and define them? How do they differ, or do games differ from play? Wittgenstein said it was impossible to define ‘games’ (2001, pg.38), not that it has stopped people trying. Johan Huizinga started the ball rolling when he summed up his definition of play:

“Summing up the formal characteristics of play we might call it a free activity standing quite consciously outside "ordinary" life as being "not serious", but at the same time absorbing the player intensely and utterly. It is an activity connected with no material interest, and no profit can be gained by it. It proceeds within its own proper boundaries of time and space according to fixed rules and in an orderly manner.”

(Huizinga 1950, pg.13)

This definition of play, also clearly encompasses games, when Huizinga talks of ‘proper boundaries’ and ‘fixed rules’ he is directly alluding to what we would term games. Caillois noted that Huizinga deliberately ‘omitted’ a definition and classification of games within his work (2001, pg.4), and although Caillois proceeds to define Ludus (play with rules) and Paidia (spontaneous free play) he also doesn’t really delineate clearly between ‘play’ and ‘games’, although in discussing rules he began to define what games are. Caillois’ main contribution is the classifications of games (agôn, alea, mimicry and ilinx). Indeed, not all languages separate the two concepts so clearly (Parlett 1999, pg.1). Salen & Zimmerman see games as specific subset of play, and vice versa:

Salen & Zimmerman believe the first, and guiding delineating point between play and games, is the emergence of formalised rules that players must obey in the later (2004, pg.72), Sicart supports this position by stating “playing is freedom”, that it isn’t constrained by formality or rules (2014, pg.18).

If we take as a starting point that games differ from play primarily through the use of formalised rules, what other characteristics define games? There appears to be no easy answer to that question, Salen & Zimmerman attempt to navigate the thorny issue, and summarise the varying competing definitions (2004, pg.70-82), ending up with a definition that games are systems, that are artificial, have players, conflict, rules and contain a quantifiable outcome, or more specifically a set goal, or win and loss states. This attempt to bring the various competing definitions together seems overly rigid, for instance pen and paper roleplaying games don’t necessarily have a quantifiable outcome, nor do some
games contain, choosing instead to focus on collaboration and the nature of collaboration, such as Jason Rhorer’s ‘Between’ (Bogost 2015, pg.66). Flanagan (2013, pg.7) chooses not follow such strict definitions, instead defining games as ‘situations with guidelines and procedures’, which seems overly vague to the point of being useless as a definition, is a courtroom a game? According to McConigal games are characterised by four ‘defining traits’, goals, rules, a feedback system, and voluntary participation (2012, pg.21), this definition seems to be broad enough to encompass more ‘types’ of game, yet specific enough to not potentially encompass purely play activity.

So why might games prove useful in exploring public policy issues? The safety afforded by the social and mental borders of play, within the magic circle (Stenros 2012) allows for free expression of ideas, there is also an explorative quality to certain types of play explored in more detail in section 2.1. Games are by their nature an abstraction of our shared reality (Kapp 2012, pg.26), they’re imperfect recontextualizations, simplifications and reconstructions of what we know. Even when about shooting aliens in space with laser rifles, games are an abstraction on reality, they’re based on reality, and such games can be viewed through the lens of speculative design, as attempts to move away from what Dunne & Raby refer to as the ‘probable, possible and preferable’ (2013, pg.2-6). True, it’s for purely entertainment purposes, but that needn’t be the case, even in these fantastical forms games suggest possible futures in ways other media can’t, they allow us to interact with them, to experience these speculative futures for ourselves. Yes, like other media it’s possible to use games to say ‘something’, to communicate rhetoric’s (Bogost 2007, pg.52), but surely the greatest things games afford us is the ability to view the world through someone else’s eyes (Bogost 2011, pg.18), not to just view the world from unfamiliar perspectives, but to experience the world from unfamiliar perspectives, what Caillois describes as mimicry (2001, pg.12). It’s this ability that might be of most use in tackling Wicked Problems.

The concept of using the power of games for social good, to promote positive social change, tackling tough subjects isn’t a new concept, games that aren’t created solely for purposes of entertainment, “games for change” (Burak & Parker 2017, pg.xii), games like ‘PeaceMaker’, a simulation of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict (Burak & Parker 2017, pg.3-7) already exist. Games are a medium, and fully understanding the properties of games will allow us to fully exploit their potential as a medium, and a tool for wider societal good. Not only are games models of experiences, but they are models we operate, that afford us agency, and these are powerful qualities that allow us to do much more with games than we currently do (Bogost 2011, pg.3-5). There are what Flanagan terms ‘Activist Games’ (2013, pg.13-14), games that take these qualities, and tackle social issues, games that seek to instigate either some personal change, or wider societal change. McConigal suggest we should “use everything we know about game design to fix what’s wrong with reality” (2012, pg.7). What if games moved towards becoming a cultural good, and contributor to public debate, rather than the focus of public debate (Bogost 2015, pg.78-88)? There are game designers, and games that seek to tackle Public Policy issues, policy games if you will, but there is no cohesive unifying form, or function, and they currently fall into three broad definitions, Persuasive Games, Serious Games and Simulations, and each approach the field very differently, and have very different goals, and it’s important to understand how these current approaches fit with the policy development Process.

1.3.1 Persuasive Games

Many games that deal with Public Policy issues do so as a call to action, an attempt to change public perception, or to convince policy makers, or others, that change is required, what Flanagan refers to as ‘Activist Games’ (2013, pg.13-14), while Bogost refers to them as ‘Persuasive Games’ defining them as games that:

“mount procedural rhetoric’s effectively”

(Bogost 2007, pg.46)
The precise meaning of this definition requires defining both ‘procedural’ and ‘rhetoric’. On the ‘procedural’ component Bogost is clear, he views it as an authoring process, by which he means the creation of programs and databases for computer applications like multimedia products or games, rather than the more technical computer science definitions more commonly associated with executions within code, or the concept of procedural programming (Bogost 2007, pg.12), what Hunicke et al see as mechanics (2005). In terms of defining the ‘rhetoric’ component Bogost is less precise, although he appears to draw heavily Aristotle’s definition of rhetoric ‘as the faculty of observing in any given case the available means of persuasion’ (Aristotle 1991). Further clarifying Bogost defines ‘procedural rhetoric’ as:

“the practice of using processes persuasively, just as verbal rhetoric is the practice of using oratory persuasively and visual rhetoric is the practice of using images persuasively.”

(Bogost 2007, pg.28)

Bogost believes that Persuasive Games seek to break down real world phenomenon into easily understandable mechanics, so players can be ‘persuaded’ effectively to viewing the phenomenon, or specific part of the hegemony in a way the game designer wants them to. In this sense, Persuasive Games seek to ‘teach’ a specific lesson, in Aristotle’s terms this would be deliberative rhetoric, an attempt to convince someone to take, or not take an action or belief. This leaves very little scope for the effective deployment of such ‘procedural rhetoric’s’ within the core policy development process, as ‘call to arms’ they are suitable for highlighting current issues, or evaluating current policy situations.

Relation to Design Proposal 1: Developing a game collaboratively with stakeholders that sought to ‘persuade’ players might be difficult to do with Wicked Problems, or issues where there is stakeholder conflict. However, developing persuasive games from each stockholder perspective and sharing the result might be an effective way of starting a discussion.

Relation to Design Proposal 2: Following on from above, playing persuasive games from the perspectives of different stakeholders could allow for exploration of different perspectives and aid dialogue, however given the likely nature of differing value perspectives it’s also just as likely to cause conflict.

1.3.2 Serious Games

The second approach often taken by ‘Policy Games’ is that of ‘Serious Games’. Djaouti et al (2011) cover the origins of Serious Games, and note the phrase was first used by Clark Abt in his book “Serious Games” (Apt 1970)(Djaouti et al 2011, pg.26). Abt’s work sought to use games to train and educate people in procedures and processes required for work within specific fields, although he also
covered academic educational games for schools. For Apt Serious Games had an explicit and carefully thought-out educational purpose (Djaouti et al 2011). The definition used today is Sawyer & Rejeski’s (2002), which states that the focus of Serious Games is on policy education, management tools and the development of skills. Essentially, Serious Games are a form of videogame pedagogy that seeks to support already pre-existing interests, be they political, corporate or social institutions (Bogost 2007, pg.57). Or more explicitly Serious Games are concerned with teaching people how things ‘are’, not how they ‘could’ be, Bogost believes that these goals don’t represent the ‘full potential’ of games, and that Persuasive Games can ‘speak past or against’ current hegemonies.

Bogost is right to draw this distinction between Serious and Persuasive Games, both seek to achieve quite different outcomes. Persuasive Games seek to lead players to one specific conclusion, to alter their ‘world-view’, meanwhile Serious Games are by design there to train players in current practices encompassed by the hegemony, or the hegemony itself. That isn’t to say that Serious Games have no merit, in a pedagogical sense often there is a need to ‘learn’ about other situations, and many of the games found at ‘Games for Change’ (Games for Change 2017a), are Serious Games, that teach specific lessons, such as Syrian Journey, Half the Sky Movement: The Game, and Spent. Persuasive and Serious Games share what Bernstein (1996, pg.42) would term pedagogical recontextualization’s from pedagogical discourse theory, insofar as they draw on real-world discourses, production or reflection, and are appropriated and repositioned to become ‘educational’ or ‘rhetorical’ via abstraction. So, unless a Serious Game is about teaching the skills to conduct policy development, within the policy development cycle itself, Serious Games can only teach the required skills to implement a policy, or potentially educate on an issue such as the Indian energy problem, itself a Wicked Problem (Hoysala et al 2013).

1.3.3 Simulations

Defining simulations within context of games is difficult. If games are by their nature an abstraction and recontextualization (Kapp 2012, pg.26) of reality, they’re an attempt at recreating part of that reality, and as such all games ‘simulate’ something. The difficulty is in defining where simulations stop, and games begin. Lindley describes simulations as:
“a representation of the function, operation or features of one process or system through the use of another.”

(Lindley 2003, pg.1)

Lindley continues, stating that simulations don’t have specific repetitive and goal-oriented activities, and no specific predefined patterns in time (Lindley 2003). In this sense, there’s no set structure to a simulation, and no ‘end’ or ‘win’ state within a simulation, which is required for classification as a game (McConigal 2012, pg.21). Players don’t ‘play’ simulations, they ‘run’ them, and over the course of running them patterns may emerge over time, and these patterns can be different every time the simulation is run. Like games though, the functioning of simulations might require repetitive actions, but these may not be directed towards a specific goal, the aim is to see what effect these actions have within the simulation.

Simulations therefore have the potential to offer the most to policy development, as they allow for the testing of ideas within a safe environment prior to deploying the policy for real, they’re procedural representations of reality (Salen & Zimmerman 2004, pg.423), and it’s this quality that is of most use within policy work. The difficulties arise when trying to develop accurate simulations for Complex, or Wicked Problems. The task of developing such complex situational Simulations, and ensuring they accurately simulate the nature of the system, is where the usefulness of Simulations within this context fails. Developing a Simulation capable of accurately representing all the variables present within Wicked Problems, would become a Wicked Problem itself. However, any ‘game’ that attempts to deal with Public Policy, or Public Management issues should as standard include some level of Simulation. So, Simulations should be for specific areas of Public Policy development, where it’s feasible to model the system in place, like transport systems within urban planning, or disaster management in crisis planning.

Relation to Design Proposal 1: Developing a Simulation would require expert input, doing so as a form of exploring the problem as part of a collaborative games design process might be of limited value.

Relation to Design Proposal 2: Conversely using an accurate Simulation of the set of circumstances present within the problem would allow for stakeholders to explore solutions collaboratively and safely.

1.3.4 Is there a Space for Wicked Games?

Given the range of approaches already taken in relation to Policy Games, there’s a question whether space exists for another approach. In a perfect world, Simulations would be the ideal solution, the
difficulty in developing such complex Simulations though, adds another layer of problem to the situation. Serious and Persuasive games encompass ‘Policy Games’, but do so in slightly different ways, while both cover Public Policy issues, neither allow for the sort of explorative (section 2.1) and creative play (Sicart 2014, pg.17) that might lead to personal exploration, insight and reflection, which is also identified by Brandt (2006) as being so important to the PD process. In both Serious and Persuasive Games the discourse is entirely one way, from game to player, interaction is just a means to acquire more information from the game, either to learn something, or to be convinced via rhetoric. Although Flanagan’s (2013) definition of games may be too broad to be of any use when trying to decide what is and isn’t a game, many of the qualities she identifies such as the freedom to explore and challenge, the ability to be challenged and to perceive things differently are qualities offered by games, and should be embraced.

The problems that currently face society aren’t easily solvable by ‘procedural rhetoric’ or ‘unidirectional education’, they’re subjects that require exploration and reframing by players. That isn’t to say that calls to action generated by Persuasive Games are unimportant, and neither is the learning offered by Serious Games, it’s just that Wicked Games should be something distinct and separate. Wicked Games should have their ‘mechanics’ (Hunicke et al 2005) exposed and accessible, so players can modify the system to safely explore interventions and options (Wahl 2005, p.6). Wicked Games should open a subject out, to allow players to safely experience a phenomenon from alternative angles, and draw new conclusions via dialogue, either with other players, or the game. Indeed, the collaborative creation of such games with experts operating in the field should be a defining characteristic of Wicked Games, they should try to resemble and emulate the systems in place within the real-world, as accurately as possible within their virtual abstractions of reality, games and participatory designers should facilitate this process, but should not govern the content.

Relation to Design Proposal 1: As a key component of Wicked Games should be the accurate development of a simulated system with experts from the field, to abstract and recontextualize the problem, Wicked Games would seek to address this proposal directly.
Relation to Design Proposal 2: With exposed and easily modifiable mechanics Wicked Games should allow players to safely explore alternate ideas and options around Wicked Problems.

1.4 Approaches to Games Development

This design process seeks to use, and assess the following games development methodologies, and provide feedback on their application for the PD practitioner.
1.4.1 Playcentric Games Development: Iterative and Incremental Design

Fullerton’s playcentric approach to games development (2014) has some key distinct features, structures and stages:

![Fig.8 Fullerton’s Playcentric Game Design Workshop Methodology](image)

The concept isn’t linear like the traditional games development model, or the policy development cycle (see Fig.2). The first stage of the process is seeking inspiration for the game (section 3.0), and understanding the sub-section of games you are designing within (section 1.3, specifically 1.3.4), in this instance Policy Games, and how they seek to affect players (section 2.2). By doing this it’s possible to create ‘Player Experience Goals’ (sections 2.3 & 2.4), which allows the designer to move onto lo-fi or physical prototyping, to allow rapid iteration of ideas, which Fullerton believes should be done within a workshop, or teamwork environment (2014, pg.197-229). The next step is to use ‘play’ as a way of testing and analysing the prototype, which leads to further iteration. This cycle continues until the game is finished.

1.4.2 Play more: Extracting Tacit Knowledge from Games

Although it sounds like an excuse to avoid work and ‘have fun’, there’s a genuine need for games designers to be familiar with the form, qualities and opportunities of their medium:

“People who wish to design games should play games. Lots of them.”

(Garfield 2011, pg.7)

Garfield’s argument is that the nature and form of games can only be understood by playing them, they’re not inanimate objects that can be observed and understood by just looking at them, or reading about them. However, there needs to be a reason to play the game, and we need to be systematic in our methodologies critiquing games, if we’re to extract useful tacit knowledge. Löwgren (2007) makes the case for the role of the ‘critic’ found in other ‘design disciplines’, as a means of extracting design knowledge within Interaction Design, Bogost (2016 pg.vii-xiv) makes the same point with regards to game design. The importance of criticising design exemplars in games, and other design areas, is best articulated thusly:
“There is a great wealth of knowledge carried in the objects of our material culture… go look at existing examples of that kind…”

(Cross 2006, pg.26)

Exemplars give designers points of reference on which, we can build our own work. Design is therefore in some way a shared cultural history, it’s important as designers to re-evaluate and reinterpret our shared history to develop new insight.

The concept and practice of ‘game criticism’ isn’t a strenuous one, and once ‘seemed unlikely and even preposterous’ (Bogost 2015 pg.182). Game design researchers have been schooled in other disciplines research techniques, and use those within the field (Lankoski & Björk 2015a, pg.1), given the lack of established ‘criticism’ within the field it’s possible to argue any approach is acceptable to criticizing game design, as long as it’s relevant to the field, and communicates insights that could be deemed valid, and valuable (Bardzell et al 2010). There are emerging trends in game design research and criticism, the use of Formal Analysis as a means of closely analysing the details of games (Lankoski & Björk 2015b, pg.23), studying games as artefacts where identifiable elements are examined in detail. Formal analysis has been used to study the aesthetics of games (Myers 2010)(Hunicke et al 2005). Formal analysis is used to help define the qualities that Wicked Games should have (section 2.4), and to extract specific knowledge from games relevant to the final design (section 3.3).

1.4.3 Distributed Playtesting

Playtesting is a fundamental part of games design, it’s required to ensure that players understand the game, and that your design intentions are played out in the final design, it’s crucial in allowing the games designer to step back and see its flaws, and strengths through another person’s perspective (Woodruff 2011, pg.100). Fullerton states that playtesting is a fundamental component of iterative design (2014, pg.272), it is important however, to understand what playtesting is and what it isn’t, and the distinct types of playtesting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Fullerton’s Playtesting Types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Playtesting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Playtesting with Confidents</strong> – having those close to the project play the game</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Playtesting with Strangers</strong> – Finding unknown participants to play the game</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target Audience Playtesting</strong> – having the target group play the game</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Playtesting with Experts</strong> – having fellow games designers play the game</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Used ✓
Not used 

The above categories are often referred to as ‘observational playtesting’ as they are done within controlled environments where the design team observes directly the playtest. Fullerton’s categorizations as useful as they are, are specifically directed at the computer games industry, and while many of these things are directly transferable to the card, board and tabletop games industries, the budgets and resources are not.

Within these other games industries there is often a practice of Distributed Playtesting, where games designers use a network of fellow games design contacts, often situated remotely around the globe,
to perform distributed playtesting. Using other designer’s networks of volunteer playtester’s allows for designers to reach audiences they wouldn’t be able to on their own, as well as covering more ground in terms of number of playtests. This has the added benefit of exposing your design to other games design experts who can also cast a critical eye over the design. Because of the time constraints of this project, conducting remote and distributed playtesting offered the opportunity to gain more feedback upon which iteration could happen more rapidly.

1.5 Research Question & Research Focus

Exploration of the literature around Wicked Problems, PD’s current uses of games, and designers work with Wicked Problems didn’t so much as lead to design openings, more it suggested two design proposals:

**Design Proposal 1:** Participatory Designers working with multiple stakeholders around critical, crucial, complex and Wicked Problems use games design processes as an engagement tool and methodology, as a means for collaborating with stakeholders to abstract and recontextualize the problem,

**Design Proposal 2:** That playing games co-developed with stakeholders, designed around the nature of Critical, Crucial, Complex and Wicked Problems could allow Participatory Designers and Stakeholders to test out potential solutions safely within the magic circle, allowing work to be conducted generatively.

The original concept was to work with Policy Officers and associated stakeholders to jointly explore issues, and develop games from multiple perspectives. The idea being to use the games development process, and cycle to explore and develop issues surrounding Wicked Problems, and then to use these games to explore and develop solutions. This would have been done in two distinct phases:

**Phase 1:** Co-design a game, or series of games with multiple stakeholders to accurately represent their perspective of the problem, to explore and understand the issue from multiple angles, but to also abstract and recontextualize the issues.

**Phase 2:** Use these co-designed games, and any developed interlocking systems between the games to explore any potential solutions to the issues. Allowing players to experience their suggestions safely within the ‘magic circle’, and to modify the rules easily so iteration on ideas can be rapid.

The time and resource limitations of the thesis project precluded the possibility of exploring the entirety of the idea, or even one of the phases. Given the timeframe, the focus of the research has been on the attempt to develop a ‘Wicked Game’ without input from experts and a co-design process, assessing the suitability of games development methodologies for PD practitioners, and to see whether it’s possible to produce a game with the characteristics in sections 2.4, so that is the main research question:

- Is it possible to produce a game with the identified characteristics (section 2.4), and achieve the desired response from players (section 2.3), that can still be classified as a game?

Although this question commits the cardinal sin of leading to a yes or no answer, it does so for a good reason. This work is unable to fully explore the proposals contained within it, therefore there needs to be a simple yes or no answer to determine whether continuing with this line of inquiry is worthwhile.
This however, necessitates further supplementary questions in support of the main research focus, which will point towards the directions any future work might take, these are:

- What games development methodologies are best suited to this style of working?
- How can designers extract, and build upon tacit knowledge contained within other games?
- What heuristics should wicked games have?
- If there is further merit in developing Wicked Games, and in what directions should future research aim?

The goal is to provide answers to these questions, even if by the very nature of the work these answers are likely to be only partial in their nature. The aim of this process is to point towards a new use of both games development practices, and the products of these practices (games) within PD, but also, to point towards what Wicked Games should be, how to develop them, and to assess the development tools used within this games design process.
2.0 What’s the Context & Value to this approach?

Who would play these games? Where would they play them? Why would they play them? And, what purpose would they serve? It’s clear such games wouldn’t seek to be commercial products for profit, even if there might be individuals who’d genuinely find such games entertaining, or fun. The value in such games would be around the ability to safely test proposals within Wicked Problem policy settings such as:

**Context 1:** Participatory Designers working with multiple stakeholders with different perspectives on a Wicked Problem, as well as different value perspectives to be able to understand each other’s positions better when attempting to coordinate responses tackling Wicked Problems.

**Context 2:** Participatory Designers working with Policy Officers across multiple stakeholders to use games, their mechanics and the ‘magic circle’ as a means for safely testing out proposed policy interventions.

The aim being to produce games that are unique to the context, not to have a suite of games to tackle generic collaborative efforts within PD.

2.1 Games or Explorative Play?

Within the PD literature there is an emphasis on the concept of exploration, or being exploratory, best exemplified by:

“When we talk about exploratory design games in design work the players seldom compete in order to win a specific game. Participants in exploratory design games often have different interests and preferences but instead of utilizing this by competing the aim is to take advantage of the various skills and expertise’s represented and jointly explore various design possibilities within a game setting.”

(brandt 2006)

Within the play and games literature too it’s acknowledged that the concept of explorative play (Sicart 2014, pg.17), and the ability to use games as a sandbox within which a free expression, and mindfulness can exist (Bogost 2016, pg.205), is potentially the most powerful aspect of the medium of games, or play. Which begs the question is it games or explorative play that’s important?

2.1.1 What is Explorative Play?

Brandt (2006) is essentially talking about explorative play, as is Flanagan (2013, pg.21-35), the structured exploration of an environment either manufactured or otherwise, identified by Vygotsky (1978, pg.96-100), as key to personal growth, learning and development, without which we wouldn’t mature. The approach they favour is structured play for adults, which is becoming a recognised pedagogical form in higher educational training of applied technical skills (Pearson & Brew 2002). For Brandt and Flanagan, explorative play is the ‘big picture’, it’s this quality that’s of paramount importance, either in leading to an engaging PD process, or as a quality that’s essential for interactive social activism, meaning that games are a part of explorative play. Borrowing Salen & Zimmerman’s (2004, pg.72-73) typology this represents their view:
Rieber, building upon Vygotsky’s work, argues that digital environments have enormous potential, for what he terms explorative learning (Rieber, 2005), the concept being that players can experiment via a form of explorative play with the content, a simulation, or game, to allow for learning to occur, or beliefs to be challenged or developed. Sicart (2014, pg.12-19) too extols plays ability to allow us to explore freely and safely, within confines. Bogost views things quite differently:

“Among the misguided advocates of play-as-freedom, “rules” are often distrusted. Rules feel like structures of compliance, bureaucracy, control, and institutionalization. Rules impinge; rules dictate. And so, rules quickly become enemies of creativity, joy, and happiness. “Rules are made to be broken!” shout advocates of play like Sicart and Flanagan, right before they advocate for a different set of rules instead.”

(Bogost 2016, pg.167)

For Bogost Explorative Play requires boundaries, structure and rules, like Vygotsky, it’s play with a purpose, and it’s part of a game:

Explorative Play is certainly a ‘quality’ that should be included within Wicked Games.
2.1.2 What are the Characteristics of Games?

McGonigal’s four defining traits of games (goals, rules, feedback system, and voluntary participation) (2012, pg.21), allow for defining games, however it doesn’t define the characteristics of games that fall under the umbrella term. Within games as a field there are many subcategorizations, and these are defined by the characteristics of these games (Elias et al 2012, pg.3), general group features that at a high-level described the type of game. It therefore follows that not all characteristics will be relevant to all games, and even within ‘genres’ of games there are likely to be some that do not adhere to generalised characteristics of any given sub-genre (Elias et al 2012, pg.4-5). There are some broad and basic categorisations that say a lot about a game, the medium the game is delivered in for instance; phrases like computer game, or card game conjure up quite different sets of characteristics, for starters one is represented on a screen, while the other uses real-world physical components. Understanding some of the basic ways in which, games portray basic characteristics like time, resources, rules, player roles, number of players, points, winning and losing is key to defining what type of game you are creating, in section 2.2 formal analysis is used to try to define the players experience goals, and characteristics of Wicked Games.

2.2 Examples Working Towards or influencing the Emergence of Wicked Games

There are no ‘canonical’ examples that specifically seek to replicate the approach to Wicked Problems and Games that this project proposes. However, there are several designers and many games that do tackle Public Policy issues, and even Wicked Problems via the use of games. Understanding current examples of Policy Games and the techniques they deploy is of importance in helping to shape the design space (MacLean et al 1991) that potential Wicked Games development resides in.

2.2.1 Policy Games

There are numerous examples of game designers developing games that tackle Public Policy issues with the aims of achieving specific outcomes, and analysing what the aims of such games are, and using formal analysis to assess the procedural techniques used in pursuit of those aims, it’s possible to begin understanding the current range and scope of games within the field today, and to assess what’s needed to address distinct parts of the policy development cycle:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Games Dealing with Policy Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the Loop: A Resource Strategy Game for Tomorrow’s Leaders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is about global resource management and production, developed by Whalen (2017). The sustainability of resources for manufacture, and dwindling resources is seen more as a complex problem (section 1.1.2). The game takes an interesting approach to what is not just a commercial, but political problem by combining both Persuasive and Serious Game elements. The game offers players multiple routes to success, and doesn’t lead players to a specific conclusion, more a range of viable solutions that differ from current thinking. It seeks to educate players on the problems and solutions the game proposes.
**Bycatch**

Is about the efficacy of surveillance of terrorism suspects and the drone wars pursued by the US Government, developed by Hubbub (Alfrink, et al 2017). It's a hybrid game (Mandryk & Maranan 2002), where physical components like playing cards are coupled with mobile phones, players use the phones to take ‘pictures’ of the cards as a game mechanic, and the game then uses these pictures to give the players information on who they should use the drone strike against. Bycatch is a persuasive game, in the activism mode, it passes strong commentary on a security policy, and is highly critical of that policy.

**Refugee Scenario Planning**

Jointly developed by the City of Amsterdam and VNG International, led by Eric van der Kooij (VNG International 2017) as a Serious Game to help the Jordanian Government. The game sought to teach Jordanian officials the skills and techniques required to develop and successfully manage the large refugee camp at Zaatari, and other sites. The game is based around a detailed Simulation of conditions and factors within such camps, and players need to learn what needs prioritising, and what’s required to safely run such a camp.

**Project SUBMERGED**

Is set in a speculative future, in which Amsterdam is submerged under water due to a catastrophic event (Korte & Ferri 2017). The game poses difficult choices to players based around the implementation of future technologies and public spaces, and the implications such technology has on citizens. The game cleverly uses a speculative future to address current concerns within society to expose players feeling towards such issues. Neither Persuasive or Serious, by exposing players beliefs in safe future setting it’s a personal exploration, or Empathy Game.

**Syrian Journey**

Commissioned by the BBC, in response to the Refugee crisis (Games for Change 2017b). It isn’t a game, but an interactive story, in the vein of Fighting Fantasy Books. Players are asked a series of questions about choices they would make as a Refugee. It’s very basic, and its prime concern is with educating players on the plight of Syrian Refugees.
2.2.2 Persuasive Games LLC: Doing Exactly What They Say

Persuasive Games LLC is the games development company co-founded by Ian Bogost. They don’t just work with Public Policy issues, also working with corporate and education clients, but a good proportion of their games are concerned with persuading people about specific Public Policy issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: Persuasive Games LLC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Killer Flu</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows players to explore how flu strains are spread and mutated, to examine the likelihood of flu pandemics, from the perspective of the flu virus (Persuasive Games LLC 2017a). Commissioned by the UK Clinical Virology Network and produced in association with Scotland’s Traffic Games to show the public just how rare, and unlikely a flu pandemic is. Using clear persuasive procedural rhetoric, as defined by Bogost (2007, pg.46), to get it’s point across, without ‘preaching’, just presenting facts to the player was persuasive.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **WindFall**                   |
| A game where players are tasked with building wind-farms to meet energy demand, while balancing that with local opposition to wind-farms (Persuasive Games LLC 2017b). Windfall is highly abstracted with simplified binary choices. Using simplified relationships as its main vehicle for procedural rhetoric. It’s a very easy game to complete, which is the point, the game’s aim is to convince the player wind-farms are a viable energy source. The game recontextualizes the world in a way to persuade you of this ‘fact’. |
2.2.3 Impact Games: Games with a Social Imperative

Impact Games was co-founded by Asi Burak, with the intention of using the medium of games to communicate more meaningful messages, and to create “compelling interactive experiences around current events” (Impact Games 2017). They seek to produce serious games or simulations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4: Impact Games</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Half the Sky Movement: The Game</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Half the Sky Movement: The Game (Games for Change 2017c) is a strange conflation of many different things fused together. Part Serious Game, yet with clearly persuasive elements. It’s probably more remarkable for the impacts it had on real world, as players earned rewards that went to help women around the world via marketing and charitable links with corporations. The game claimed to be a ‘simulation’, although it was more a narrative game with persuasive and educational elements, used to raise awareness of issues of gender inequality.

| **PeaceMaker** |

Is simulation of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict (Games for Change 2017d). The game asks players to assume the role of either the Israeli PM or Palestinian President, and to deal with events as they unfold within the simulation, and achieve peace. It seeks to allow players to view the problem from different perspectives and challenge prior value perspectives. The game claims to be a ‘Simulation’, but functions like a Serious Game teaching about the complexities of the conflict. It’s also a part Persuasive Game as advancing towards success, is a heavily guided route.
2.2.4 Fields of View, Bangalore India: Tackling the Wicked

Fields of View in Bangalore India have developed several games, and Gaming-Simulations (Palavalli et al 2014) that seek to address wicked problems specifically, as well as other more educational, or Serious Games. Their approach is focussed around collaborative play and open exploration of topics.

### Table 5: Fields of View

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>₹ubbish!</th>
<th>Explores the challenges faced by the Dry Waste Collection Centres in Bangalore, India, including apathy, lack of knowledge. It was developed to promote understanding of the waste management system at both the micro and macro levels (Fields of View 2017a). Although the game had a ‘win’ state, the aim was to allow players to explore all potential solutions, by generating their own strategies. ‘₹ubbish!’ is an attempt at a more open and explorative form of gaming, that asks players to find an equilibrium with the system.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

|Map My City| A participatory exercise developed to give cities a tool to identify the challenges they faced with regards to climate change (Fields of View 2017b). Play sessions involved city officials working collaboratively to identify risks and challenges. Participants are then provided with mock scenarios and ‘roleplay’ their agencies responses, to identify weaknesses. Participants are then tasked with developing short, medium and long-term goals. Strictly speaking Map My City isn’t a game, it’s a form of structured roleplay, or explorative play, but it does use game mechanics to develop solutions to problems. |

#### 2.3 What Should a Wicked Game Seek to Achieve?

During the analysis of the types of Policy Games (section 1.3) some distinctions were made, coupled with the analysis in section 2.2 the following player experience goals are what Wicked Games should seek to Achieve:

- Explorative Play of a perspective on a Wicked Problem.
- A safe space in which, players can test out value perspectives and solutions.
- Exposed, simplified and modifiable rules and mechanics to allow for policy iteration via game development.
- A rhetoric free zone, Wicked Games shouldn’t seek to persuade players of a certain world view, that would defeat the purpose of Explorative Play, but opinions should be challenged, just the result of that challenge shouldn’t be unidirectional.
- Should start a dialogue between players, or players and the game.
2.4 What Characteristics Should a Wicked Game Have?

The formal analysis of games raised the question whether there could, or should be characteristics that define Wicked Games. If the nature of Wicked Problems are unique, then shouldn’t the games created to represent them be as unique? However, the games analysed in section 2.2 didn’t always stick to the conventions of the broad definitions covered in section 1.3, highlighting intriguing characteristics that would serve the overall player experience goals well:

- Should be a simplified, but accurate simulation of the phenomenon they portray.
- The rules and mechanics should be fully observable, and form a core part of the games aesthetics.
- The possibility of multiple routes to success is important as it limits the possibility of Wicked Games becoming persuasive.
- Systemic equilibrium within ‘running’ the simulated elements of the games.
- Creating player uncertainty through insufficient knowledge, forcing players to ‘break’ the magic circle to research missing information from real-world sources.
- The need for multiple random elements, playing Wicked Games shouldn’t be about learning the ‘best play heuristics’ (Elias et al 2012, pg.29) for ‘winning’, and should be about responding to random fluctuations within the system.
3.0 Deciding a Topic: Global Refugee Crisis

The world is full of Wicked Problems, from climate change to growing inequality, and issues around resource sustainability. However, one issue has dominated the media within Europe, and Sweden more than any other, that of the current Refugee crisis (Park 2015), given this attention there is a rich vein of research, and relevant games to examine and build upon.

3.1 Background

The crisis in and around Syria led to 162,877 people seeking asylum in Sweden in 2015, which was a significant increase on previous year’s figures, and unprecedented in Swedish history (The Migration Agency, 2015). This placed pressures upon Sweden, and in particular Malmö, having a transformative effect not only on Swedish Public Policy, but also potentially Swedish societies normal generosity (Traub 2016). The wider response of the European Union (EU) to the crisis has also exposed how ill-prepared the organisation is to deal with the crisis, or organise a coordinated effort from member states (Guild et al 2015). The complex nature of the civil war in Syria, and wider instability within the region, and sub-Saharan Africa coupled with the transnational obligations and goals of the EU, and competing value systems and strategic priorities of member states, represents not only the biggest challenge the continent has faced since the inception of the EU (Park 2015), but one that current responses are unlikely to resolve (Carrera 2015). It’s undoubtedly a Wicked Problem, with individual member states taking wildly different approaches, based on self-interest (Ostrand 2015), as opposed to the cooperation that forms the basis of the EU, it is an existential threat to the organisation. It therefore provides a very rich series of possible perspectives to work with.

3.2 Potential perspectives

As outlined above, the situation remains a highly complex one, with many interconnecting and moving parts, below is a rough outline of the potential perspectives:

![Fig.11 The Interconnectedness of the Refugee Crisis]

This isn’t a fully exhaustive map, and below some of these perspectives lie even more complex problem maps (Head 2008), such as the sides in the Syrian conflict. However, for the purposes of deciding where current policy game examples reside, and where to position the work within this research it’s sufficient. The issues within this problem map range from the global and transnational at one end, via nation states and regional concerns, right down to the human and individual level at the other end of the scale. There have been various games developed that tackle different perspectives within this map already:
Refugee Scenario Planning: Covered in more detail in section 2.3.1 this game views the crisis from that of a Refugee camp administrator, seeking to teach relevant skills to those who are (VNG International 2017).

Darfur is Dying: Seeks to educate players on the situation facing displaced Refugees in the Darfur region of Sudan. The game pits players as a Refugee struggling to survive in a highly hostile environment. Although ostensibly a Serious Game that seeks to educate, it’s a powerful piece of emotional gaming design too, that exposes the player to some quite harrowing real-world testimonials (Games for Change 2017e).

Syrian Journey: Covered in more detail in section 2.3.1 this game is also viewed from the perspective of a Refugee; this time fleeing the Syrian conflict, and is aimed at raising awareness of Refugee’s plight (Games for Change 2017b).

This War of Mine: Was a commercial and critical success for developer 11 Bit Studios. The game is set in a fictitious country, somewhere within either Eastern Europe or the Balkans. Players are tasked with trying to survive within the warzone, scavenging for food and supplies, and quite often being forced to make moral choices between their characters own survival at the expense of other citizens. The game forces players to empathize with those who find themselves trapped in warzones and is an extremely effecting Empathy Game (Games for Change 2017f).

The Migrant Trail: Although not focused on the European refugee crisis, The Migrant Trail is included in this list because of the unique perspective it takes to the issues of illegal migration, in that it tackles the issue from the perspective of US Border Patrols on the US-Mexico border, giving players a unique perspective on the challenges facing US Border Patrols (Games for Change 2017g).

Endgame Syria: Is a digital card game, that pits players as one of the rebel factions currently fighting within Syria. Players are tasked with trying to reach a potential resolution to the war via a combination of political and military means. The game is a part Serious Game, educating on the complexity of the conflict, and part Persuasive Game as it leans heavily towards the use of peaceful means for success (Games for Change 2017h).

Immigration Nation: Is a serious game that focuses on teaching players the classifications, and rules governing immigration into the USA (Games for Change 2017i).

Below is a diagram showing the perspectives these games view the current refugee crisis from:
3.2.1 Selecting a Perspective

Although there are numerous areas within the problem map (fig.12) that haven’t seemingly been tackled by games (greyed-out boxes), they also represent some of the most complex parts of the current problem map. Given the timescales within the project the most prudent decision was to work with a perspective that is more easily framed, and which has a range of games that have tackled the issue, therefore providing sources of tacit knowledge upon which, it is possible to build and ideate. For these reasons, the perspective of immigration control was chosen:

![Diagram of the problem map with immigration control highlighted](image)

3.3 Inspiration and Critique

The context of border control, or immigration in games isn’t a new one, indeed there’s a rich vein of already existing examples on which, to draw inspiration. There are however, two that have gained varying degrees of notoriety within their respective fields, either as Persuasive Game (Points of Immigration) or Empathy Game (Papers, Please). To extract the tacit knowledge they contain, formal analysis was performed during play. Formal analysis can be traced back to the work of Kant, and has its origin in the visual arts (Zangwill 2001, pg.84-86), it has a less illustrious and established history in games research, however in terms of form within games according to Lankoski & Björk (2015b) aspects of games like “components, actions, goals and rules” can be analysed. These terms need to be defined further for the analysis to be criticisable:

**Components:** Are the games individual entities that can be manipulated by players or the game system, such as chess pieces. Furthermore, the game ‘space’ is a component, like the chessboard.

**Actions:** Take two forms, firstly player actions are those that the player initiates, secondly those the game initiates via game components. In chess, there are only player actions, those of the two opposing players. This is not true of computer games, where by necessity the mechanics of a game need to be executed via components for the game to exist.

**Goals:** These can be incremental goals like finishing levels before finishing the final level, or a specific overall task. In chess taking an opponent’s piece might be an incremental and dynamic goal, but the ultimate goal is to put your opponent into checkmate.

**Rules:** These are the framework within which the game takes place, time limit etc. and the choices and options the game allows. In chess, these are the way the individual pieces can move, and the alternating turn sequence, and the rules governing victory ‘checkmate’.
Björk & Holopainen (2005) used formal analysis to identify design patterns in games, or points of ‘convergence’, however, it isn’t only the exposure of patterns that should be of interest to game design analysis, but also the points of ‘divergence’. It’s these divergent details that often give rise to a game’s unique character, and would give other designers a space within which, to explore new ideas. Below is a description and a critique of two games:

### Table 6: Right to Remain Inspiration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points of Immigration</th>
<th>Papers, Please: A Dystopian Document Thriller</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Points of Immigration is part Serious Game, insofar as it seeks to educate people on the changes to US immigration law proposed by senators Ted Kennedy and John McCain in 2007. It’s also part Persuasive Game as it seeks to point out the flaws in the proposed, and ultimately implemented changes, it does this by placing the player in the role of an immigration officer attempting to award more ‘green cards’ than a virtual co-worker (Persuasive Games LLC 2017c).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papers, Please places the player in the role of an immigration officer in a fictional country of Arstotzka (Pope 2017). Players review applicant’s passports and supporting paperwork against a list of rules and guidelines. The player is rewarded with a daily salary for correctly processing applicants, and fined for incorrect decisions. This salary is used to provide shelter, food, and heat for their in-game family. Players are faced with moral decisions, like approving entry of a citizen without paperwork, knowing this will affect their salary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.3.1 Points of Convergence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7: Points of Convergence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points of Immigration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application forms with points system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases presented by individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points of Immigration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affecting entry decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points of Immigration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition against AI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Both games seek to affect players in a unidirectional way, and both are quite overt in their attempts at ‘persuasion’, or at the very least how they want to affect the player. Points of Entry wants to expose, what it sees as the unfair, or ill-conceived nature of the proposed standardized system for all immigrants adopted by the US Government, and it isn’t subtle about how it does so. Meanwhile Papers, Please uses a fictional setting to allow the designer to exaggerate current immigration practices, in an attempt to build empathy, for Papers, Please’s fictional immigrants. Both games are critical of the immigration procedures they represent.

3.3.2 Points of Divergence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Points of Immigration</th>
<th>Papers, Please</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Singular presentation space</td>
<td>Multiple presentation spaces, with multiple components.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simple ‘lever’ plus or minus mechanics</td>
<td>Binary yes / no decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Household management decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>Points of Immigration</td>
<td>Papers, Please</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Players can ‘change’ applicant’s details on forms to increase their prospects of ‘gaining’ entry</td>
<td>Players can ‘assassinate’ potential spies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Players can interrogate immigrants for further information</td>
<td>Players must choose how to spend their ‘salary’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>Points of Immigration</td>
<td>Papers, Please</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To get ‘your’ applicants admitted over the AI’s</td>
<td>To correctly process applicants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To ensure families survival</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To stop spies entering Arstotzka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules</td>
<td>Points of Immigration</td>
<td>Papers, Please</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Must make alterations to papers before proceeding</td>
<td>Ensure paper processed correctly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most obvious difference is the visual aesthetics, Points of Immigration use very bright primary colours, with a single fixed playing field, whereas Papers, Please uses very monochrome palettes of greys and browns with the odd splash of strong colour, giving a grim tone and setting. Papers, Please also differs by offering multiple playing fields. Both games approach the topic of immigration quite differently, and share few mechanical similarities, the games ‘dive’ far more than they ‘converge’. ‘Papers, Please’ is a more complex game, with more components, actions and goals, while Points of Immigration is very singular and focused on delivering its message.
3.4 Qualities ‘Borrowed’

Both games are highly persuasive, and this approach is simply not an option for a Wicked Game, the idea isn’t to ‘persuade’ someone to a specific point of view, it’s to give players the opportunity to explore a complex Public Policy issue from another perspective, without trying to ‘sway’ opinion one way or the other. For this reason, there are very few qualities that can be borrowed from either game:

- Straight forward decision based on criteria, yes / no.
- Data presented on a personal level, not mass figures.
- Procedural challenge to ensure immigration systems viability.

However, there were enough to start building on, and the space between the two games left a lot of room to explore.
4.0 Methodological Approaches & Appraisal

Different design methodologies were used at various points throughout the development of the game Right to Remain, this is a description of those methodologies and appraisal of their suitability for not only the specified tasks, but also PD Practitioner’s unfamiliar with games development.

4.1 Distributed Playtesting

A key component the development process was the reliance on and use of distributed playtesting. While other playtesting methodologies are well documented (Fullerton 2014, pg.271-304)(Woodruff 2011, pg.99-105), this mode of playtesting isn’t as well documented or described, what follows is a description of how the process was conducted within this project, with reflections on the practice.

4.1.1 Preparing the Playtest Pack

The most important thing to ensure is that the resources you give to your test coordinators make sense in terms of the rules, and what it is you hope to achieve from the test in terms of player feedback, via structured feedback forms. It’s also important to ensure that your test coordinators have everything that is required of them to run a successful playtest session in their location, including all game play resources and recording apparatus. The preparation required to run distributed playtesting sessions isn’t much more than that needed to conduct standard observational playtests, there’s just the added need to communicate it well enough to ensure the work is delegated properly.

4.1.2 The Playtest pre-brief

It’s important to have a pre-brief session with test coordinators, this ensures the ‘Playtest Pack’ is understood, and that the test coordinators know what is expected of them, it also gives test coordinators the chance to ask questions, and to make agreed amendments to the playtest session should they require, or request changes; due to lack of resources, or because they feel they might be able to provide more useful insight into the game by doing so. These briefing sessions are best conducted via video calls, and as one-to-one conversations as opposed to group conversations with multiple test coordinators, as this tends to lead to wider variance of experience in the playtest sessions, as each playtest coordinator remains untainted by ‘groupthink’.

4.1.3 Trusting Your Test Coordinators

When conducting a distributed playtesting there is a need to trust the test coordinators to:

- Test your game as agreed and within set timeframes.
- Understand what you are trying to achieve.
- Know the best way to get the answers you want from the playtester’s they know.

It’s a process as a designer that you can guide, but not control. It is therefore necessary to develop a network of fellow designers over time, and to build relationships on mutual understanding, and this requires reciprocating the favour when fellow designers call on you for help.

4.1.4 The Playtest debrief

Just like it’s important that your coordinators understand your aims, it’s important that they get a chance to talk you through their findings. Reports and feedback forms aren’t enough, sometimes you need to interrogate the information they provide, and their responses, to get at their full insights. The
playtest debrief should be treated like a semi-structured interview (Bryman 2012, pg.471-472), there is a need to prepare by reading and analysing the response forms, and deciding what questions to ask, and produce a thorough interview guide. However, the debrief should be allowed to go in the direction the test coordinator wants it to, and allow them to fully express any insights and opinions they might have.

4.1.5 Not a Substitute for Observational Playtesting

Previously when working with this method it hasn’t ‘raised’ things that required further observational playtesting, however, perhaps due to the nature of the project this wasn’t the case during the development of Right to Remain. There were numerous issues raised within the remote playtests that were difficult for the coordinators to fully explain, and described behaviour in players that was uncommon in more traditional game types. This necessitated further observational playtesting to directly try and observe the behaviour. It’s therefore important to make the point that distributed playtesting is not a replacement, or substitute for more traditional observation playtesting (Fullerton 2014, pg.272). It should be considered a supplement, and used in conjunction with more traditional observational playtesting. It can however help point to things that need exploring in greater detail, allowing for covering greater ‘development distance’ quicker, but there is often the need observe things in person.

4.2 Playcentric Development and Iteration

Fullerton’s playcentric methodology was chosen for multiple reasons, firstly as a non-linear form of iterative design it is diametrically opposed to normally policy development methods, and as such is more likely to allow for alternative generative methods, as opposed to the more common rational-technical approaches adopted within Public Policy. Unfortunately, as time constraints didn’t allow for a PD process to take place the methodologies effectiveness in this area is untested. Secondly, it’s a method that seemingly aped the collaborative methodological approaches used within PD, although this wasn’t a PD process, two player-workshops were held during development.

4.2.1 Workshop for One?

The first workshop was conducted at the beginning of the process (section 5.2), while the second was conducted at the end of development, to make the final iterative steps (section 5.5). Neither workshop really functioned as a workshop, mainly because those involved in the workshop weren’t ‘invested’ within the process of developing the game as co-designers. Instead they became observational playtests, and although the development work continued with lo-fi prototyping and playcentric development, it isn’t possible to conduct a workshop for one.

4.2.2 There Can Be No Iteration Without Play

Games aren’t purely artefacts (section 4.3.1), and as such they can’t be iterated upon without having been played, and seeing others play them, and examining their functioning via interaction with them:
The green sections denote how far through development Right to Remain got. Throughout the development of right to remain (section 5.0) it was impossible to iterate without first playtesting an idea. The project required extensive playtesting of other games before starting (section’s 2.2 & 3.3), play is a crucially important part of games development, and without it there can be no iteration. Essentially, games development is a form or play, and this insight, coupled with Design Proposal 1, using the games development process as an engagement tool within PD, brings the work full circle and into alignment with Brandt’s (2006) position.

4.3 Play more: Extracting Tacit knowledge

The use of formal analysis in sections 2.2 and 3.3 was vital to starting the games development process. It enabled the production of characteristics for Wicked Games, and basic mechanical structures to start iterating upon.

4.3.1 Use of Formal Analysis

In section 2.2 formal analysis was used to draw out the characteristics of policy games that might be advantageous in the development of Wicked Games, as well as those characteristics that’d be a hindrance. In section 3.3 the use of formal analysis provided inspiration, and a starting point for the development of Right to Remain, as a tool for extracting tacit knowledge from games it proved invaluable. However, while conducting the formal analysis, three questions arose:

- Are games artefacts?
- Are they activities?
- Or are they both?

Formal analysis did reveal knowledge that’s useful within the design process, however it does treat games solely as artefacts, and to treat games solely as artefacts is missing the qualities they have as activities. Ignoring their performative quality, which is a large part of what games are, and why we
play them (Bogost 2016, pg.65-66), is to miss vital evidence and knowledge contained within games. Games are a blending of artefact and activity, to truly understand their full worth and value we must understand this duality, and explore the other side of the coin, games as activity, performative or otherwise.

4.3.2 How Should We Analyse Games as Activity?

Games are unique, diverse yet strangely similar activities with a myriad of characteristics that give rise to many different types of games (Elias et al 2012, pg.4-5), and not everyone will like every type of game, we are all subjective about our taste when it comes to entertainment, and games are no different (Bogost 2015, pg.ix-x), our responses to engagement with games is often highly personal. Not only do we play and enjoy diverse types of games, but the reasons we play are also different and personal (Salen & Zimmerman 2006, pg.6), so, when trying to extract tacit knowledge from games as activity it only seems right, and honest, that we use methodologies that put our personal experiences within that analysis, and that suggests taking an autoethnographic approach. Brown concurs, arguing that autoethnography’s ability to enable researchers to give a first-hand account, with their subjective responses at the centre of the analysis, is the ideal tool for subjectively researching games as activity (2015, pg.85-86). Looking at the handwritten notes made while analysing playing these games, they take on an autoethnographic tone naturally:

A harrowing choice in ‘This War of Mine’ led to a very emotional and effecting response
5.0 Applied Methodology, Playcentric Development: Right to Remain

Right to Remain is a tabletop card game placing players in the role of immigration officers, deciding the fate of Refugees. Players randomly draw a number of Refugee Cards per round (Appendix 18) and decide their fates based on national criteria cards (Appendix 15). Rather than seeking to create empathy between the player and the plight of Refugees, the game focuses on utilising what Callois termed ‘mimicry’ allowing players to understand what immigration officers do, and the system they operate within. The ‘outcome’ of this work though isn’t the game Right to Remain, although if you wish to play the game you can do so by printing out the final game rules (Appendix 14), the game cards (Appendix 16 & 18), national Eligibility Criteria Cards (Appendix 15), and game tokens (Appendix 17). The outcome is the process used to produce the game, and the knowledge developed in doing so, which will be of use to participatory designers attempting something similar within their own practice, who may not be aware of games design techniques and how to deploy them.

5.1 The Problem of Defining no Goal

The lack of having a specific behavioural change goal, or singular outcome, within a game that seeks to allow players to draw their own conclusions, makes the task of tackling designing such a game very difficult. Games have goals (Fullerton 2014, pg.41-42), a clear challenge to overcome, an artificial conflict (Salen & Zimmerman 2004, pg.80), yet setting a goal or series of goals and challenges that don’t lead a player to a specific moral outcome when dealing with emotionally charged societal issues proves challenging. In choosing such a highly politicised and sensitive topic as Refugees, there was a clear danger that whatever was produced could fall into becoming a unidirectional ‘procedural rhetoric’ (Bogost 2007, pg.46), without the intention to do so. To avoid this there was a need to break with one of the initial principles of games design, by not setting a goal for the game. The initial focus was on trying to incrementally develop a simulation of the real-world system.

5.2 Right to Remain Version 1.0

The initial design work was intended to take place as part of a playcentric workshop, although it became an ‘adaptive’ Observation Playtest, with one member of the workshop iterating while the others played. Version 1.0 (appendix 1) was not concerned with achieving anything other than a very basic mechanical structure upon which, further game rules and logic could be built. It had no goal or fail state, and wasn’t a game at this stage, the design goal was to start building a system that made logical sense that ‘mimicked’ the process of an immigration system.
Roleplaying was used to simulate the detail on the playing cards, essentially roleplaying ‘game logic’ players used access to the UNHCR database to generate refugee cards ‘on the fly’, these were annotated as they were verbalised, with a tick or a cross denoting whether the other player had granted or denied refugee status:

![Roleplayed annotated cards](image)

There was however a natural inclination to respond to the player across the table to provide ‘persuasive’ information to convince people to accept OR decline applicants, based on the players value perspectives. To try and mitigate these affects, and to provide some structure a rough framework was hastily drawn up to provide limits to the roleplaying of the game logic:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Syrian</td>
<td>Papers</td>
<td>No Papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian</td>
<td>Papers</td>
<td>No Papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghan</td>
<td>Papers</td>
<td>No Papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghan</td>
<td>Papers</td>
<td>No Papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraqi</td>
<td>Papers</td>
<td>No Papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraqi</td>
<td>Papers</td>
<td>No Papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemeni</td>
<td>Papers</td>
<td>No Papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemeni</td>
<td>Papers</td>
<td>No Papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalian</td>
<td>Papers</td>
<td>No Papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalian</td>
<td>Papers</td>
<td>No Papers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, it didn’t work, the stories still tended to drift into being persuasive, to try and illicit an emotional or empathetic response.

5.2.1 Version 1.5: Expanding the ‘Simulated System’

With the basic binary structure of the immigration process outlined, there was a need to develop a form of pressure ‘build-up’ with the very basic ‘simulated system’, as the UNHCR has explained that
displaced people don’t just ‘disappear’ (UNHCR 2017), they linger and increase pressure on host nations systems until properly processed:

![Fig.16 Game Flow ver.1.5](image1)

The simple addition of a feedback loop between the Applications Deck and Applications Denied Deck provided the simulated global pressure caused by mass displacement events. Having a clear and simple system to iterate on at first should be the initial priority.

5.3 Right to Remain ver.2.0

![Fig.17 Game Flow ver.2.0](image2)

The next addition to the simulated system was the Integrated Applicants Deck, at this stage and for many other iterations of the game it served no ‘useful’ purposes within the game, eventually becoming important version 3.9 and the development of the ‘Integration Roll’, it was included because integration into a host nation is often seen as the aim for any successful refugee system (Strang & Ager 2010). Version 2.0 was the first version of the game to be sent for distributed playtesting, the concept proved to be a difficult to describe effectively to test coordinators, who are used to testing games with clear goals:

“My initial thoughts were what the hell is he up to now. My concluding thoughts are… what the hell is he up to now!!!”

Appendix 4 USA Coordinator 1
The lack of clear goals, and by extension game structure was an issue. It did however lead to a useful insight from one of the test coordinators, which helped define the nature of the initial task:

“it is not a game good sir. It’s a piece of computer code at the moment executed by humans.”

Appendix 4 UK Coordinator 1

This described perfectly exactly what the aim of the process was up to this point, it was to build a robust simulated structure that made logical sense, that was ‘executable’. The other component of the system that required testing was the content on the cards, which at this stage were rows in a spreadsheet, the 30 cases were drawn up from an amalgam of UNHCR and Amnesty International data:

The use of a spreadsheet firstly allowed the playtest packs to be produced for remote playtesting, secondly it removed the test coordinators ability to become ‘persuasive’ in descriptions, and finally it allowed for testing the content on the cards to see if it too might become persuasive, indeed two test coordinators raised this very concern:

“You are going to need to be super, super careful with the games presentation, visuals on cards and stuff”

Appendix 4 USA Coordinator 2

“Think you’re mad for taking on the refugee crisis though, mainly because you are going to struggle to remain neutral on it… on that note two of my playtester’s… felt your silly little cartoon character pictures might be an attempt to make them feel guilty, or sympathetic”

Appendix 4 UK Coordinator 1

5.3.1 Version 2.5: Almost a Game Now

During the debriefs for version 2.0 (appendix 4) two test coordinators raised the need for there to be a fail states within the simulated system, for it to start functioning like a game. The concept of a ‘pressure tracker’ was discussed with the same two test coordinators separately, and the concept of the Public Opinion Tracker was added to version 2.5:
The way the Public Opinion Tracker works (appendix 5), is that it represents the ‘internal pressures’ faced by any immigration systems from the society they represent, it’s ‘crude’ relationship based on the number of Refugee Cards players move into the Successful Applicants Deck, with the higher the number increasing the likelihood of failure. So essentially, resources within the game are used to avoid failure, this runs contrary to prevailing mechanical logic where resources within games are used primarily to win (Selinker 2011, pg.56-60). The other change to the simulated system was how many refugee cards were drawn each turn, in version 2.0 (appendix 3) one dice was used to determine the number, to ensure a level of predictability within the system two dice were used in version 2.5 (appendix 5) and beyond, as two dice gives a bell curve of predictability around the number 7. This was done to ensure iterating game balance was easier from this point forward.

Another potential incidence of accidental persuasion occurred:

“Meghan and her friend spotted there were… fewer women in the deck of cards, and that women were far more likely to not have papers”

Appendix 6 USA Coordinator 2

The number of female cards was representative of the proportion of women making asylum claims within Europe, and the lack of paperwork disproportionately affecting women was reported by the European Parliament (2016). This lead to a further insight:

“This brings up some questions you might need to answer, like what if the situation is just persuasive anyway? I mean, sometimes you look at facts and they just tell you where to go.”

Appendix 6 USA Coordinator 2

When dealing with certain topics, there is of course the potential for the nature of the phenomenon being developed into a game to be persuasive in nature, no matter how the facts of the situation are presented. This is OK, so long as there isn’t a concerted effort to be persuasive on the game designers
part, if something is just persuasive then that is the nature of the situation, and it can’t be avoided, but neither should it be exacerbated by deliberate procedural design decision, it should remain an honest representation of information within the simulation, or mechanic of the game.

5.4 Right to Remain ver.3.0

Although the addition of the Public Opinion Tracker in version 2.0 started the transformation from simulation to game, it became problematic:

“this current system is now persuasive, it persuades people that frog faced cretin Farage is right and we should turn everyone down. There needs to be a pressure from the other side too… balance it out.”

Appendix 6 UK Coordinator 1

“You need something to balance out the public tracker, and I know from the brief beforehand you are thinking the same.”

Appendix 6 USA Coordinator 1

“You also need a balance the other way, I’m sure you know this, but the public opinion tracker made Meghan reject WAY more people. Interestingly afterwards she felt guilty about it.”

Appendix 6 USA Coordinator 2

The feedback was clear and unanimous, without multiple routes to failure the game was essentially rewarding a specific behaviour, which was a procedural rhetoric (Bogost 2007), it’s therefore massively important to have balance between fail states within the game, so players aren’t encouraged to adopt one behaviour over another. A second tracker was developed for version 3.0 (appendix 7) that put pressure back into the system, this time from rejected claims:

![Diagram showing Game Flow ver.3.0 and ver.3.3]

Fig.19 Game Flow ver.3.0 and ver.3.3
This attempt at balancing the pressure within the system placed tension back onto Application decisions within the game, which was the desired point of pressure within the system, as the game sought to simulate the pressures faced by immigration officers. However, the most interesting thing to come out of the distributed playtesting of version 3.0 was the switch from single-player to multi-player game, essentially several coordinator’s unilaterally chose to develop version 3.3 (appendix 9):

“I know it’s meant to be a single player game at this point because you’re wanting to slowly iterate on the system, but I totally ignored you this time.”

Appendix 8 USA Coordinator 2

This change led to the desired aesthetic of the game initiating a ‘dialogue’ identified in section 2.3, and the insight that reflection and contemplation doesn’t happen in isolation, it happens between people as a discussion, which is a revelation only now starting to be fully explored within cognitive science (Sloman & Fernbach 2017, pg.1-10).

5.4.1 Version’s 3.6 and 3.9: Spit and Polish

Some very specific and critical feedback led to a re-writing of the version 3.3 rules, in a more professional and clear manner (version 3.6 appendix 10) so that a very specific remote playtest could be attempted:

“You need to work on balance and tidying up the rules. I think the structure is there, but I have not been able to drop the game rules in front of somebody yet and say DIY. We’re only able to play because you’ve explained it to me and I can fill in the blanks / translate the mess.”

Appendix 8 USA Coordinator 2

Although the content of the rulebook was essentially completely re-written, and made easier to follow, the flow of the game remained essentially the same as version 3.0, with the addition of clearing up how the Applied Applications Deck functioned on the playing surface, with the addition of the Returned Home Deck:

---

Fig.20 Game Flow ver.3.6
Being forced to think of the game rules as a ‘product’ for someone to play without the presence of a playtest coordinator focused not only the mind, and the language used within the rulebook, but also the need for clarity within the simulated system itself. The aim of developing version 3.6 was to enable a test coordinator, to put the rules and components of the game in front of some players to see if they could play the game without further instruction, and input beyond what the rulebook provided. This is an important milestone in the playtesting process as it indicates that you have a functioning game. The answer to that question was positive:

“Yes, and quite easily, although they’re experienced gamers. You might want to try it on normal people without neckbeards.”

Appendix 11 USA Coordinator 2

The playtest also provided the decisive feedback with regards to two Opinion Trackers, and the need to alter them:

“It is way… too hard… the game dies every time around 34 cards. So either you need a mechanic which allows players to affect the trackers more deliberately going the other way, or you need to vastly widen the range in the tables…”

Appendix 11 USA Coordinator 2

This feedback led to the development of the ‘Integration Roll’ mentioned earlier in section 5.3, whereby cards moved into the Integrated Applicants Deck, via a roll of a dice, have the potential to reduce the two Opinion Trackers (version 3.9 appendix 12), giving players a direct, if risky, way to play for potentially reducing the Opinion Trackers. The other major change was to the Opinion Trackers themselves, firstly their length was doubled from 6 to 12, and the tables governing their behaviour were changed so they wouldn’t be as prone to increasing the pressure in the game. Beyond that though the structure and the flow of the game remained essentially unchanged:

In the main the changes were positive, with the trackers being less volatile and the ‘Integration Roll’s’ having the desired effect of keeping the game alive longer. However, the changes intended to make things easier, made things a little too easy:
“As to the game remember it was too hard before? It’s now probably a bit too easy to maintain that balance, I think once you kick into the game proper the counters oscillate between 3, 4, and 5 for most of the game and for the two games we played, roughly around 80 cards we noticed it creep up towards the end to rest around 5, 6 and 7. So maybe cut the trackers down to reflect that so there’s pressure at the end.”

Appendix 13 Australia Coordinator

Game ‘balancing’ is a phrase that is common amongst game development literature, if games are a form of artificial conflict and challenge (Salen & Zimmerman 2004, pg.248-249), then the aim is to ensure that the challenge is set at the right level, that the game isn’t too easy or too hard. This is arguably the most difficult part of any game development process, and often requires a large amount of playtesting to ensure the game ‘balance’ is set at the right level (Woodruff 2011). For Fullerton (2014, pg.314) game balancing is about ensuring that the game meets the desired goals that have been set for the player experience, in the case of Right to Remain the aim was to put ‘prolonged’ pressure on players at the point of deciding refugees fate, and although that was where the pressure was within the system, it wasn’t prolonged enough to cause dialogue to develop because maintaining the systemic equilibrium was too hard. At this point the final iterative steps needed to be made via another playcentric workshop, with Observational Playtesting to try to balance the game elements.

5.5 Right to Remain tinkering and final iterative steps

The final iterative steps were taken during a playcentric workshop, with balancing the two opinion trackers the primary concern, followed by understanding the addition of a time limit, and how the addition of National Trait Cards affected play. The final game flow for version 4.0:

![Game Flow ver.4.0](image)

Firstly various ‘lengths’ of opinion trackers were tested, for the average number of refugee cards ‘dealt’ with by players. The results are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Average Cards Dealt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Positions</td>
<td>57.33 Cards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Positions</td>
<td>82.66 Cards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Positions</td>
<td>83.33 Cards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Positions</td>
<td>96.33 Cards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Positions</td>
<td>100 Cards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Positions</td>
<td>100 Cards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Both Trackers with 100% success rates were discounted for being ‘too easy’, the Tracker with 9 positions was also considered to have too high a probability of success to provide a challenging game. The original Tracker length of 6 remained too difficult for players to complete, which left Opinion Tracker lengths 7 or 8, which had a similar success rate. Opinion Tracker lengths of 8 were chosen because it made it easier to mathematically balance the amount of Refugee Cards that needed to be turned down each game turn due to the Public Opinion Tracker.

The playtest was conducted with only three players, and as such the time of the rounds was only ‘calibrated’ to a game of 3 players, and 4 minutes proved a sufficient amount of time for playtester’s to complete, most rounds without incident, but provided enough pressure to force players into deciding quickly. It is however, an element of the game that isn’t fully understood, and has been left in the rules only because players felt it added an extra ‘edge’ to proceedings. However, it detracts from desired aesthetic of starting dialogue between players (section 2.3), it did start dialogue, but it was argumentative dialogue and not constructive.

Finally, the addition of the National Trait Cards had very little bearing on the number of average cards dealt with by each nation either turn by turn, or throughout an entire play session. Of far greater impact on the number of Refugee Cards dealt with was the Integration Roll requirements, which essentially meant Sweden and the UK were the average difficulty setting, with the average amount of Refugee Cards dealt with, as integration rolls of 5 and 6 were used to test the Trackers. The USA became the easy difficulty setting, achieving almost 100% success rate, and Australia dropping 15 cards below average dealt with during play session essentially became the hard difficulty setting. Meaning the game has low, medium and High difficulty settings, although this wasn’t the intended design outcome. Although version 4.0 isn’t a fully finished game, this is as far as the iteration was able to go, the game requires further playtesting and balancing to achieve the desired goals that were set for the player experience.

5.6 Right to Remain the finished design

Although primarily a product of a process to ascertain whether the creation of such a game was possible, the final design does stand as its own contribution. Right to Remain is a card game that places three players in the position of deciding the fate of refugees, using a crude simulation based on real world data. The game is designed to illicit discussion between players, to expose their true feelings, and to garner some understanding of the difficult position many countries find themselves in, within this current climate. The players are tasked with dealing with a random number of cards generated every turn, and decided who is granted and denied asylum, there are 100 cards in total and the game concludes when all cards have been dealt with, or one of two fail states is reached. Players also must balance internal pressures, for allowing ‘too many’ refugees Asylum Status, and external pressures for denying ‘too many’. Each round is time limited to add further pressure on the players decisions. The game exposes not only its mechanics, but also the problems countries face in meeting their United Nations obligations, and as such is an effective way to inform non-experts as to the complexity of the situation faced.
6.0 Further Discussion

During the process of developing Right to Remain, several lessons, and knowledge contributions were generated, some predictable, and others that weren’t necessarily expected. Firstly, there’s a contribution around games design methodology for PD practitioners covered in more detail elsewhere (section 4.0 & 5.0). Secondly, the insight that a Wicked Game can’t exist in isolation points future research in a clear direction. Thirdly, the tentative development of preliminary design heuristics for Wicked Games, as a pointer for other games designers and participatory designers to work with. Finally, there is the assessment as to whether continuing researching Wicked Games as a potential tool in PD, is worthwhile.

6.1 Right to Remain as Part of a Broader Megagame

What emerges from developing the final version of Right to Remain is that on its own, without linking to a broader, more representative holistic system, it can’t fully convey the complexity of the situation, or the tensions involved. This isn’t surprising, and there was always going to be a need to develop a broader suite of games tackling the Wicked Problem from multiple angles, as was discussed in section 1.1. The intention was always that Right to Remain would form part of a broader Megagame (Mega Game Makers 2017), and that it would link into a bigger ecosystem of other games to create a bigger whole. This would allow players to experience all aspects of the refugee crisis, and to attempt whole-system solutions, as well as guarding against falling into the trap of being persuasive by focusing on only one perspective. If we reconsider Fig.11 we can see how this might be achieved:

In terms of linking Right to Remain game elements back into the interconnectedness of the current Refugee crisis, the clearest linkage is via the journey of refugees themselves, represented on the left side of Fig.11, from Origin Nations right through to Immigration control, it should be possible to simulate the journey refugee’s take within a game structure, and provide more detailed refugees within the system, who might also journey off to other parts of the system such as Refugee Camps. The two Opinion Trackers in the game represent simulated pressure within the system, both internal to individual nations and external from transnational bodies such as the EU and UN. The pressure could also be turned into game elements to be played by other players, internally players could be forced to deal with providing support to the Refugees players of Right to Remain grant Refugee Status too, trying to use simulated resources like housing, social care and education amongst others, the impacts of which could be fed back to players. Likewise, international pressure around rejected refugees and displaced peoples could also form game elements. Sadly, there wasn’t the time to fully develop or scope out how these separate elements might be developed and brought together within a megagame structure.
6.2 Design Heuristics of Wicked Games

During the development of Right to Remain there emerged several principles that came from working on the game, and receiving feedback from playtester’s, which pointed towards a series of design heuristics (Rothlauf 2011, pg.1-3) for designers seeking to develop Wicked Games themselves:

- The need for multiple routes to failure
- Systemic Equilibrium as success
- The need for nondirective reflective moral practice
- The need for broader participation (multi-player games and interlinked games)
- The game system, or mechanics should be open and exposed, to allow for players to 'modify' them.

This list is only tentative, and by no means should be considered sacrosanct, it should be viewed more as a starting point in a hopefully much longer discussion about the heuristics of such games.

6.3 A Worthwhile Endeavour?

The main research question was whether it was possible to develop a ‘Wicked Game’ as outlined in sections 2.3 and 2.4, the answer is frustratingly a maybe, Right to Remain has those characteristics, the question remains whether it is possible for a Wicked Game to only show one perspective. It’s certainly possible to create a game with a non-specified goal, and you do so by setting systemic equilibrium as the goal, and it’s possible to be non-persuasive by having multiple routes to failure. However, such ‘games’ clearly need to be part of a much wider ‘eco-system’ of games that interlink and give players the possibility to view problems from multiple angles. Without this opportunity, there’s a risk that in isolation such games could become persuasive, but more importantly any attempts at fully resolving whatever problem exists is diminished. The development of a megagame (section 6.1) wasn’t possible within the scope of this project, but is certainly the main direction for future research.
7.0 Conclusion

The design process contained within this thesis has generated a lot of material, which answers some of the questions raised in section 1.5, but also asks new questions, and points towards the need to develop further knowledge in specific areas.

7.1 Knowledge Contribution

This thesis provides six primary knowledge contributions, which each add value and knowledge to different fields within Interaction Design, be they PD or Games Design Research, and possibly the wider design community and potentially beyond design itself and into Public Policy:

- Proposed a new way of using games and games design methodology within PD, that comes from a games research perspective (section 1.0).
- A new game sub-genre (including definition) within Policy Games, Wicked Games (sections 1.3.4).
- A starting point for the discussion of Design Heuristics for Wicked Games (section 6.2).
- Developed a Wicked Game, ‘Right to Remain’, and provided a step by step account of how it was developed so other designers, but specifically participatory designers can use the process for guidance (section 5.0 and Appendices).
- Information on how to conduct Distributed Playtests (section 4.1).
- Conducted formal analysis as a means for extracting tacit knowledge from games (sections 2.2 & 3.3) and assessed its suitability for the task (section 4.3.1).

7.2 Future Research Directions

There are several strands that have emerged from this design process that merit further consideration, investigation and research:

- Further development of Wicked Games
- Development of Wicked Games into broader Megagame Framework
- Use of Games and Games Design Techniques with PD

Not every strand was intended, but each point towards the need for more work, and as such this thesis should be seen as the very start of a process, which scopes out the reference points for further research to be built upon.
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Appendix 1

Right to Remain Rules Version 1.0

Set up Phase

The player decides on their levels of requirement Refugee status to be granted, these can be based on national guidelines, or UN recommendation guidelines, or personal beliefs. These then form the basis of the decisions the player makes during the Application Phase. The player then shuffles the Refugee Deck.

Immigration Phase

The player then rolls a single 6-sided dice (1D6) to determine the global refugee crisis level. This determines how many ‘refugees’ the player draws from the Refugee Card Deck, and places into the Applications Deck.

Application Phase

The player then must decide which ‘applicants’ will be successfully granted refugee status and placed in the Successful Applicants Deck. Those that are ‘unsuccessful’ are placed in applications denied deck. After the ‘Applicants’ have been placed in their correct Decks the player moves to the end phase.

End Phase

Check to see if you have exhausted the ‘Refugee Card Deck’. If the player hasn’t exhausted the ‘Refugee Card Deck’ they should continue playing until there are no more Cards in the ‘Refugee Card Deck’. When all Refugee Cards have been placed in either the ‘Applications Denied Deck’ or ‘Successful Applications Deck’ the player is encouraged to compare the two piles of cards to see if there is any real discernible difference between those who were successful and those who weren’t, and reflect on them, as well as the criteria they chose for selecting eligible status.
Appendix 2

Right to Remain Rules Version 1.5

Set up Phase

The player decides on their levels of requirement for Refugee status to be granted, these can be based on national guidelines, or UN recommendation guidelines. These then form the basis of the decisions the player makes during the Application Phase. The player then shuffles the Refugee Deck.

Immigration Phase

The player then rolls a single 6-sided dice (1D6) to determine the global refugee crisis level. This determines how many ‘refugees’ the player draws from the Refugee Card Deck, and places into the Applications Deck. If there are any cards in the Global Pressure Deck these are also added to the Applications Deck.

Applications Phase

The players then must decide which ‘applicants’ will be successfully granted refugee status and placed in the Successful Applicants Deck. Those that are ‘unsuccessful’ are placed into the global pressure deck. After the ‘Applicants’ have been placed in their correct Decks the player moves to the end phase.

End Phase

The first task is to count how many cards there are in the Global Pressure Deck, divide the deck randomly into half and place half of the cards (rounding down) into the Applications Denied Deck. These are Applicants that have been thoroughly turned down, and will play no further part in the game (Do not discard these cards entirely set them to one side). The remaining cards (rounding up) remain in the ‘Global Pressure Deck’.

Check to see if you have exhausted the ‘Refugee Card Deck’. If the player hasn’t exhausted the ‘Refugee Card Deck’ they should continue playing until there are no more Cards in the ‘Refugee
Card Deck’. If Players have exhausted the ‘Refugee Card Deck’ they should continue playing until there are no more Cards in the ‘Global Pressure Deck’. When all Refugee Cards have been placed in either the ‘Applications Denied Deck’ or ‘Successful Applications Deck’ the player is encouraged to compare the two piles of cards to see if there is any real discernible difference between those who were successful and those who weren’t, and reflect on them, as well as the criteria for selecting eligible status.
Appendix 3

Right to Remain Rules Version 2.0

Set up Phase

The player selects to use Either the UNHCR guidelines or Sweden Migrationsverket Guidelines provided. These then form the basis of the decisions the player makes during the application phase. The players then shuffle the Refugee Deck (or use Excel Spreadsheet provided).

Immigration Phase

The player then rolls a single 6-sided dice (1D6) to determine the global refugee crisis level. This determines how many ‘refugees’ the player draws from the Refugee Card Deck, and places into the Applications Deck. If there are any cards in the Global Pressure Deck these are also added to the Applications Deck.

Applications Phase

The player then must decide which ‘applicants’ will be successfully granted refugee status and placed in the Successful Applicants Deck. Those that are ‘unsuccessful’ are placed into the global pressure deck. After the ‘Applicants’ have been placed in their correct Decks the player moves to the end phase.

End Phase

The first task is to count how many cards there are in the Global Pressure Deck, divide the deck randomly into half and place half of the cards (rounding down) into the Applications Denied Deck. These are Applicants that have been thoroughly turned down, and will play no further part in the game (Do not discard these cards entirely). The remaining cards (rounding up) remain in the ‘Global Pressure Deck’.

Next count the ‘Successful Applicants Deck’ and split the deck in half (rounding down) and move these cards into the ‘Integrated Applicants Deck’. The other half (rounding up) are placed in the
‘Successful Applicants Deck’. At this point the ‘Integrated Applicants Deck’ plays not further part in the game.

Check to see if you have exhausted the ‘Refugee Card Deck’. The player hasn’t exhausted the ‘Refugee Card Deck’ they should continue playing until there are no more Cards in the ‘Refugee Card Deck’. If the player hasn’t exhausted the ‘Refugee Card Deck’ they should continue playing until there are no more Cards in the ‘Global Pressure Deck’. When all Refugee Cards have been placed in either the ‘Applications Denied Deck’ or ‘Successful Applications Deck’ the player is encouraged to compare the two piles of cards to see if there is any real discernible difference between those who were successful and those who weren’t, and reflect on them, as well as the criteria they chose for selecting eligible status.
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## Right to Remain Version 2.0: Feedback Forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USA Coordinator 1: Colin</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA Coordinator 2: John</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Coordinator 1: Jon</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Right to Remain Playtest form

Name of Host: Colin T

Host Nation: USA (Battle Creek, Michigan) Dude, it’s really not as exciting as it sounds we’re famous for cornflakes! CORNFLAKES!!!

Date of playtest: March 30th

Number of players: 2

Number of Game played: 3 (I also played it myself first, so not a playtest)

Version of Rules Tried: Version 2.0

Thoughts on the Concept:

My initial thoughts were what the hell is he up to now. My concluding thoughts are… what the hell is he up to now!!!

😊

I think you’re crazy, I like the idea, but games for Public Policy? You know that’s not a get rich quick scheme right?

As to the game I think given the time frame you’ve told me about you are completely right to go for a straightforward card game. If you had more time I’d suggest some more boardgame elements to represent maybe trying to ‘control’ immigrants in various places, what happens if one just disappears and you can’t track / deport them? That happens all the time here in the USA.

Thoughts on the Simulated System:

I think you’ve got the flow about right I guess. Not an immigration expert, although me and Rebecca are getting there, been Googling it. I think there needs to be pressure in the system too based on decisions. Just looking at it as a ‘flow’ I think the Global Pressure Deck will work nicely. If you get two rounds with high dice rolls in a row, or more, once some game elements are in there it should cause some rage quitting.

How Can I make it a Game?:

Million dollar question I guess… give it a goal? And a way to fail, games like this you need to fail on, and hard. I know you said you didn’t want it to be about training people to be immigration officers, but maybe that should be part of it, having like a performance review at the end of each round to check to see if players have made the correct calls. Too many mistakes and you’re fired.

General Comments on the Game:

It’s not a game.

Any other Comments:
You know I never fill these sections out… oh wait, I just did.

**Debrief notes:**

Colin really doesn’t understand what I’m trying to do, says he gets it then talks about making people understand how bad being a refugee is.

Is enthusiastic about it though, wants to test more.
Right to Remain Playtest form

Name of Host: John L

Host Nation: Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA

Date of playtest: 03/29/2017

Number of players: 1 (sorry, just the wife at short notice)

Number of Game played: 2

Version of Rules Tried: Version 2.0

Thoughts on the Concept:

I don’t think FFG will be interested in buying it Jody, so don’t prepare a pitch just yet.

You know Meghan works with refugee school children here, so we’re interested in what you are trying to do, although I’m not entirely sure what that is. It’s not a serious game, or an empathy game and you said its not a Bogost type persuasive game, totally want to see where you go with it.

You are going to need to be super, super careful with the games presentation, visuals on cards and stuff. We have a design team full of wizards for a reason, font change here and font change there can change how people read the information, bold = important, italic = fluff. On that score the place holder pictures, we’re programmed to feel something when we see a human face, don’t need to tell you that. So just be careful when removing the place holder, too many dirty looking children and people will start to feel sympathy,

Thoughts on the Simulated System:

It’s a system, and it’s simulated. How accurate it is I don’t know. I guess you can’t just rock up to your local immigration services and ask them to play it on their lunch break can you?

If you can get professional input, do.

How Can I make it a Game?:

Define game

Let’s not go there again. It has no goal at the moment, there are components, and basic characteristics, and that’s all good, but if you said it’s a card game to people they’d expect certain things… I’m not sure your card game is heading in that direction right now though.

General Comments on the Game:

See above.

Any other Comments:
Definitely send me the next versions. Interested to see where it goes from here really. I know he’s busy but ask Jimmy to help, he’s into this policy game stuff, he made a game for kids about recycling I think.

**Debrief notes:**

Debrief with both John and Meghan. Both understand what I’m trying to do, and both are interested to see where it ends up.

John thinks I should add some pressure tracking system to the game. Just something simple that responds to how the players play. Let more people in, pressure tracker builds. I agree, there needs to be a ‘Feedback System’ a la McGonigal’s definition.
Right to Remain Playtest form

Name of Host: Jon G

Host Nation: Abergavenny, Wales, United Kingdom

Date of playtest: 31/03/2017

Number of players: 4

Number of Game played: 4 (Not a game, executable program)

Version of Rules Tried: Version 2.0

Thoughts on the Concept:

Well my good fellow what can I say, I’m intrigued by your thoroughly bonkers, and totally you proposition. Really glad you decided to give this a shot, and if it works and you make a consultancy out of this, you better remember me you blaggard.

I totally get what you are trying to do, using game systems to abstract policy problems, and we’ve talked about it before, good to see you actually trying it out.

Think you’re mad for taking on the refugee crisis though, mainly because you are going to struggle to remain neutral on it. I think just asking people to play a game where they have to assess humans in dire need, as refugees, well if it doesn’t pull at your heart strings you’ve probably got no heart.

And on that note two of my playtester’s (UKIP sorts, don’t ask) felt your silly little cartoon character pictures might be an attempt to make them feel guilty, or sympathetic, I explained it was probably just a placeholder (although how generic white guy cartoon can be seen as an attempt to make people feel bad I fail to see, le sigh) but that just made them more convinced you’d be using pictures of drowning babies, street urchins and wounded old ladies to manipulate them. It’s a hard line to follow, I don’t know if you can avoid people feeling preached too, or manipulated. Just something to be aware of with presentation.

Still you’ve picked your poison and are laying in your bed, and I’ve mixed my metaphors!

Thoughts on the Simulated System:

I think it’s all in there. Humans coming to country. Check. System not working quick enough to decide causing build up. Check. Applicants denied. Check. Applicants accepted. Check.

The only thing I might add is that you’ve got an integration deck of cards, what about anti-integration? Sorry, don’t know the antonym for that, you probably do, but what happens to the people sent home? Do some try to stay and you can’t get rid of them? I think those are things to build in much, much later at this point, perhaps when you actually have a proper game in place, which brings me nicely onto →

How Can I make it a Game?:

I know it’s not a game, you know it’s not a game, everyone knows it’s not a game.
How do I win? How do I lose. I guess you need to set up ‘lose’ first, because given you’re trying to set up a system that should work, you want to show what’s going wrong first. Is winning going to be just doing the job right?

I always think there needs to be indicators for players on how the thing is going as well, a nice visual cue that says ‘OK the shit has hit the fan’ or ‘yes we’re cooking on gas’.

**General Comments on the Game:**

I’ve said it above, it is not a game good sir. It’s a piece of computer code at the moment executed by humans. I suppose it’s good practice for when Skynet takes over.

**Any other Comments:**

You’ve got a hell of a lot of work ahead of you to even make it into a game, but, to make it into a game that isn’t about empathy or preaching to people about what is ‘right’, that my dear boy is quite the task. You need to start adding gaming elements to it, and see where it goes from there, my first suggestion is try finding a way of turning the card sorting mechanic into a feedback system.

**Debrief notes:**

Jon suggested using a simple counter system to show levels of pressure in the system as they build up.

I talked with him about how to best do that, given the idea wasn’t to learn how to ‘game’ the system, it was about seeing how it responds to stress. The only conclusion we came to is dice. There needs to be random elements in there somehow that stops players being able to predict and control the math of the simulated system.
Appendix 5

Right to Remain Rules Version 2.5

Set up Phase

The player selects to use Either the UNHCR guidelines or Sweden Migrationsverket Guidelines provided. These then form the basis of the decisions the player makes during the application phase. Players then shuffle the Refugee Deck (or use Excel Spreadsheet provided). Place the ‘Public Opinion Tracker’ at Zero.

Immigration Phase

The player then rolls two six-sided dice (2D6) to determine the global refugee crisis level. This determines how many refugees the player draws from the Refugee Card Deck, and places into the Applications Deck. If there are any cards in the Global Pressure Deck these are also added to the Applications Deck.

Applications Phase

The player then must decide which ‘applicants’ will be successfully granted refugee status and placed in the Successful Applicants Deck. Depending on ‘Public Opinion’ a certain number of refugees MUST be turned down, the number on the tracker indicates how many applicant cards must be placed directly into the Applications Denied Deck. Those that are ‘unsuccessful’ are placed in the global pressure deck. After the ‘Applicants’ have been placed in their correct Decks the player moves to the end phase.
End Phase

The first task is to count how many cards there are in the Global Pressure Deck, divide the deck in half and place half of the cards (rounding up) into the Applications Denied Deck. These are Applicants than have been thoroughly turned down, and will play no further part in the game (Do not discard these cards entirely). The remaining cards (rounding down) remain in the ‘Global Pressure Deck’.

Next count the ‘Successful Applicants Deck’ and split the deck in half (rounding down) and move these cards into the ‘Integrated Applicants Deck’. The other half (rounding up) are placed in the ‘Successful Applicants Deck’, count these cards this number becomes the ‘Public Pressure Score’, take two six-sided dice (2D6) and roll them and add the ‘Public Pressure Score’ to the result and consult the ‘Public Opinion Tracker’.

Next check to see if you have exhausted the ‘Refugee Card Deck’. If The player hasn’t exhausted the ‘Refugee Card Deck’ they should continue playing until there are no more Cards in the ‘Global Pressure Deck’. When all Refugee Cards have been placed in either the ‘Applications Denied Deck’ or ‘Successful Applications / Integrated Applicants Decks’ the player is encouraged to compare the two piles of cards to see if there is any real discernible difference between those who were successful and those who weren’t.

Fail state: If the Public Opinion Tracker remains at level 6 for 3 consecutive turns the game is over.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Opinion Tracker</th>
<th>2D6 Roll</th>
<th>Affect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>Move the ‘Public Opinion Tracker’ down one on the Public Opinion Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 9</td>
<td>No change in ‘Public Opinion Tracker’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 - 12</td>
<td>Move the ‘Public Opinion Tracker’ up one on the Public Opinion Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13+</td>
<td>Move the ‘Public Opinion Tracker’ up two on the Public Opinion Scale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 6

Right to Remain Version 2.5: Feedback Forms

USA Coordinator 1: Colin  
USA Coordinator 2: John  
UK Coordinator 1: Jon  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USA Coordinator 1: Colin</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA Coordinator 2: John</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Coordinator 1: Jon</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Right to Remain Playtest form

Name of Host: Colin T

Host Nation: Battle Creek, Michigan, USA (We have a farmers market so we must be cool)

Date of playtest: April 2nd and April 4th

Number of players: 3

Number of Game played: 3

Version of Rules Tried: Version 2.5

Thoughts on the Concept:

Took it to my wargaming club, there was actually some interest (sorry to sound shocked). Only 3 wanted to play it though, the rest just stood around a gawped (that’s my new favorite word).

It is a hard sell though because it’s not like we’re talking about a fun game with aliens or zombies. That’s why I took it to my crusty historic wargaming club.

It was played by a librarian, a history teacher at a local school and an accountant… not tryin’ to say there’s a trend there or anything, but they are the sorts of people who wear jackets with leather elbow patches. ☺

There was some buzz around the idea at the club though, some people there seem to get the concept better than I do, in fact the history teacher (Paul) really understood it. He said he’s used games in class to explain things and re-enact things, and he thinks you’re going for a similar thing but with policy

‘Change the rules, play the game, see what happens, then do it again’

That’s a quote, he said that. Told you. Elbow patch types. I think I get it now though, it’s an exciting idea.

Thoughts on the Simulated System:

Right the change to 2D6 adds a much higher average of cards obviously, and that has implications, you need to do more cards. We got through the 30 cards you’ve put in the spread sheet very quickly.

So I just altered it and went round again with the same 30 cards, but really it’s not enough. For next time you really need to do more cards. About 100 is a good number, sorry it’s that high.

Next the public tracker. Love it. Gives a good sense of feedback on your actions in game. However it isn’t balanced in any way shape or form. The 3 who played it were all turning way more people down than accepting. I don’t know if that’s reality, if that happens, but I think they were turning people down who should have been accepted.

How Can I make it a Game?:

71
It almost is a game now. You need something to balance out the public tracker, and I know from the brief beforehand you are thinking the same. You need to do it now, it can be the exact same thing, a mirror. Might make it easier for players if it is, but if you don’t want to convince people Trump is right to build a wall, you do need something that says turning too many people down is also bad.

**General Comments on the Game:**

My 3 playtesters want to see how it evolves from here, and I do too. So you can sign us up for the ride.

Still not a game though, it’s still a way of sifting through and sorting cards.

Talking of cards there needs to be more information on them. Name, Age, Gender, Country of Origin and type of papers isn’t really enough to go on. There needs to be bio stuff. I know it’s loads more work for you, but no pain no gain. It would be interesting to see how players respond when there is a bit of background. Not too much though, just enough to indicate what they’re fleeing from.

**Any other Comments:**

Yes… no comment.

**Debrief notes:**

Colin brought up that some of his playtester’s felt that there needed to be more info as he fed back. Many felt they were just picking which pile to put them in based on documents and nation of origin. Fair point.
Right to Remain Playtest form

Name of Host: John L

Host Nation: Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA

Date of playtest: 04/08/2017

Number of players: 2

Number of Game played: 4

Version of Rules Tried: Version 2.5

Thoughts on the Concept:

Same as before, it’s an interesting idea, and I spoke to a few people at work about it, and when it’s looking like a game they’d like to try it. For now it’s the wife and her best friend playing it.

Thoughts on the Simulated System:

Maybe because they’re women, maybe because they’re feminists, maybe because they spent way too much time analysing the cards, but both Meghan and her friend spotted there were

- A) Fewer women in the deck of cards (8 in total)
- B) And that women were far more likely to not have papers

So question, is this deliberate? It felt deliberate during the games we played, but it did get them talking about it. If it is how it is in the real world I’ve been told to tell you it’s fuc*ed up!

This brings up some questions you might need to answer, like what if the situation is just persuasive anyway? I mean, sometimes you look at facts and they just tell you where to go.

How Can I make it a Game?:

I think it is a simulation now at least. Especially if the cards do represent the reality of the people in the system. That’s going to be key, you have to make sure, absolutely sure that you are, if not 100% accurate, at least in the ball park with your refugee cards.

You also need a balance the other way, I’m sure you know this, but the public opinion tracker made Meghan reject WAY more people. Interestingly afterwards she felt guilty about it. Her friend who is a Republican, and totally against America letting Syrian’s into the country (strange for a feminist maybe?) felt really passionately about women not having papers. It made her want to go away and read up on it.

General Comments on the Game:

Balance the pressure out, there needs to be punishment for turning too many people down too.

Also need more info on cards, and more cards. 50 is fine for a mock up at this point, as I can just duplicate them to continue on with the playtest should it be required.
Also, as it stands I think failure is almost impossible.

**Any other Comments:**

Nope

**Debrief notes:**

Was able to debrief with John, his wife, and her friend. They were incensed about the way the US treated women refugees, when they looked it up. Given where these women come from sometimes they can’t have their ‘own’ passport, but the US makes no concessions for this. Neither does the UK or Sweden for that matter. This is just going to be a persuasive element no matter what I do. Inevitable. The facts just sway you.

John wants bio info on cards as well. I knew it was coming so I have a lot of work ahead of me trawling UNHCR stories and demographics.
Right to Remain Playtest form

Name of Host: Jon G

Host Nation: Abergavenny, Wales, United Kingdom

Date of playtest: 07/04/2017 (you totally ruined my Friday evening you swine!)

Number of players: 3

Number of Game played: 3

Version of Rules Tried: Version 2.5

Thoughts on the Concept:

Still bags of potential, but it needs to be a game soon Jody. I can’t be running many more sessions with people sorting cards into piles.

Thoughts on the Simulated System:

Getting there, but this current system is now persuasive, it persuades people that frog faced cretin Farage is right and we should turn everyone down. There needs to be a pressure from the other side too, a way to balance it out. Like the EU and Poland right now. Poland aren’t taking their fair share of refugees and neither is Hungary and the EU voted to cut funding until they do their bit. I’m sure the UN wag their finger vigorously at countries like Australia who basically have bloody concentration camps in other countries. Bloody awful situation. But now, this simulation is no longer a simulation, it’s a game that teaches you to turn people away. Not what you were shooting for methinks old boy!

How Can I make it a Game?:

Another fail state would be a good start. Maybe a win state? I don’t know, could there be multiple win states? I’m stumped here.

General Comments on the Game:

You want folk to reflect on what they’re doing, and my current lot just aren’t reflecting at all, they just perform like monkey says monkey does style. Not sure if adding more pressure from the rejected pile will help that though. I think if you want people to reflect you have to give them something to reflect on, and that means details, details, details, and a challenge. But how do you add details without people feeling like you’re twisting their arms, and what if the challenges swings you to game the system?

Any other Comments:

The next version needs to be a game please. That is all.

Debrief notes:
Echoed both Coin and John’s comments about more cards, more details, and balancing the pressure in the game system out. Also, very unhappy about testing out ‘system’ as opposed to a game.

Agreed not to send him another version of the ‘game’ until it is a game, and one that’s ready for what everyone calls a DIY test (give players box, see if they can play it).
Appendix 7

Right to Remain Rules Version 3.0

Set up Phase

The player selects to use Either the UNHCR guidelines or Sweden Migrationsverket Guidelines provided. These then form the basis of the decisions the player makes during the application phase. The player then shuffles the Refugee Deck (or use Excel Spreadsheet provided). Place the ‘Public Opinion Tracker’ at Zero.

Immigration Phase

The player then rolls two six-sided dice (2D6) to determine the global refugee crisis level. This determines how many refugees the player draws from the Refugee Card Deck, and places into the Applications Deck. If there are any cards in the Global Pressure Deck these are also added to the Applications Deck.

Applications Phase

The player then must decide which ‘applicants’ will be successfully granted refugee status and placed in the Successful Applicants Deck. Depending on ‘Public Opinion’ a certain number of refugees MUST be turned down, the number on the tracker indicates how many applicant cards must be placed directly into the Applications Denied Deck. Those that are ‘unsuccessful’ are placed in the global pressure deck. After the ‘Applicants’ have been placed in their correct Decks the player moves to the end phase.
End Phase

The first task is to count how many cards there are in the Global Pressure Deck, divide the deck in half and place half of the cards (rounding up) into the Applications Denied Deck. These are Applicants that have been thoroughly turned down, and will play no further part in the game (Do not discard these cards entirely). The remaining cards (rounding down) remain in the ‘Global Pressure Deck’. Count the entire total of applicants refused this turn, including those that were required to be turned down due to the ‘Public Opinion tracker’, this becomes the ‘International Pressure Score’, take two six-sided dice (2D6) and roll them and add the ‘International Pressure Score’ to the result and consult the ‘International Opinion Tracker’.

Next count the ‘Successful Applicants Deck’ and split the deck in half (rounding down) and move these cards into the ‘Integrated Applicants Deck’. The other half (rounding up) are placed in the ‘Successful Applicants Deck’, count these cards this number becomes the ‘Public Pressure Score’, take two six-sided dice (2D6) and roll them and add the ‘Public Pressure Score’ to the result and consult the ‘Public Opinion Tracker’.

Next check to see if you have exhausted the ‘Refugee Card Deck’, If the player has exhausted the ‘Refugee Card Deck’ they should continue playing until there are no more Cards in the ‘Global Pressure Deck’. When all Refugee Cards have been placed in either the ‘Applications Denied Deck’ or ‘Successful Applications / Integrated Applicants Decks’ the player is encouraged to compare the two piles of cards to see if there is any real discernible difference between those who were successful and those who weren’t.

Fail state: If the ‘Public Opinion Tracker’ or the ‘International Opinion Tracker’ remains level 6 for 3 consecutive turns the game is over. This means each individual tracker, so two turns at 6 on the international tracker, followed by 1 turn at 6 on the Public tracker does not count as 3 consecutive turns. It must be 3 consecutives turns on the same tracker.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Opinion Tracker</th>
<th>2D6 Roll</th>
<th>Affect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>Move the ‘Public Opinion Tracker’ down one on the Public Opinion Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 9</td>
<td>No change in ‘Public Opinion Tracker’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 - 12</td>
<td>Move the ‘Public Opinion Tracker’ up one on the Public Opinion Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13+</td>
<td>Move the ‘Public Opinion Tracker’ up two on the Public Opinion Scale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>International Opinion Tracker</th>
<th>2D6 Roll</th>
<th>Affect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>Move the ‘International Opinion Tracker’ down one on the International Opinion Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 9</td>
<td>No change in ‘International Opinion Tracker’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 - 12</td>
<td>Move the ‘International Opinion Tracker’ up one on the International Opinion Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13+</td>
<td>Move the ‘International Opinion Tracker’ up two on the International Opinion Scale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 8

### Right to Remain Version 3.0: Feedback Forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordinator</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia Coordinator: Jimmy</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA Coordinator 1: Colin</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA Coordinator 2: John</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Coordinator 2: Chris</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Right to Remain Playtest form

Name of Host: Jimmy the Oz man

Host Nation: Canberra, Australian

Date of playtest: 12th April

Number of players: 4

Number of Game played: 6

Version of Rules Tried: Version 3.0

Thoughts on the Concept:

We’re all sold. I’ve done educational games here in Oz, mainly for kids and teenagers, but I think, as you well know, there’s power in games for social good. Solidarity brother! Lol.

Took a bit of getting used to playing a game without an explicit goal, the goal being keeping your shit together for as long as you can.

Also feels weird that you aren’t trying to teach a message, I’ve played so many educational policy games, and written a few, not done the persuasive or activist thing yet, but it’s difficult niche you’re going for.

Feels like your game is trying to be part simulation, but not totally, part educational, but not totally and part empathy game, but not totally. Good luck.

Thoughts on the Simulated System:

Each person played the game twice and I think only one person actually got through all 50 Excel cases, most failed between the mid 20’s to late 30’s. That’s too hard.

The system you’ve simulated is clearly Euro focused. Doesn’t work like that here in Oz. I could give you some feedback on our system here, it’s not pleasant at all. The other thing is the mix of refugees isn’t right for Oz, not many Syrians or Somalians coming to here.

Maybe you need specific packs for different nations, although I get that the concept is to develop these games for specific situations, rather than be a generic product in a box, just thought it might be useful to see how different nations affect the game.

Is it now a Game?:

Absolutely yes it is. Might need more random cards, dials and tokens to be my kind of game, but it is a game.

Are people reflecting on their choices?:

Yes. We obviously played with the Swedish rules, and it made us reflect on the fact we have concentration camps in other countries stopping Asylum seekers getting into Australia.
So it made us deeply embarrassed. As a note for your cards, you have 3 levels of paperwork on your cards, none, some papers, and passport. You’d need another layer for Australia, coz for certain countries like Yemen, verified bulletproof blessed by God passports are required. It’s a virtually impossible to reach that level for anyone from some of these countries because they have no functioning Government and we need a Government verification. Then even if there is a Governement if the Asylum Seeker is a political dissident is that Government really going to say “yeah, they are who they say they are”, I don’t know.

**General Comments on the Game:**

It’s a super interesting topic for a game, I take it you’ve played Papers, Please and some of the other efforts. If not you should, just to see how differently you’re tackling things.

I think it currently is way too hard. I think you might want to try different national criteria and I also think once you have the balance right you might want to start tweaking it with more game choices. Maybe add a timer so people have to make choices quickly.

**Any other Comments:**

Not at this stage.

**Debrief notes:**

Time zone differences made it quite hard to debrief with him, but he feels like my work should focus on two main things:

1) Making sure there’s balance in the system and that it’s not too hard to play.
2) More national criteria, he thinks given the idea is for people to use the rules as a way of exploring policy changes, perhaps seeing if there is a difference when I do might prove my point.
Right to Remain Playtest form

Name of Host: Colin T

Host Nation: Battle Creek, Michigan, USA, USA, USA… I’m actually not patriotic at all

Date of playtest: April 14th and 16th

Number of players: 2 (Librarian and history teacher again)

Number of Game played: 4

Version of Rules Tried: Version 3.0

Thoughts on the Concept:

Been there, done that, stop asking me the question.

Thoughts on the Simulated System:

It’s certainly a system now, but boy do you fail hard on the global pressure. All 4 games failed on the global pressure, and all very early really, seems a bit intense to me.

But at least there’s a counter point to work with now, so that’s good. Stay positive.

Is it now a Game?:

I think it might be, but I’m not quite sure it’s a game like anything I’ve personally played.

Are people reflecting on their choices?:

No, not at all, and I’d argue these guys are pretty reflective people. Paul certainly is. I think there isn’t a place to verbalize what you are thinking and why, no reason to speak out loud and hear it. Maybe make players justify their decisions at the end of each round by writing down the reasons?

General Comments on the Game:

Too hard. Too damn hard. If I was an alcoholic in might drive me to drink.

I told you to make 100 cards right? No point buddy, we struggled to get halfway through the deck of 50.

Any other Comments:

I plead the 5th.

Debrief notes:

Really clear that the simulated system is leading to a build up quite early on in the Global pressure deck, but that the mechanism to relieve this (accept more refugees) is temporary as it push public
opinion back up and force more refugees to be turned down. The see saw is there but it still steadily builds too much.
Right to Remain Playtest form

Name of Host: John L

Host Nation: Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA

Date of playtest: 04/13/2017

Number of players: 4

Number of Game played: 2

Version of Rules Tried: Version 3.0

Thoughts on the Concept:

I know it’s meant to be a single player game at this point because you’re wanting to slowly iterate on the system, but I totally ignored you this time.

Took it with me to work so it got played by some game designers at lunch, and a little afterwards, a few of us would like to read your thesis after it’s done because the concept is interesting...

But we played two games with 4 players and it was just a better experience from the off. It needs to be multi-player because of the conversations people had, and so the reflection you want happens between people. Without other people its you and a moving puzzle. It’s a mental challenge, but not a contemplative one.

Thoughts on the Simulated System:

I think you have all the elements, I think it is now about making it robust enough that it works as a game, that it’s not too easy, not too hard, and just the right amount of random to make people think about what they are doing. Just to be clear, some super experienced game designers failed twice to make it to 40 cards drawn. First game was 31, second game 36. That seems a little on the hard side. Maybe running immigration is that brutal, if so then it’s not a good subject for a game.

Is it now a Game?:

This caused heated debate around our lunch table, with a vote of 3 to 2 in favour of it actually being a game. I voted in favour, I actually get the system in balance thing as the goal of the game now. Given it is hard to complete, getting through that deck of cards would feel like quite an achievement, and you do have to think about your decisions every round at least.

But only after we changed it from being a single player experience. The tension between players adds that bit of conflict it needed. Do keep it multiplayer!

Are people reflecting on their choices?:

Yes. I pointed out to the guys after the first game how many women they’d turned down from quite nasty countries that oppress women and asked them what they thought, we had a 30 minute conversation about it, which was longer than playing the game took! We actually got some movement of opinion too, we had a Methodist Republican type say it was wrong to penalise these
women because the countries they come from don’t issue women papers without husbands etc. Yet on the other side we had a Bernie Sanders supporting, anti-nuke vegan (who loves death metal) seeing the point of the current administration over papers. If people don’t have documents how can we be sure who they are? They actually came to an understanding, and the only other thing they agree on is that the Vikings suck.

**General Comments on the Game:**

You need to work on balance and tidying up the rules. I think the structure is there, but I have not been able to drop the game rules in front of somebody yet and say DIY. We’re only able to play because you’ve explained it to me and I can fill in the blanks / translate the mess.

Take some time on the next write up. I can give you some feedback before you send it out if you like. But I think it would really help if you wrote the rules like you were here, in the space running an intro game of Right to Remain for somebody.

Here, our rules for testing are massively detailed documents. In some cases we have one rulebook for the first round, and a second rule book for subsequent rounds.

Also put more diagrams in to explain the flow of the game, a word heavy rulebook that doesn’t have pictures to show you how things should look is a turn off to playtester’s. You should though talk people through the game step by step. Once it’s robust and you know what you have, then you simplify to rules.

**Any other Comments:**

It’s coming along nicely, I know the guys are looking forward to seeing the next iteration, yep that’s right, you didn’t scare them off. Yet.

**Debrief notes:**

Asked John about this ‘consensus’ building. Sounds like interesting feedback, could be one off could be an important aesthetic of what I’ve produced so far.

Lots, and lots of notes on how to write a proper rulebook for playtesting. Made me realise how crap the current rules are, but gave useful pointers for what I should be doing.

Next rules to be sent to John first for feedback and appraisal. He’ll run a playtest with his work colleagues then get back to me with detailed feedback, then go from there with wider testing when I have something worthwhile to test.
Right to Remain Playtest form

Name of Host: Chris T

Host Nation: Walsall, Uk

Date of playtest: 14/04/17

Number of players: 5 (one 2 player game, one 3 player game, and two 1 player games)

Number of Game played: 4

Version of Rules Tried: Version 3.0

Thoughts on the Concept:

Sorry, didn’t realise it was meant to be single player, ran it multiplayer first two games, and it worked, then realised it was supposed to be single player and played two more games, and its crap. Sorry, needs to be said. I’ve known you long enough to tell you when what you are doing is pants, and as a single player game it’s pants. As a multiplayer game there’s tension between players, well there was here, but you know Rich and Ash, they’d argue over whether white is white.

I explained at the club what it is that you are hoping to do, use games to help in policy work. Don’t think many people get what your aim is, and I’m not totally sure either.

Thoughts on the Simulated System:

I know you’ve been working on this for a few weeks, and I’ve only seen where you’ve come from, not actually played where you’ve come from, but it seems to me that you’ve now got a solid foundation to build and tweak.

Right now? It is very hard to get through the 50 cards without failing. I think pressure builds up too quickly, although that could just be Rich and his dice rolls.

Is it now a Game?:

Yes, but only just. What’s going to be key is how it balances out and what extra ‘game’ elements you can throw into the mix without making it confusing, or getting away from what your concept is.

Are people reflecting on their choices?:

On their own during single player? Nope. When in a group? Yeah.

Not sure my group of gamers (you know them all well) are the right people to ask to reflect on it. Although Ash did comment that if the cards are right, and so many come to the UK without documents he can understand why our Government is reluctant to let them in. Not sure that’s what you want to hear though, that you’ve turned a liberal into a conservative.

General Comments on the Game:
I think generally I’d like to see more game type elements, points, counters, trackers, random elements, that sort of thing. But I know you want to keep it streamlined.

On the positive side, there is plenty of scope to add on to this game in terms of extra rules, bolt on mods / house rules.

**Any other Comments:**

Not yet.

**Debrief notes:**

Wasn’t able to have a debrief with Chris because he was busy with work.

Bit annoying as he has an incidence of ‘consensus’ building like John, would have been useful to hear more.
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Right to Remain Rules Version 3.3

Right to Remain is a cooperative multiplayer game for between 2 to 5 players. Decide how many players want to play the game and then move onto the Set-up Phase. (Iterated by test coordinators, included as they play tested it).

Set-up Phase

Players select to use Either the UNHCR guidelines or Sweden Migrationsverket Guidelines provided. These then form the basis of the decisions players make during the Application Phase. Players then shuffle the Refugee Deck (or use Excel Spreadsheet provided). Place the ‘Public Opinion’ Tracker at Zero.

Immigration Phase

Players then roll two six-sided dice (2D6) to determine the global refugee crisis level. This determines how many refugees the players draw from the Refugee Card Deck, and place into the Applications Deck. If there are any cards in the Global Pressure Deck these are also added to the Applications Deck.

Applications Phase

Players then must decide which ‘applicants’ will be successfully granted refugee status and placed in the Successful Applicants Deck. Depending on ‘Public Opinion’ a certain number of refugees MUST be turned down, the number on the tracker indicates how many applicant cards must be placed directly into the Applications Denied Deck. Those that are ‘unsuccessful’ are placed in the global pressure deck. After the ‘Applicants’ have been placed in their correct Decks the player moves to the end phase.
End Phase

The first task is to count how many cards there are in the Global Pressure Deck, divide the deck in half and place half of the cards (rounding up) into the Applications Denied Deck. These are Applicants than have been thoroughly turned down, and will play no further part in the game (Do not discard these cards entirely). The remaining cards (rounding down) remain in the ‘Global Pressure Deck’. Count the entire total of applicants refused this turn, including those that were required to be turned down due to the Public Opinion tracker, this becomes the ‘International Pressure Score’, take two six-sided dice (2D6) and roll them and add the ‘International Pressure Score’ to the result and consult the ‘International Opinion Tracker.

Next count the ‘Successful Applicants Deck’ and split the deck in half (rounding down) and move these cards into the ‘Integrated Applicants Deck’. The other half (rounding up) are placed in the ‘Successful Applicants Deck’, count these cards this number becomes the ‘Public Pressure Score’, take two six-sided dice (2D6) and roll them and add the ‘Public Pressure Score’ to the result and consult the ‘Public Opinion Tracker.

Next check to see if you have exhausted the ‘Refugee Card Deck’ If Players have exhausted the ‘Refugee Card Deck’ they should continue playing until there are no more Cards in the ‘Global Pressure Deck’. When all Refugee Cards have been placed in either the ‘Applications Denied Deck’ or ‘Successful Applications / Integrated Applicants Decks’ players are encouraged to compare the two piles of cards to see if there is any real discernible difference between those who were successful and those who weren’t.

Fail state: If the ‘Public Opinion Tracker’ or the ‘International Opinion Tracker’ remains level 6 for 3 consecutive turns the game is over. This means each individual tracker, so two turns at level 6 on the international tracker, followed by 1 turn at 6 on the Public tracker does not count as 3 consecutive turns. It must be 3 consecutives turns on the same tracker.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Opinion Tracker</th>
<th>Affect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2D6 Roll</td>
<td>Affect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>Move the ‘Public Opinion Tracker’ down one on the Public Opinion Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 9</td>
<td>No change in ‘Public Opinion Tracker’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 12</td>
<td>Move the ‘Public Opinion Tracker’ up one on the Public Opinion Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13+</td>
<td>Move the ‘Public Opinion Tracker’ up two on the Public Opinion Scale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>International Opinion Tracker</th>
<th>Affect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2D6 Roll</td>
<td>Affect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>Move the ‘International Opinion Tracker’ down one on the International Opinion Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 9</td>
<td>No change in ‘International Opinion Tracker’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 12</td>
<td>Move the ‘International Opinion Tracker’ up one on the International Opinion Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13+</td>
<td>Move the ‘International Opinion Tracker’ up two on the International Opinion Scale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Right to Remain Rules Version 3.6

Welcome!

Welcome to Right to Remain, a card game designed to give you the player an insight into the pressures faced by immigration services the world over due to the Refugee crisis.

The aim of Right to Remain is to give people the opportunity to see how current immigration practices work, and to use the game as a way to iterate on Public Policy. You might find it ‘fun’ but that isn’t its aim, it’s a tool designed to help people shape Policy Decisions.

Right to Remain is a cooperative multiplayer game for between 2 to 5 players. So first you need to decide how many players want to play the game, and then move onto the Set-up Phase.

Set-up Phase

The first task you must decide amongst yourselves is which country you wish to play as, there are 5 National Criteria Cards to Choose from:

➢ Australia
➢ Sweden
➢ United Kingdom
➢ United States of America
➢ UNHCR

Once you have chosen the Nation you wish to play as set the criteria card to one side, in an easily accessible place where everyone can see it. The Criteria contained on the card will form the basis of the decisions you will make concerning Refugee Status.

The next task is to take the deck of 100 Refugee Cards and give them as thorough a ‘shuffle’ as possible. If you have any card hustlers amongst you it’s probably best to give them the cards to shuffle! Now place the Refugee Cards Face down on the table. Your playing area should now look like this:

Next, take the two Opinion Trackers, both look the same, so at this point it doesn’t matter which is which, and place them on the table with the rest of the game pieces. Next find the two counters, one
represents **Global Opinion**, and the other represents **National Opinion**, take both counters and place one on each tracker, on the position marked Zero:

The playing space should now look like this:

OK, you’re now ready to move onto your **First Immigration Phase**, and start playing **Right to Remain!**

**First Immigration Phase**

One of the Players then takes the two six-sided dice (referred to as 2D6 hereafter) and rolls them, adding the score on the two dice together, this score is called the **Global Refugee Crisis Score**.

This determines how many **Refugee Cards** are drawn from the **Refugee Card Deck** and placed into the **Applications Deck** face down. The playing area should now look like this:
You are now ready to move onto your **First Applications Phase**!

**First Applications Phase**

The next step is to turn the **Applications Deck** face up so everyone can see who the ‘Applicants’ are. The Players must then decide amongst themselves which ‘Applicants’ will be successfully granted ‘Refugee Status’, players do this by referring to their chosen **National Criteria Card**, although players can decide to ignore the criteria if they choose to. If there is disagreement amongst the players over whether an ‘Applicant’ should be granted ‘Refugee Status’ players must vote. If the vote is equal one player takes a single dice and rolls it, on a result of 1, 2 or 3 the ‘Applicant’ is refused ‘Refugee Status’, on a result of 4, 5 or 6 the ‘Applicant’ is successful and is granted ‘Refugee Status’. All successful ‘Applicants’ are placed in the **Successful Applicants Deck**, and all unsuccessful ‘Applicants’ are placed in the **Global Pressure Deck**. The playing area should now look like this:

After the ‘Applicants’ have been placed in their correct ‘Decks’ you are now ready to move onto your **First End Phase**!
First End Phase

The first task is to count how many cards there are in the **Global Pressure Deck**, divide the deck in half and place half of the cards (rounding up) into the **Applications Denied Deck**, like this:

The remaining cards (rounding down) remain in the **Global Pressure Deck**. Count the cards in the **Applications Denied Deck** this turn, this is the ‘Global Opinion Score’, now one of the players takes 2D6 and rolls them, add the score from the 2D6 to the ‘Global Opinion Score’ and consult the **Global Opinion Tracker**:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Opinion Tracker</th>
<th>Affect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td><strong>Global Opinion Tracker</strong> moves down one place (if at 0 there’s no change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 9</td>
<td>No change in <strong>Global Opinion Tracker</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 12</td>
<td><strong>Global Opinion Tracker</strong> moves up one place (if at 6 there’s no change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13+</td>
<td><strong>Global Opinion Tracker</strong> moves up two places (if at 6 there’s no change)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The **Global Opinion Tracker** simulates the pressure your Government faces when turning down Applicants from the ‘International Community’. If the **Global Opinion Tracker** stays at level 6 for 3 consecutive game turns the game is over, players have failed, and the weight of the ‘International Community’s’ condemnation is too much for your Government to bear. If the **Global Opinion Tracker** hasn’t been at level 6 for 3 consecutive turns then move all the cards in the **Applications Denied Deck** and move them into the **Returned Home Deck**, like this:
These are ‘ Applicants’ that have been thoroughly turned down, and will play no further part in the game (Do not discard these cards entirely).

The next task is to count how many cards there are in the Successful Applicants Deck, divide the deck in half and place half of the cards (rounding down) into the Integrated Applicants Deck, like this:

The remaining cards (rounding up) remain in the Successful Applicants Deck. Count the cards in the Successful Applicants Deck this turn, this is the ‘Public Opinion Score’, now one of the players takes 2D6 and rolls them, add the score from the 2D6 to the ‘Public Opinion Score’ and consult the Public Opinion Tracker:
The Public Opinion Tracker simulates the pressure your Government faces your ‘Population’ when you Accept Refugees into your community. If the Public Opinion Tracker stays at level 6 for 3 consecutive game turns the game is over, players have failed, and the weight of the ‘Population’’s condemnation is too much for your Government to bear. If the Public Opinion Tracker hasn’t been at level 6 for 3 consecutive turns then you’re safe for now.

As this is your first turn, it isn’t possible that you have exhausted the Refugee Card Deck, so for now it’s time to move onto turn two.

Immigration Phase

Hopefully you’re all getting the hang of playing Right to Remain now, so there’s not more diagrams from here on in (although you can always look back). One of the Players then takes 2D6 and rolls them, adding the score on the two dice together, this score is your Global Refugee Crisis Score.

This determines how many Refugee Cards are drawn from the Refugee Card Deck and placed into the Applications Deck face down. If there are any cards in the Global Pressure Deck these are also added to the Applications Deck.

You are now ready to move onto your Applications Phase.

Applications Phase

Firstly, depending on the Public Opinion Tracker a certain number of refugees MUST be turned down, the number on the Public Opinion Tracker indicates how many ‘Applicant Cards’ must be placed directly into the Applications Denied Deck, Players should decide Amongst themselves which ‘Applicants’ are ‘unsuccessful’.

The next step is to turn the Applications Deck face up so everyone can see who the ‘Applicants’ are. Players must then decide amongst themselves which ‘Applicants’ will be successfully granted ‘Refugee Status’, players do this by referring to their chosen National Criteria Card, although players can decide to ignore the criteria if they choose to. If there is disagreement amongst the players over whether an ‘Applicant’ should be granted ‘Refugee Status’ players must vote. If the vote is equal one player takes a single dice and rolls it, on a result of 1, 2 or 3 the ‘Applicant’ is refused ‘Refugee Status’, on a result of 4, 5 or 6 the ‘Applicant’ is successful and is granted ‘Refugee Status’. All successful ‘Applicants’ are placed in the Successful Applicants Deck, and all unsuccessful ‘Applicants’ are placed in the Global Pressure Deck.

You are now ready to move onto the End Phase.
End Phase

The first task is to count how many cards there are in the **Global Pressure Deck**, divide the deck in half and place half of the cards (rounding up) into the **Applications Denied Deck**.

The remaining cards (rounding down) remain in the **Global Pressure Deck**. Count the cards in the **Applications Denied Deck**, this is the ‘Global Opinion Score’ for this turn, now one of the Players takes 2D6 and rolls them, add the score from the 2D6 to the ‘Global Opinion Score’ and consult the **Global Opinion Tracker**:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Opinion Score</th>
<th>Affect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td><strong>Global Opinion Tracker</strong> moves down one place (if at 0 there’s no change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 9</td>
<td>No change in <strong>Global Opinion Tracker</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 12</td>
<td><strong>Global Opinion Tracker</strong> moves up one place (if at 6 there’s no change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13+</td>
<td><strong>Global Opinion Tracker</strong> moves up two places (if at 6 there’s no change)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the **Global Opinion Tracker** stays at level 6 for 3 consecutive game turns the game is over, Players have failed, and the weight of the ‘International Community’s’ condemnation is too much for your Government to bear. If the **Global Opinion Tracker** hasn’t been at level 6 for 3 consecutive turns then move all the cards in the **Applications Denied Deck** into the **Returned Home Deck**. These ‘Applicants’ that have been thoroughly turned down, and will play no further part in the game (Do not discard these cards entirely).

Next count how many cards there are in the **Successful Applicants Deck**, divide the deck in half and place half of the cards (rounding down) into the **Integrated Applicants Deck**. The remaining cards (rounding up) remain in the **Successful Applicants Deck**. Count the cards in the **Successful Applicants Deck** this turn, this is the ‘Public Opinion Score’, now one of the players takes 2D6 and rolls them, add the score from the 2D6 to the ‘Public Opinion Score’ and consult the **Public Opinion Tracker**:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Opinion Score</th>
<th>Affect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td><strong>Public Opinion Tracker</strong> moves down one place (if at 0 there’s no change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 9</td>
<td>No change in <strong>Public Opinion Tracker</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 12</td>
<td><strong>Public Opinion Tracker</strong> moves up one place (if at 6 there’s no change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13+</td>
<td><strong>Public Opinion Tracker</strong> moves up two places (if at 6 there’s no change)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the **Public Opinion Tracker** stays at level 6 for 3 consecutive game turns the game is over, players have failed, and the weight of the ‘Population’s’ condemnation is too much for your Government to bear. If the **Public Opinion Tracker** hasn’t been at level 6 for 3 consecutive turns then you’re safe for now.

Finally check to see if you have exhausted the **Refugee Card Deck**. If there are still cards left in the Refugee Card Deck it’s time to move on and start another Immigration Phase. Play until the Refugee Card Deck is exhausted and then consult the End Game.
End Game

If Players have exhausted the Refuge Card Deck they should continue playing until there are no more Cards in the Global Pressure Deck. When all Refugee Cards have been placed in either the Applications Denied Deck or either the Successful Applications and Integrated Applicants Deck’s players are encouraged to compare the two piles of cards to see if there is any real discernible difference between those who were successful and those who weren’t, and reflect on the decisions made.

Congratulations you have successfully completed Right to Remain.
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Right to Remain Version 3.6: Feedback Forms

USA Coordinator 2: John
Right to Remain Playtest form

Name of Host: John L

Host Nation: Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA

Date of playtest: 05/08/2017

Number of players: 5

Number of Game played: 1

Version of Rules Tried: Version 3.6

Were players able to play without guidance?:

Yes, and quite easily, although they’re experienced gamers. You might want to try it on normal people without neckbeards.

However, as long as they can read English I can’t see how anyone would have problems playing the game as is.

Thoughts on the Rulebook:

Much, much better effort. Clear in communication, enough detail so players don’t get lost and good informative diagrams with the flow of the game explained, not a book I’d publish, but a very solid playtest book. I’m proud of my Padawan.

Opinions on Immigration before the game:

| What do you think about the number of refugees being let into your country? |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Way too much               | Too much        | About right     | Too few         | Way too few     |
| P1                         | X               |                 |                 |                 |
| P2                         |                 | X               |                 |                 |
| P3                         |                 | X               |                 |                 |
| P4                         |                 |                 | X               |                 |
| P5                         |                 |                 |                 | X               |

| What threat level do refugees pose to your country? |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Very high                   | High            | Medium          | Low             | Very Low        |
| P1                          |                 |                 | X               |                 |
| P2                          |                 |                 |                 | X               |
| P3                          |                 |                 | X               |                 |
| P4                          |                 |                 | X               |                 |
| P5                          |                 |                 |                 | X               |
Opinions on Immigration after the game:

| What do you think about the number of refugees being let into your country? |
|---------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|
| Way too much                    | Too much| About right| Too few| Way too few |
| P1                               |         | X        |        |          |
| P2                               |         |          |        | X        |
| P3                               |         |          |        |          |
| P4                               |         | X        |        |          |
| P5                               |         |          |        | X        |

| What threat level do refugees pose to your country? |
|---------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Very high                       | High    | Medium  | Low     | Very Low|
| P1                               |         |         | X       |          |
| P2                               |         |         | X       |          |
| P3                               |         |         | X       |          |
| P4                               |         |         | X       |          |
| P5                               |         |         |          | X       |

General Comments on the Game:

It is way, way, way too hard. I math’ed it out in my notebook 8 times, you should try that. The game dies every time around 34 cards. So either you need a mechanic which allows players to affect the trackers more deliberately going the other way, or you need to vastly widen the range in the tables because rolling 13+ after round 3 with the way the global pressure deck stacks is a lot easier than you think. On average, you have about 3 to 4 cards in there from round 3 onwards, and I know you know this, but on 2D6 there is an average bell curve around 7:

\[ 7 + 4 = 11 \]

So the counters are going to move up steadily, and those 2 place jumps are quite common because all it takes is a high roll on the refugee round and a high roll Global tacker and things can go very wrong quickly. It’s the opposite of random, it’s inevitable, and I don’t think there’s skill in that really if there’s no way to affect it.

The Public opinion tracker doesn’t move quite as fast as the global tracker though, so maybe the points for that are OK. Not perfect, but OK. I think it’s the ranges on the global tracker you need to seriously look at.

Next up we like the nation cards, not a big difference between attitudes on immigration though is there? Surprised us. Sure you Brits and the Swedes are slightly more lenient than your former colonies, but not by much is it? Also feel you could do more with these cards. Give each nation a one off super power to affect the game. Some suggested names:

We’ve got 12 Aircraft carriers (for USA) some effect on lowering the global tracker, because who can really bully the states?

Great Barrier Refugees (Aus) because they look them up in camps, deplete the global pressure deck.

I don’t know, might be too fun for what you want to do but do consider it. Maybe get the game balance right first and then put more game elements in.
Any other Comments:
Keep doing what you are doing, it’s a really vast improvement on version 3.0 in terms of the rulebook, and the details on the cards. The brief bio’s are good, points towards why someone wants refuge, but doesn’t lay it on too thick and make it feel like you’re trying to convince people we should let everyone in.

Debrief notes:
Lots of feedback on the consensus building, it is happening, and it is definitely an aesthetic according to John. He thinks it is inevitable that getting people round a table to engage with these topics that people will move towards common ground. Interesting, and maybe need to observe it in action myself.

Biggest feedback is on the difficulty. Two clear suggestions, up the ranges in the tables for the trackers significantly, and secondly reconsider how the trackers work. He thinks there’s way too many refugees turned down automatically from the public opinion tracker early on.

Definitely need a way to reverse the steady build-up of the trackers too.
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Right to Remain Rules Version 3.9

Welcome!

Welcome to Right to Remain, a card game designed to give you the Player an insight into the pressures faced by immigration services the world over, due to the current Refugee crisis.

The aim of Right to Remain is to give Players the opportunity to see how current immigration practices work, and to use the game as a way to iterate on Public Policy. You might find it ‘fun’ but that isn’t its aim, it’s a tool designed to help people shape Policy Decisions.

Right to Remain is a cooperative multiplayer game for between 2 to 4 players. So first you need to decide how many players want to play the game, and then move onto the Set-up Phase.

Set-up Phase

The first task you must decide amongst yourselves is which country you wish to play as, there are 5 National Criteria Cards to Choose from:

➢ Australia
➢ Sweden
➢ United Kingdom
➢ United States of America
➢ UNHCR

Once you have chosen the Nation you wish to play as set the criteria card to one side, in an easily accessible place where everyone can see it. The Criteria contained on the card will form the basis of the decisions you will make concerning Refugee Status.

The next task is to take the deck of 100 Refugee Cards and give them as thorough a ‘shuffle’ as possible. If you have any card hustlers amongst you it’s probably best to give them the cards to shuffle! Now place the Refugee Cards Face down on the table. Your playing area should now look like this:

Next, take the two Opinion Trackers, both look the same, so at this point it doesn’t matter which is which, and place them on the table with the rest of the game pieces. Next find the two counters, one
represents **Global Opinion**, and the other represents **National Opinion**, take both counters and place one on each tracker, on the position marked 1:

The playing space should now look like this:

---

OK, you’re now ready to move onto your **First Immigration Phase**, and start playing **Right to Remain!**

**First Immigration Phase**

One of the Players should take the two six-sided dice (referred to as 2D6 hereafter) and roll them, adding the score on the two dice together, this score is called the **Global Refugee Crisis Score**.

This determines how many **Refugee Cards** are drawn from the **Refugee Card Deck** to be placed into the **Applications Deck** face down. The playing area should now look like this:
You are now ready to move onto your **First Applications Phase**!

**First Applications Phase**

**WARNING** – This first **Applications Phase** is not timed, from turn 2 onwards they are – **WARNING**

The next step is to turn the **Applications Deck** face up so everyone can see who the ‘Applicants’ are. The Players must then decide amongst themselves which ‘Applicants’ will be successfully granted ‘Refugee Status’, players do this by referring to their chosen **National Criteria Card**, although Players can decide to ignore the criteria if they choose to. If there is disagreement amongst the players over whether an ‘Applicant’ should be granted ‘Refugee Status’ players must vote. If the vote is equal one player takes a single dice and rolls it, on a result of 1, 2 or 3 the ‘Applicant’ is refused ‘Refugee Status’, on a result of 4, 5 or 6 the ‘Applicant’ is successful and is granted ‘Refugee Status’. All successful ‘Applicants’ are placed in the **Successful Applicants Deck**, and all unsuccessful ‘Applicants’ are placed in the **Global Pressure Deck**. The playing area should now look like this:
After the ‘Applicants’ have been placed in their correct ‘Decks’ you are now ready to move onto your **First End Phase**!

**First End Phase**

The first task is to count how many cards there are in the **Global Pressure Deck**, divide the deck in half and place half of the cards (rounding up) into the **Applications Denied Deck**, like this:

![Diagram of deck placement](image)

The remaining cards (rounding down) remain in the **Global Pressure Deck**. Count the cards in the **Applications Denied Deck** this turn, this is the ‘Global Opinion Score’. One of the Players takes 2D6 and rolls them, add the score from the 2D6 to the ‘Global Opinion Score’ and consult the **Global Opinion Tracker**:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Opinion Score</th>
<th>Affect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 - 8</td>
<td><strong>Global Opinion Tracker</strong> moves down one place (if at 0 there’s no change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - 13</td>
<td>No change in <strong>Global Opinion Tracker</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 - 18</td>
<td><strong>Global Opinion Tracker</strong> moves up one place (if at 6 there’s no change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19+</td>
<td><strong>Global Opinion Tracker</strong> moves up two places (if at 6 there’s no change)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The **Global Opinion Tacker** simulates the pressure your Government faces when turning down Applicants from the ‘International Community’. If the **Global Opinion Tracker** stays at level 12 for 3 consecutive game turns the game is over, players have failed, and the weight of the ‘International Community’s’ condemnation is too much for your Government to bear. If the **Global Opinion Tracker** hasn’t been at level 12 for 3 consecutive turns, then collect all the remaining cards in the **Applications Denied Deck** and move them into the **Returned Home Deck**, like this:
These are ‘Applicants’ that have been thoroughly turned down by the system, and will play no further part in the game (Do not discard these cards entirely).

The next task is to count how many cards there are in the **Successful Applicants Deck**, divide the deck in half and place half of the cards (rounding down) into the **Integrated Applicants Deck**, like this:

For every ‘Applicant’ moved into the **Integrated Applicants Deck** take 1D6, so if there were 4 ‘Applicants’ moved into the **Integrated Applicants Deck** you should take 4D6, if it were 5 ‘Applicants’ 5D6 and so on. Take the appropriate amount of dice and make an ‘Integration Roll’, any dice that score a 5 or 6 represents a Refugee who has successfully integrated into your country. For every ‘Successful Integration’ the Players can move either the **Global Opinion Tracker** or the **Public**.
Opinion Tracker down one place. So, if there were 2 ‘Successful Integration’ rolls the players could choose to move the Opinion Tracker Counters down 2 spaces, either 1 space on each Opinion Tracker or 2 spaces on one Opinion Tracker. They cannot move both Opinion Trackers down two spaces!

The remaining cards (rounding up) remain in the Successful Applicants Deck. Count the cards in the Successful Applicants Deck this turn, this is the ‘Public Opinion Score’, now one of the Players takes 2D6 and rolls them, add the score from the 2D6 to the ‘Public Opinion Score’ and consult the Public Opinion Tracker:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Opinion Tracker</th>
<th>Affect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 - 7</td>
<td>Public Opinion Tracker moves down one place (if at 0 there’s no change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 12</td>
<td>No change in Global Opinion Tracker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 16</td>
<td>Public Opinion Tracker moves up one place (if at 6 there’s no change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17+</td>
<td>Public Opinion Tracker moves up two places (if at 6 there’s no change)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Public Opinion Tracker simulates the pressure your Government faces from your ‘Population’ when you Accept Refugees into your community. If the Public Opinion Tracker stays at level 12 for 3 consecutive game turns the game is over, players have failed, and the weight of the ‘Population’s’ condemnation is too much for your Government to bear. If the Public Opinion Tracker hasn’t been at level 12 for 3 consecutive turns then you’re safe for now.

As this is your first turn, it isn’t possible that you have exhausted the Refugee Card Deck, so for now it’s time to move onto turn two!

Immigration Phase

Hopefully you’re all getting the hang of playing Right to Remain now, so there’s not more diagrams from here on in (although you can always look back). One of the Players takes 2D6 and rolls them, adding the score on the two dice together, this score is your Global Refugee Crisis Score. This determines how many Refugee Cards are drawn from the Refugee Card Deck and placed into the Applications Deck face down. If there are any cards in the Global Pressure Deck these are also added to the Applications Deck.

You are now ready to move onto your Applications Phase.

Applications Phase

It’s time to set a stop clock (use a mobile phone if possible, or some other device), consult the player table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Players</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Players</td>
<td>4 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or 4 Players</td>
<td>5 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Players</td>
<td>6 mins</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the required time known, start the timer and get assessing those applications quickly!
Firstly, depending on the **Public Opinion Tracker** a certain number of refugees MUST be turned down, the number relates to the colour of the **Public Opinion Tracker**:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Declined</th>
<th>Colour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Applicant</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Applicants</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Applicants</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The colour indicates how many ‘Applicant Cards’ must be placed directly into the **Applications Denied Deck**, Players should decide Amongst themselves which ‘Applicants’ are ‘unsuccessful’.

The next step is to turn the **Applications Deck** face up so everyone can see who the ‘Applicants’ are. Players must then decide amongst themselves which ‘Applicants’ will be successfully granted ‘Refugee Status’, Players do this by referring to their chosen **National Criteria Card**, although Players can decide to ignore the criteria if they choose to. If there is disagreement amongst the Players over whether an ‘Applicant’ should be granted ‘Refugee Status’ players must vote. If the vote is equal one player takes a single dice and rolls it, on a result of 1, 2 or 3 the ‘Applicant’ is refused ‘Refugee Status’, on a result of 4, 5 or 6 the ‘Applicant’ is successful and is granted ‘Refugee Status’. All successful ‘Applicants’ are placed in the **Successful Applicants Deck**, and all unsuccessful ‘Applicants’ are placed in the **Global Pressure Deck**.

If players run out of time then the both Global Opinion and Public Opinion takes a very dim view on how chaotically run your immigration service is, move both the **Global Opinion Tracker** and the **Public Opinion Tracker** up one space!

You are now ready to move onto the **End Phase**.

**End Phase**

The first task is to count how many cards there are in the **Global Pressure Deck**, divide the deck in half and place half of the cards (rounding up) into the **Applications Denied Deck**. The remaining cards (rounding down) remain in the **Global Pressure Deck**. Count the cards in the **Applications Denied Deck**, this is the ‘Global Opinion Score’ for this turn. One of the Players takes 2D6 and rolls them, add the score from the 2D6 to the ‘Global Opinion Score’ and consult the **Global Opinion Tracker**:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Opinion Tracker</th>
<th>Affect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 - 8</td>
<td>Global Opinion Tracker moves down one place (if at 0 there’s no change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - 13</td>
<td>No change in Global Opinion Tracker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 - 18</td>
<td>Global Opinion Tracker moves up one place (if at 6 there’s no change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19+</td>
<td>Global Opinion Tracker moves up two places (if at 6 there’s no change)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the **Global Opinion Tracker** stays at level 12 for 3 consecutive game turns the game is over, Players have failed, and the weight of the ‘International Community’s’ condemnation is too much for your Government to bear. If the **Global Opinion Tracker** hasn’t been at level 12 for 3 consecutive turns then move all the cards in the **Applications Denied Deck** into the **Returned Home Deck**. These
‘Applicants’ that have been thoroughly turned down, and will play no further part in the game (Do not discard these cards entirely).

Next count how many cards there are in the Successful Applicants Deck, divide the deck in half and place half of the cards (rounding down) into the Integrated Applicants Deck. For every ‘Applicant’ moved into the Integrated Applicants Deck take 1D6, so if there were 4 ‘Applicants’ moved into the Integrated Applicants Deck you should take 4D6, if it were 5 ‘Applicants’ 5D6 and so on. Take the appropriate amount of dice and make an ‘Integration Roll’, any dice that score a 5 or 6 represents a Refugee who has successfully integrated into your country. For every ‘Successful Integration’ the Players can move either the Global Opinion Tracker or the Public Opinion Tracker down one place. So, if there were 2 ‘Successful Integration’ rolls the players could choose to move the Opinion Tracker Counters down 2 spaces, either 1 space on each Opinion Tracker or 2 spaces on one Opinion Tracker. They cannot move both Opinion Trackers down two spaces!

The remaining cards (rounding up) remain in the Successful Applicants Deck. Count the cards in the Successful Applicants Deck this turn, this is the ‘Public Opinion Score’, now one of the players takes 2D6 and rolls them, add the score from the 2D6 to the ‘Public Opinion Score’ and consult the Public Opinion Tracker:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Opinion Score</th>
<th>Public Opinion Tracker Affect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 - 7</td>
<td>Public Opinion Tracker moves down one place (if at 0 there’s no change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 12</td>
<td>No change in Global Opinion Tracker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 16</td>
<td>Public Opinion Tracker moves up one place (if at 6 there’s no change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17+</td>
<td>Public Opinion Tracker moves up two places (if at 6 there’s no change)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the Public Opinion Tracker stays at level 12 for 3 consecutive game turns the game is over, players have failed, and the weight of the ‘Population’s’ condemnation is too much for your Government to bear. If the Public Opinion Tracker hasn’t been at level 12 for 3 consecutive turns then you’re safe for now.

Finally check to see if you have exhausted the Refugee Card Deck. If there are still cards left in the Refugee Card Deck it’s time to move on and start another Immigration Phase. Play until the Refugee Card Deck is exhausted, and then consult the End Game.

**End Game**

If Players have exhausted the Refugee Card Deck they should continue playing until there are no more Cards in the Global Pressure Deck. When all Refugee Cards have been placed in the Applications Denied Deck, or Returned Home Deck, or Successful Applications Deck, or Integrated Applicants Deck Players are encouraged to compare the two piles of cards to see if there is any real discernible difference between those who were successful and those who weren’t, and reflect on the decisions made.

Congratulations you have successfully completed Right to Remain.
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Right to Remain Version 3.9: Feedback Forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordinator</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia Coordinator: Jimmy</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA Coordinator 2: John</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Coordinator 1: Jon</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Name of Host:** Jimmy the Oz man

**Host Nation:** Canberra, Australian

**Date of playtest:** 12\textsuperscript{th} May

**Number of players:** 3

**Number of Game played:** 2

**Version of Rules Tried:** Version 3.9

**Were players able to play without guidance?:**

Yes. No problems at all.

**Thoughts on the Rulebook:**

You really stepped it up a notch. Much better rulebook, I hear Lauby gave you some pointers and it worked out well.

**Opinions on Immigration before the game:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What do you think about the number of refugees being let into your country?</th>
<th>Way too much</th>
<th>Too much</th>
<th>About right</th>
<th>Too few</th>
<th>Way too few</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What threat level do refugees pose to your country?</th>
<th>Very high</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Opinions on Immigration after the game:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What do you think about the number of refugees being let into your country?</th>
<th>Way too much</th>
<th>Too much</th>
<th>About right</th>
<th>Too few</th>
<th>Way too few</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What threat level do refugees pose to your country?</th>
<th>Very high</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**General Comments on the Game:**

Firstly it is a game, a really good fun game at that. Not sure you want to hear we had fun with it, but we sat around the kitchen table drinking beer and talking about refugees and what’s wrong with the system.

We get that the lack of paper work is a security risk, but there has to be a way round that, that answers people’s genuine concerns, while not making Australia look like a right wing hell hole.

As to the game remember it was too hard before? It’s now probably a bit too easy to maintain that balance, I think once you kick into the game proper the counters oscillate between 3, 4, and 5 for most of the game and for the two games we played, roughly around 80 cards we noticed it creep up towards the end to rest around 5, 6 and 7. So maybe cut the trackers down to reflect that so there’s pressure at the end.

But the pressure does get you thinking about the decisions you are making.

**Any other Comments:**

I think you really need to find someone or some organisation that will let you test your approach out. Working with experts on problems and doing this might be a really strong concept. Could also be rubbish, but you need to find out which one it is.

**Debrief notes:**

Jimmy had really positive things to say about the flow of the game, but he did say the opinion trackers were now too long.

We used dice to virtually work out what might happen with the tracker length at 8 and 9 and decided that 8 was probably the right length.

Long conversation about how sad it is I haven’t been able to try the idea out properly with real stakeholders.
Name of Host: John

Host Nation: Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA

Date of playtest: 05/10/2017

Number of players: 3

Number of Game played: 1

Version of Rules Tried: Version 3.9

Were players able to play without guidance?:

Yes they were, just like last time. No problems.

Thoughts on the Rulebook:

Same as before, it is much clearer and the hand holding helps. It’s just a shame you don’t have enough time to really ‘hone’ the rulebook through playtesting.

Opinions on Immigration before the game:

Didn’t want to ask them these questions again as I didn’t think there was a points.

Opinions on Immigration after the game:

See above comment.

General Comments on the Game:

From now until your hand in you should just try playing it yourself, and make little tweaks here and there, maybe add a game element or two. The nationality cards we spoke about last time.

Maybe throw in some national and global event decks of cards that mix the game play up a bit? These things take ages to balance though, and you won’t have the time to test them all, so pick a few good ideas and play with them.

You have to cut the length of the opinion trackers down a bit though, they’re way too long now at 12 stages, although toning the amount of automatically denied applicants down via colour blocks instead of numbers is a nice. Gut says try 9.

Any other Comments:

It’s been nice seeing the game evolve. I think it’s at a stage now where you need to see it being played and work on it in close proximity with your playtester’s.

This might make you disheartened, but what you now have is a solid first draft that you can work on. If you had two more months you could probably turn it into a good game.

Debrief notes:
John wasn’t able to do a debrief.
Name of Host: Jon G

Host Nation: Abergavenny, Wales, United Kingdom

Date of playtest: 10/05/2017

Number of players: 4

Number of Game played: 2

Version of Rules Tried: Version 3.9

Were players able to play without guidance?:

Absolutely yes, except for one plonker who didn’t see the different figures for the two opinion trackers. Apart from that this was a pretty straight forward here’s the box now play session.

Thoughts on the Rulebook:

Night and day from the last rulebook I saw dear boy! Genuinely looks like a professional testing document, so you should pour yourself a whiskey tonight, or whenever it is you read your email.

Opinions on Immigration before the game:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Way too much</th>
<th>Too much</th>
<th>About right</th>
<th>Too few</th>
<th>Way too few</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What threat level do refugees pose to your country?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very high</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Opinions on Immigration after the game:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Way too much</th>
<th>Too much</th>
<th>About right</th>
<th>Too few</th>
<th>Way too few</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What threat level do refugees pose to your country?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very high</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Comments on the Game:**

Where do I start. Compared to the last abomination you gave me this is an absolute joy. It has rules that makes sense, there is feedback from the game to the player, it’s a multi-player game and people talk (sometimes shout) about it. Good God man… it’s a game!!!

It’s all there, I don’t think it feels like I’m being smacked round the head with the bible or anything, my players were able to have civil(ish) conversations about refugees, and what it is we should do.

It’s way too bloody easy though Barton. Even Craig and Ellen were able to beat it, and they struggle with snakes and ladders. But it’s all there, you have your solid foundation and you have a system where every element makes sense and influences some other element. It’s not massively complex in rules, but what’s going on behind the scene is. Most games don’t try to link so many elements together because it’s hard to do.

All you have to do is sort out amount of stages on the trackers now. You get that right and you’re golden. I’d just get the cards out myself and play, play, play until you think you’ve got it right.

**Any other Comments:**

I’m guessing you’re probably done for now, right? Well if you are good luck with your hand in, but if you aren’t do send me any amendments, I’d love to see how actual immigration officers would respond to it though. Probably say it’s a giant bag of bollocks.

**Debrief notes:**

Only had a short chat. Not much to add.

Did say maybe add more gamey bits in the stir things up like random event cards. Others have suggested this but I feel it’d be moving away from what I want to achieve.
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Right to Remain Rules Version 4.0

Welcome!

Welcome to Right to Remain, a card game designed to give you, the Player an insight into the pressures faced by immigration services the world over, due to the current Refugee crisis.

The aim of Right to Remain is to give Players the opportunity to see how current immigration practices work, and to use the game as a way to iterate on Public Policy. You might find it ‘fun’ but that isn’t its aim, it’s a tool designed to help people shape Policy Decisions.

Right to Remain is a cooperative multiplayer game that has been specifically designed for 3 Players. Once there are 3 of you ready to play it’s time to move onto the Set-up Phase.

Set-up Phase

The first task you must decide amongst yourselves is which country you wish to play as, there are 4 National Criteria Cards to Choose from:

- Australia
- Sweden
- United Kingdom
- United States of America

Each country has slightly different criteria for granting ‘Refugee Status’, so play close attention to that when you choose. Each country also has a corresponding National Trait Card, this is a one off super power that can be used during the game, as described on the card.

Once you have chosen the Nation you wish to play as set the criteria card to one side on the table, in an easily accessible place where everyone can see it. The Criteria contained on the card will form the basis of the decisions you will make concerning Refugee Status.

The next task is to take the deck of 100 Refugee Cards and give them as thorough a ‘shuffle’ as possible. If you have any card hustlers amongst you it’s probably best to give them the cards to shuffle! Now place the Refugee Cards Face down on the table next to the National Criteria Card. Your playing area should now look like this:
Next, take the two Opinion Trackers, both look the same, so at this point it doesn’t matter which is which, and place them on the table with the rest of the game pieces. Next find the two counters, one represents Global Opinion, and the other represents National Opinion, take both counters and place one on each tracker, on the position marked 1:

The playing space should now look like this:

OK, you’re now ready to move onto your First Immigration Phase, and start playing Right to Remain!

**First Immigration Phase**

One of the Players should take the two six-sided dice (referred to as 2D6 hereafter) and roll them, adding the score on the two dice together, this score is called the Global Refugee Crisis Score. This
determines how many Refugee Cards are drawn from the Refugee Card Deck to be placed into the Applications Deck face down. The playing area should now look like this:

You are now ready to move onto your First Applications Phase!

First Applications Phase

WARNING – This first Applications Phase is not timed, from turn 2 onwards they are – WARNING

The next step is to turn the Applications Deck face up so everyone can see who the ‘Applicants’ are. The Players must then decide amongst themselves which ‘Applicants’ will be successfully granted ‘Refugee Status’, players do this by referring to their chosen National Criteria Card, although Players can decide to ignore the criteria if they choose to. If there is disagreement amongst the players over whether an ‘Applicant’ should be granted ‘Refugee Status’ players must vote. All successful ‘Applicants’ are placed in the Successful Applicants Deck, and all unsuccessful ‘Applicants’ are placed in the Global Pressure Deck. The playing area should now look like this:
After the ‘Applicants’ have been placed in their correct ‘Decks’ you are now ready to move onto your **First End Phase**!

**First End Phase**

The first task is to count how many cards there are in the **Global Pressure Deck**, divide the deck randomly in half, and place half of the cards (rounding up) into the **Applications Denied Deck**, like this:

The remaining cards (rounding down) remain in the **Global Pressure Deck**. Count the cards in the **Applications Denied Deck** this turn, this is the ‘Global Opinion Score’. One of the Players takes 2D6 and rolls them, add the score from the 2D6 to the ‘Global Opinion Score’ and consult the **Global Opinion Tracker**:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Opinion Tracker</th>
<th>Global Opinion Score</th>
<th>Affect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 8</td>
<td><strong>Global Opinion Tracker</strong> moves down one place (if at 0 there’s no change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 - 13</td>
<td>No change in <strong>Global Opinion Tracker</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 - 18</td>
<td><strong>Global Opinion Tracker</strong> moves up one place (if at 6 there’s no change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19+</td>
<td><strong>Global Opinion Tracker</strong> moves up two places (if at 6 there’s no change)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The **Global Opinion Tacker** simulates the pressure your Government faces when turning down Applicants from the ‘International Community’. If the **Global Opinion Tracker** stays at level 8 for 3 consecutive game turns the game is over, players have failed, and the weight of the ‘International Community’s’ condemnation is too much for your Government to bear. If the **Global Opinion Tracker** hasn’t been at level 8 for 3 consecutive turns, then collect all the remaining cards in the **Applications Denied Deck** and move them into the **Returned Home Deck**, like this:
These are ‘Applicants’ that have been thoroughly turned down by the system, and will play no further part in the game (Do not discard these cards entirely).

The next task is to count how many cards there are in the **Successful Applicants Deck**, divide the deck in half and place half of the cards (rounding up) into the **Integrated Applicants Deck**, like this:

For every ‘Applicant’ moved into the **Integrated Applicants Deck** take 1D6, so if there were 4 ‘Applicants’ moved into the **Integrated Applicants Deck** you should take 4D6, if it were 5 ‘Applicants’ 5D6 and so on. Take the appropriate amount of dice and make an ‘Integration Roll’, consult your **National Criteria Card** to see if the ‘Integration Rolls’ were successful. For every ‘Successful Integration’ the Players can move either the **Global Opinion Tracker** or the **Public Opinion Tracker** down one place. So, if there were 2 ‘Successful Integration’ rolls the players could choose to move the **Opinion Tracker Counters** down 2 spaces, either 1 space on each **Opinion Tracker** or 2 spaces on one **Opinion Tracker**. They cannot move both **Opinion Trackers** down two spaces!

The remaining cards (rounding down) remain in the **Successful Applicants Deck**. Count the cards in the **Successful Applicants Deck** this turn, this is the ‘Public Opinion Score’, now one of the Players takes 2D6 and rolls them, add the score from the 2D6 to the ‘Public Opinion Score’ and consult the **Public Opinion Tracker**:
### Public Opinion Tracker

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Opinion Score</th>
<th>Affect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 - 7</td>
<td>Public Opinion Tracker moves down one place (if at 0 there’s no change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 12</td>
<td>No change in Global Opinion Tracker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 15</td>
<td>Public Opinion Tracker moves up one place (if at 6 there’s no change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16+</td>
<td>Public Opinion Tracker moves up two places (if at 6 there’s no change)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The **Public Opinion Tracker** simulates the pressure your Government faces from your ‘Population’ when you Accept Refugees into your community. If the **Public Opinion Tracker** stays at level 12 for 3 consecutive game turns the game is over, players have failed, and the weight of the ‘Population’s’ condemnation is too much for your Government to bear. If the **Public Opinion Tracker** hasn’t been at level 12 for 3 consecutive turns then you’re safe for now.

As this is your first turn, it isn’t possible that you have exhausted the Refugee Card Deck, so for now it’s time to move onto turn two!

### Immigration Phase

Hopefully you’re all getting the hang of playing **Right to Remain** now, so there’s no more diagrams from here on in (although you can always look back). One of the Players takes 2D6 and rolls them, adding the score on the two dice together, this score is your **Global Refugee Crisis Score**. This determines how many Refugee Cards are drawn from the **Refugee Card Deck** and placed into the **Applications Deck** face down. If there are any cards in the **Global Pressure Deck** these are also added to the **Applications Deck**.

You are now ready to move onto your **Applications Phase**.

### Applications Phase

It’s time to set a stop clock for 4 minutes, as this is how long you have to complete your Applications Phase (use a mobile phone if possible, or some other device). Start the timer and get assessing those applications quickly!

Firstly, depending on the **Public Opinion Tracker** a certain number of refugees MUST be turned down, the number relates to the colour of the **Public Opinion Tracker**:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Declined</th>
<th>Colour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Applicant</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Applicants</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Applicants</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The colour indicates how many ‘Applicant Cards’ must be placed directly into the **Applications Denied Deck**, to decide which ‘Applicants’ are automatically ‘unsuccesful’ shuffle the **Applications Deck** and randomly remove the required number of cards and place them into the **Applications Denied Deck**.

The next step is to turn the **Applications Deck** face up so everyone can see who the ‘Applicants’ are. Players must then decide amongst themselves which ‘Applicants’ will be successfully granted
Refugee Status’, Players do this by referring to their chosen National Criteria Card, although Players can decide to ignore the criteria if they choose to. If there is disagreement amongst the Players over whether an ‘Applicant’ should be granted ‘Refugee Status’ players must vote. All successful ‘Applicants’ are placed in the Successful Applicants Deck, and all unsuccessful ‘Applicants’ are placed in the Global Pressure Deck.

If players run out of time then the both Global Opinion and Public Opinion take a very dim view on how chaotically run your immigration service is, move both the Global Opinion Tracker and the Public Opinion Tracker up one space!

You are now ready to move onto the End Phase.

End Phase

The first task is to count how many cards there are in the Global Pressure Deck, divide the deck randomly in half and place half of the cards (rounding up) into the Applications Denied Deck. The remaining cards (rounding down) remain in the Global Pressure Deck. Count the cards in the Applications Denied Deck, this is the ‘Global Opinion Score’ for this turn. One of the Players takes 2D6 and rolls them, add the score from the 2D6 to the ‘Global Opinion Score’ and consult the Global Opinion Tracker:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Opinion Tracker</th>
<th>Affect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 - 7</td>
<td>Global Opinion Tracker moves down one place (if at 0 there’s no change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 12</td>
<td>No change in Global Opinion Tracker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 15</td>
<td>Global Opinion Tracker moves up one place (if at 6 there’s no change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16+</td>
<td>Global Opinion Tracker moves up two places (if at 6 there’s no change)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the Global Opinion Tracker stays at level 8 for 3 consecutive game turns the game is over, Players have failed, and the weight of the ‘International Community’s’ condemnation is too much for your Government to bear. If the Global Opinion Tracker hasn’t been at level 8 for 3 consecutive turns then move all the cards in the Applications Denied Deck into the Returned Home Deck. These ‘Applicants’ that have been thoroughly turned down, and will play no further part in the game (Do not discard these cards entirely).

Next count how many cards there are in the Successful Applicants Deck, divide the deck in half and place half of the cards (rounding up) into the Integrated Applicants Deck. For every ‘Applicant’ moved into the Integrated Applicants Deck take 1D6, so if there were 4 ‘Applicants’ moved into the Integrated Applicants Deck you should take 4D6, if it were 5 ‘Applicants’ 5D6 and so on. Take the appropriate amount of dice and make an ‘Integration Roll’, consult your National Criteria Card to see if the Integration Rolls were successful. For every ‘Successful Integration’ the Players can move either the Global Opinion Tracker or the Public Opinion Tracker down one place. So, if there were 2 ‘Successful Integration’ rolls the players could choose to move the Opinion Tracker Counters down 2 spaces, either 1 space on each Opinion Tracker or 2 spaces on one Opinion Tracker. They cannot move both Opinion Trackers down two spaces!

The remaining cards (rounding down) remain in the Successful Applicants Deck. Count the cards in the Successful Applicants Deck this turn, this is the ‘Public Opinion Score’, now one of the players takes 2D6 and rolls them, add the score from the 2D6 to the ‘Public Opinion Score’ and consult the Public Opinion Tracker:
### Public Opinion Tracker

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Opinion Score</th>
<th>Affect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 - 7</td>
<td><strong>Public Opinion Tracker</strong> moves down one place (if at 0 there’s no change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 12</td>
<td>No change in <strong>Global Opinion Tracker</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 15</td>
<td><strong>Public Opinion Tracker</strong> moves up one place (if at 6 there’s no change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16+</td>
<td><strong>Public Opinion Tracker</strong> moves up two places (if at 6 there’s no change)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the **Public Opinion Tracker** stays at level 8 for 3 consecutive game turns the game is over, players have failed, and the weight of the ‘Population’s’ condemnation is too much for your Government to bear. If the **Public Opinion Tracker** hasn’t been at level 8 for 3 consecutive turns then you’re safe for now!

Finally check to see if you have exhausted the Refugee Card Deck. If there are still cards left in the Refugee Card Deck it’s time to move on and start another Immigration Phase. Play until the **Refugee Card Deck** is exhausted, and then consult the End Game.

**End Game**

If Players have exhausted the **Refugee Card Deck** they should continue playing until there are no more Cards in the **Global Pressure Deck**. When all Refugee Cards have been placed in the **Applications Denied Deck**, or **Returned Home Deck**, or **Successful Applications Deck**, or **Integrated Applicants Deck** Players are encouraged to compare the ‘Unsuccessful Applicants’ with the ‘Successful Applicants’ to see if there is any real discernible difference between those who were successful and those who weren’t, and reflect on the decisions made.

**Congratulations** you have successfully completed **Right to Remain**.
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Australian Refugee Criteria Card

Australia is a signatory to The United Nations Convention relating to the Status of Refugees (1951) and considers more countries than most OECD Members States to require the full 1951 protections. Australia will provide in most cases, shelter and safe harbour to any persons seeking Refugee Status, where there is genuine risk, and concern they will be persecuted or where grounds exist there is a fear that they will suffer persecution due to:

- your race
- your religion
- your nationality
- your political opinion
- anything else that puts you at risk because of the social, cultural, religious or political situation in your country, for example, your gender, gender identity or sexual orientation

Where the Asylum seeker can prove they have attempted to seek protection, and have failed to get the protection sought from authorities in their own country.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Afghanistan</th>
<th>Burundi</th>
<th>Ethiopia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Security</strong></td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL 1951 grounds for Refugee status accepted.</td>
<td>ALL 1951 grounds for Refugee status accepted.</td>
<td>race / religion / cultural / gender / sexual orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Iraq</strong></td>
<td><strong>Myanmar</strong></td>
<td><strong>Nigeria</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Security</strong></td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL 1951 grounds for Refugee status accepted.</td>
<td>ALL 1951 grounds for Refugee status accepted.</td>
<td>political / cultural / War / gender / sexual orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Somalia</strong></td>
<td><strong>South Sudan</strong></td>
<td><strong>Syria</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Security</strong></td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL 1951 grounds for Refugee status accepted.</td>
<td>ALL 1951 grounds for Refugee status accepted.</td>
<td>ALL 1951 grounds for Refugee status accepted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uganda</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yemen</strong></td>
<td><strong>Syria</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Security</strong></td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL 1951 grounds for Refugee status accepted.</td>
<td>ALL 1951 grounds for Refugee status accepted.</td>
<td>ALL 1951 grounds for Refugee status accepted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although Australia is its own continent, only 10% of its land is considered habitable, with only 10% of this being ‘colonised’ by construction, meaning there isn’t as much land resource as you might think. Australia over the last decade by proportion of population has taken on the average amount for OECD countries. However, Amnesty International report in terms of integrating Refugees find Australia one of the hardest societies for integration:

Refugees Integrate on a roll of 6
Sweden is a signatory to The United Nations Convention relating to the Status of Refugees (1951) in most cases extends the full 1951 protections to all nations, with a few notable exceptions where they feel the nation is politically stable and able to off protection. Sweden will provide where necessary, shelter and safe harbour to any persons seeking Refugee Status, where there is genuine risk, and concern they will be persecuted or where grounds exist there is a fear that they will suffer persecution due to:

- your race
- your religion
- your nationality
- your political opinion
- anything else that puts you at risk because of the social, cultural, religious or political situation in your country, for example, your gender, gender identity or sexual orientation

### Children seeking asylum:

According to Swedish law, they treat applications from children separately and under their own merit, they also extend the full 1951 convention protections to all children, and the burden of proof for having sought protection is lowered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Security</th>
<th>Reasons for Refugee Status Accepted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>ALL 1951 grounds for Refugee status accepted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>ALL 1951 grounds for Refugee status accepted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>race / religion / cultural / gender / sexual orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>ALL 1951 grounds for Refugee status accepted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>ALL 1951 grounds for Refugee status accepted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>ALL 1951 grounds for Refugee status accepted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>ALL 1951 grounds for Refugee status accepted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>ALL 1951 grounds for Refugee status accepted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>ALL 1951 grounds for Refugee status accepted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>ALL 1951 grounds for Refugee status accepted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>ALL 1951 grounds for Refugee status accepted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sweden is the least culturally diverse nation on this list, however for the last decade it has rated as the biggest recipient of refugees by proportion of population of OECD countries, and on numbers it has maintained its position in the top 5 for longer than a decade. Generally, Sweden is a welcoming country, Amnesty International reports very positive rating in Education, Health, Housing and Work data, it is only on the cultural index score where refugees report difficulty, often feeling isolated, or segregated:

**Refugees Integrate on a roll of 5 or 6**
The UK is a signatory to The United Nations Convention relating to the Status of Refugees (1951) and extends the full 1951 protections to most nations, the UK views some nations as suitably stable to offer protection. The UK provides where necessary, shelter and safe harbour to any persons seeking Refugee Status, where there is genuine risk, and concern they will be persecuted or where grounds exist there is a fear that they will suffer persecution due to:

- your race
- your religion
- your nationality
- your political opinion
- anything else that puts you at risk because of the social, cultural, religious or political situation in your country, for example, your gender, gender identity or sexual orientation

**Children seeking asylum:** According to UK law, they treat applications from children separately and under their own merit, they also extend the full 1951 convention protections to all children, and children are not required to have any papers or passports, due to their age.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Afghanistan</th>
<th>Burundi</th>
<th>Ethiopia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL 1951 grounds for Refugee status accepted.</td>
<td>race / religion / political / cultural / War / gender / sexual orientation</td>
<td>race / religion / cultural / gender / sexual orientation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Iraq</th>
<th>Myanmar</th>
<th>Nigeria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL 1951 grounds for Refugee status accepted.</td>
<td>ALL 1951 grounds for Refugee status accepted.</td>
<td>political / cultural / War / gender / sexual orientation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Somalia</th>
<th>South Sudan</th>
<th>Syria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL 1951 grounds for Refugee status accepted.</td>
<td>ALL 1951 grounds for Refugee status accepted.</td>
<td>ALL 1951 grounds for Refugee status accepted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uganda</th>
<th>Yemen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>race / political / cultural / gender / sexual orientation</td>
<td>ALL 1951 grounds for Refugee status accepted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The United Kingdom is the most ethnically diverse nation in Europe in terms of both cultures represented, and proportion of population not claiming their heritage from the hegemonic dominant culture. Over the last decade the UK has accepted the 3rd highest proportion of refugees in Europe (behind on Germany and Italy), although restrictions have tightened significantly. Amnesty international ranks the UK as one of the best countries for integration in the western world:

**Refugees Integrate on a roll of 5 or 6**
United States of America Refugee Criteria Card

The USA is a signatory to The United Nations Convention relating to the Status of Refugees (1951) and extends the full 1951 protections to many nations, the USA views some nations as suitably stable to offer protection. The USA provides where necessary, shelter and safe harbour to any persons seeking Refugee Status, where there is genuine risk, and concern they will be persecuted or where grounds exist there is a fear that they will suffer persecution due to:

- your race
- your religion
- your nationality
- your political opinion
- anything else that puts you at risk because of the social, cultural, religious or political situation in your country, for example, your gender, gender identity or sexual orientation

The USA does not require Asylum seekers to prove they have sought protection, from many countries as they believe this to put people at potential risk.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Afghanistan</th>
<th>Burundi</th>
<th>Ethiopia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security Level 2</td>
<td>Race / Religion / Political / Cultural / War / Gender / Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>Race / Religion / Cultural / Gender / Sexual Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL 1951 grounds for Refugee status accepted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Iraq</th>
<th>Myanmar</th>
<th>Nigeria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security Level 2</td>
<td>Race / Religion / Cultural / War / Gender / Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>Religion / Political / Cultural / War / Gender / Sexual Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Political / Cultural / War / Gender / Sexual Orientation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Somalia</th>
<th>South Sudan</th>
<th>Syria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security Level 3</td>
<td>All 1951 grounds for Refugee status accepted.</td>
<td>All 1951 grounds for Refugee status accepted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uganda</th>
<th>Yemen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security Level 2</td>
<td>Race / Political / Cultural / Gender / Sexual Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All 1951 grounds for Refugee status accepted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The United States of America is a nation of immigrants, and despite popular international misconception still receives and accepts more Asylum Seekers and grants Refugee Status per year than any other country on earth over the last decade. Amnesty international reports that Refugees report far lower concerns about integration into the USA than any other country, and this is supported by education, health, housing and work data:

Refugees Integrate on a roll of 4, 5 or 6
The United Nations Convention relating to the Status of Refugees (1951) sets out the principles by which signatories will give refuge to those who seek, and require it. Nation are required to provide shelter and safe harbour to any persons seeking Refugee Status, where there is genuine risk, and concern they will be persecuted or where grounds exist there is a fear that they will suffer persecution due to:

- your race
- your religion
- your nationality
- your political opinion
- anything else that puts you at risk because of the social, cultural, religious or political situation in your country, for example, your gender, gender identity or sexual orientation

Where the Asylum seeker can prove they have attempted to seek protection, and have failed to get the protection sought from authorities in their own country.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Afghanistan</th>
<th>Burundi</th>
<th>Ethiopia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL 1951 grounds for Refugee status accepted.</td>
<td>ALL 1951 grounds for Refugee status accepted.</td>
<td>ALL 1951 grounds for Refugee status accepted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Iraq</th>
<th>Myanmar</th>
<th>Nigeria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL 1951 grounds for Refugee status accepted.</td>
<td>ALL 1951 grounds for Refugee status accepted.</td>
<td>ALL 1951 grounds for Refugee status accepted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Somalia</th>
<th>South Sudan</th>
<th>Syria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL 1951 grounds for Refugee status accepted.</td>
<td>ALL 1951 grounds for Refugee status accepted.</td>
<td>ALL 1951 grounds for Refugee status accepted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uganda</th>
<th>Yemen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL 1951 grounds for Refugee status accepted.</td>
<td>ALL 1951 grounds for Refugee status accepted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The UNHCR is not a country, and as such has no ‘integration’ score or ranking, so a default score is provided:

**Refugees Integrate on a roll of 5 or 6**
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National Trait Cards

The Great Refugee Barrier
Australia

Offshore Refugee camps are great. Twice per game you may choose to move all of the current Refugee Cards in the Global Pressure Deck into the Returned Home Deck, no need to check on the Global Opinion Tracker.

A Lagom Amount of Refugees
Sweden

Swedes are a welcoming bunch, and want to help out. Once per game you may halve the Public Opinion Tracker (rounding down) just because you’re Sweden, and you can’t have too much falafel.

Keep Calm and Carry On
United Kingdom

As long as you understand cricket and like drinking cups of tea, there’s a good bet you’ll be welcomed! Once per game you may move all Refugees in the Successful Applicants Deck into the Integrated Applicants Deck, and yes make those rolls.

We’ve Got 12 Aircraft Carriers!!!
United States of America

Once per game you may choose to halve the Global Opinion Tracker (rounding down) just because you’re the United States of America, you scoff at international pressure. No one tells America what to do!
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Right to Remain Game Tokens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Opinion</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Global Opinion</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 18

Right to Remain Refugee Cards
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Afghanistan</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Age 15</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Age 21</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Age 16</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Family broken because of conflict, nowhere to live</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Age 28</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Age 15</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Age 16</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Age 29</td>
<td>Married/3 Children</td>
<td>Cultural / Political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Age 24</td>
<td>Married/1 Child</td>
<td>Cultural / Political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Age 19</td>
<td>Single/2 Children</td>
<td>Cultural / Political</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Leaving because of violence in country
- Area from overrun with militants
- Parents both killed by militants
- Hometown destroyed by war and family displaced
- Level of violence in area high
- Parents both killed, bringing two siblings to safer country
- Was a member of Tribal council, now replaced by elected officials, fears reprisals
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Reason for Risk</th>
<th>Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>War</td>
<td>Was a translator for allied forces, life now at risk from militants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>War</td>
<td>Brought over by uncle as no family in Afghanistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Race/Political</td>
<td>Tutsi minority, targeted for protesting President's third term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Race/Political</td>
<td>Son of former Hutu militia, fears he's being targeted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Race/Political</td>
<td>Hutu journalist who has been critical of President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Single/1 Child</td>
<td>Political</td>
<td>Daughter of opposition politician who has been imprisoned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Single/2 Children</td>
<td>Political</td>
<td>Opposition politician whose family has been targeted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Single/1 Child</td>
<td>Race/Political</td>
<td>Hutu targeted for work as civil rights activist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Race/Political</td>
<td>Daughter of Tutsi minority politician, killed at end of civil war</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Young artist critical of Government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Married/1 Child</td>
<td>Political activist whose radio station has been shut down</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Married/2 Children</td>
<td>Civil servant critical of media clampdown, targeted by law officials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Kurdish from Northern, family targeted by ISIS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Family deceased, region targeted by militants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Christian from northern Iraq</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Kurdish family from northern Iraq</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Single/2 Children</td>
<td>Hometown overrun by militants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Married/1 Child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Reason for Fleeing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Son of former governor, targeted by locals seeking revenge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Yazidi girl fleeing from slavery in northern Iraq</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Married/2 Children</td>
<td>Buddhist family fleeing northern Iraq and the conflict</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Married/2 Children</td>
<td>Rohingya Muslim family fearful of army persecution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Journalist fleeing persecution from authorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Muslim religious activist from the north recently found by authorities, fears unfair trial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Single/1 Child</td>
<td>Wife of former military officer who has been missing since 2015 fears persecution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Political* | *Religious* | *Political*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Married / 1 Child</td>
<td>Religious / War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Gender / War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Gender / War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Sexuality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>War / Political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Married / 2 Children</td>
<td>Political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Married / 2 Children</td>
<td>Political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Single / 1 Child</td>
<td>War</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Christian pastor from the north, family targeted by Boko Haram
- Former sex slave from Boko Haram fleeing further abuse
- Gay man who has received public beatings in Hargeisa
- Ex-military fleeing persecution from authorities for alleged corruption
- Former A-Shabab insurgent, fearful of reprisals from new Government
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Married/1 Child</td>
<td>War/Political</td>
<td>Former Anilist rebel, fears unfair trials and persecution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Single/1 Child</td>
<td>War</td>
<td>Fleeing the Darfur region with little brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Married/2 Children</td>
<td>War/Religious</td>
<td>Christian family claiming persecution by Islamic regional Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Single/2 Children</td>
<td>Gender/War</td>
<td>Fleeing sexual abuse in Darfur with 2 younger siblings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Single/2 Children</td>
<td>Gender/War</td>
<td>Fleeing conflict in Darfur, with young daughter and little brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Married/1 Child</td>
<td>War/Political</td>
<td>Young couple, political activists fearful of Government reprisals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Single/3 Children</td>
<td>Gender/War</td>
<td>Eldest of 4 children fleeing conflict in Darfur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>War</td>
<td>Fleeing conflict in Syria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>War</td>
<td>Fleeing conflict in Syria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>Reason for Fleeing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>War</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Fleeing conflict in Syria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>War</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Fleeing conflict in Syria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Married / 1 Child</td>
<td>Fleeing conflict in Syria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Married / 2 Children</td>
<td>War</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Married / 1 Child</td>
<td>Fleeing conflict in Syria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Single / 3 Children</td>
<td>Fleeing conflict in Syria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>War</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Fleeing conflict in Syria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Reason for Fleeing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>War</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>War</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>War</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>War</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>War</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>War</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>War</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>War</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>War</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>War</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>War</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>War</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>War</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>War</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>War</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>War</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>War</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>War</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>War</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>War</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>War</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Reason for Fleeing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>War</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Syria
Female
Level 2
Age 23
Single / 2 Children
War
Fleeing conflict in Syria

Syria
Female
Level 2
Age 27
Married / 1 Child
War
Fleeing conflict in Syria

Syria
Female
Level 2
Age 22
Single
War
Fleeing conflict in Syria

Syria
Female
Level 1
Age 14
Single
War
Fleeing conflict in Syria

Uganda
Male
Level 2
Age 24
Married / 1 Child
War
Fleeing conflict in Syria

Uganda
Male
Level 2
Age 24
Single
Sexuality
Fleeing persecution over sexuality

Uganda
Male
Level 2
Age 27
Single
War / Political
Former member of the Lords Resistance Army, trying to escape his former warlord

Uganda
Male
Level 1
Age 23
Single
Sexuality
Survived a lynch mob who attacked him for being gay

Uganda
Female
Level 1
Age 18
Single
Political / Sexuality
Daughter killed LGBT political activist
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>War / Political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Young former Huthi rebel, fleeing the war</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>War / Political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yemeni Army Officer, fleeing the war / deserting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fleeing home town, overrun by militants, family killed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Married / 1 Child</td>
<td>War / Political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regional administrator, fleeing advance of Huthi rebels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Married / 1 Child</td>
<td>War / Political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Young family fleeing the advance of the Huthi rebels, and bomb from their home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Single / 2 Children</td>
<td>Gender / War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daughter of military commander, two siblings fleeing conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Married / 1 Child</td>
<td>War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Family of doctors fleeing the conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Gender / War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wife of Al-Qaeda commander fleeing him and the war</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fleeing the conflict, young child and sister</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>