19th International Command and Control Research and Technology Symposium

DESIGN OF A MULTI-TOUCH TABLETOP FOR SIMULATION-BASED TRAINING

Queen's University, Kingston, ON, Canada Dr. CHRISTOPHE BORTOLASO

Dr. CHRISTOPHE BORTOLASO christophe.bortolaso@queensu.ca

University of Waterloo, ON, Canada Dr. Stacey D. Scott stacey.scott@uwaterloo.ca

Directorate of Land Synthetic Environments, Doug Brown *CFB Kingston, ON, Canada* dgbrown62@gmail.com

Thales Canada, Defense and Security Centre Liam Porter *Kingston, ON, Canada* liam.porter@ca.thalesgroup.com Pf. T.C. Nicholas Graham nicholas.graham@queensu.ca Matthew Oskamp 7mao@queensu.ca

THE ORCHESTRATING MILITARY SIMULATION (ORMIS) PROJECT



A collaborative tabletopbased tool to support **simulation based training**

> 2 years of design and development in collaboration with



Goal of this talk:

- 1. Show the **potential of tabletop based interfaces** to ease simulation-based training exercises
- 2. Illustrate that simply relying on a tabletop-based interface is **not sufficient**

SIMULATION-BASED TRAINING



PRIMARY TRAINING AUDIENCE in a simulated command headquarters

Radio, Chat, GPS



TROOPS on the battlefield

SIMULATION-BASED TRAINING



PRIMARY TRAINING AUDIENCE in a simulated command headquarters Radio, Chat, GPS



INTERACTORS roleplay troops on the battlefield with simulation tools

SIMULATION-BASED TRAINING ADVANTAGES

- **Inexpensive** mounting of large-scale exercises by avoiding the costs of field deployments
- **Enable actions** that cannot normally be performed repeatedly in real-world collective training (e.g. blowing-up buildings)
- Allows officers to be trained **frequently**

BUT...

the quality of the training experience highly depends on the ability of **interactors** to perform a realistic and educationally beneficial scenario.

EXISTING TOOLS

- PC-based Software
 - ABACUS (Advanced Battlefield CompUter Simulation)
 - JCATS (Joint Conflict And Tactics Simulation)
- Analysis of Issues with the existing tools
 - In-situ observations
 - Task analysis
 - Interviews with interactors and simulation experts

PROBLEMS WITH EXISTING TOOLS

1. Interface complexity

2. Weak support for coordinated tasks

3. Poor flexibility when plans need to change

Solution: OrMiS

Bringing large multi-touch interactive surfaces to simulation-based training

Personal computers / Tablets

1Les

Speed x2

Radar view

QOD

_

Tabl

1. INTERFACE COMPLEXITY

- Interface problems
 - Too many controls on separated windows
 - Complex access to basic features
 - Poor visualization tools (e.g. Line of sight)
- Impact on the simulation
 - Training costs
 - Scalability problems







The ABACUS interface 10

1. INTERFACE COMPLEXITY

OrMiS solution: example 1 - route planning

- 1. Simple drag technique to create a route
- 2. Contextual pie menus instead of external windows
- 3. Animations that provide cues about the state of the units and routes



1. INTERFACE COMPLEXITY

OrMiS solution: Example 2 - Line of sight visualisation

- 1. Simple tap to access visualization tools
- 2. Real time computation at a low resolution
- 3. Simple touch technique to reorient units



- Coordination and awareness issues
 - Communication limited with the pc-based physical setting
 - Tightly coordinated scenarios are difficult to perform



- Impact on the simulation
 - Very limited awareness between interactors
 - Tightly coordinated scenarios require unit reassignments



• OrMiS supports communication with multiple space-sharing techniques



COORDINATION COUPLING

Shared table: ideal for tightly coordinated scenarios in a limited area

Advantages

- 1. Provide mutual awareness
- 2. Enable simultaneous work on the same area of the map
- 3. Adapted to tightly coordinated actions

Inconvenient

1. Simultaneous users are limited by the size of the table



Bifocal lenses: ideal for maintaining high awareness while working on different areas

Advantages

- 1. Able to work with a high level of detail, without interfering with others
- 2. Indicates the part of the map your partners are working on
- 3. Keeps its position when using the main zoom

Inconvenient

1. Can overlap when working closely



Viewports: ideal for working simultaneously in a decoupled manner on the map, while maintaining low awareness.

Advantages

- 1. Can be reoriented
- 2. Able to reach distant parts of the map
- 3. Not influenced by main zoom

Inconvenient

1. Provide low awareness



PC/Tablets: ideal for individual work and low awareness

Advantage

- 1. Offers higher degree of privacy
- 2. Does not take away any screen real estate from the main map
- 3. Provides a high input/output resolution

Inconvenient

1. Poor awareness of others' actions



3. POOR FLEXIBILITY WHEN PLANS NEED TO CHANGE

- Unexpected events may occur
 - Need to leave their desk
 - Gather around the map table
 - Reposition pieces of paper representing units on the paper map
- Impact on the simulation
 - Breaks the workflow
 - Requires one interactor to monitor the simulation in the meantime





3. POOR FLEXIBILITY WHEN PLANS NEED TO CHANGE

- Switch between simulation and planning in a second
- 2. Tablets positioned around the table to monitor the simulation
- 3. No need to update the position of units



HOW ORMIS SOLVES EXISTING PROBLEMS

1. Interface complexity

Solved: with simple touch based interaction techniques

2. Weak support for coordinated tasks

Solved: by providing a shared space supporting various types of collaboration couplings

3. Poor flexibility when plans need to change

Solved: by enabling rapid switching between planning and running the simulation

EARLY FEEDBACK ABOUT ORMIS

- Early qualitative study
- 6 pairs of officer candidates Royal Military College, Kingston, ON
- Procedure
 - Short training (< 15 min)
 - Simple scenario
 - Interviews / questionnaires





RESULTS

- Effectiveness: users were able to perform the task successfully with minimal (< 15 min) training
- Users were very enthusiastic about OrMiS
 - "I really liked the table, it was very intuitive"
 - "...for planning the route, I found it was actually pretty good!"
 - "when we clicked it would tell us if it was water, road, etc. and that was really handy. I liked that."
- The tested techniques obtained very good usability results with the SUS standard*

* Brooke, J. (1996). SUS - A quick and dirty usability scale. In A. Jordan, Patrick, W., Thomas, Bruce, Weerdmeester, Bernhard, A., McLelland, Ian (Ed.), Usability Evaluation in Industry (pp. 189–194). CRC Press. doi:10.1002/hbm.20701

SOME LESSONS LEARNED

• Need to limit the risk of interferences

"[we] had to create a seniority of who was allowed and who was in control of the board, because at some points I would go touch something and it would screw him up, ... so we had to have one person who would say don't touch it until I'm done".

• Ergonomic considerations

"the table should be higher or angled ... there is clearly one side that's better"

CONCLUSIONS

- Tabletop based interfaces are a promising solution to ease simulation-based training exercises
 - Minimal training
 - High awareness
 - Support for tightly coupled collaborative tasks
- But...
 - Simply relying on a multi-touch table is not sufficient
 - Need to support various types of collaboration coupling



19th International Command and Control Research and Technology Symposium

DESIGN OF A MULTI-TOUCH TABLETOP FOR SIMULATION-BASED TRAINING

Queen's University, Kingston, ON, Canada **Dr. CHRISTOPHE BORTOLASO** christophe.bortolaso@queensu.ca

University of Waterloo, ON, Canada Dr. Stacey D. Scott stacey.scott@uwaterloo.ca

Directorate of Land Synthetic Environments, Doug Brown CFB Kingston, ON, Canada dgbrown62@gmail.com

Thales Canada, Defense and Security Centre Liam Porter *Kingston, ON, Canada* liam.porter@ca.thalesgroup.com Pf. T.C. Nicholas Graham nicholas.graham@queensu.ca Matthew Oskamp 7mao@queensu.ca