All right, so this will all be transcribed so we can, you know, filter out the bits that are not super critical, but so we've talked about the details of a couple of sessions, like how your logic works to actually structure the games. We've talked about the overall structure of a session and what logic goes into that. And then we happen to be on the topic of game design and the benefits of gaming versus drilling. So I think it's worth picking at that a bit while we're on the topic. You were just saying something about, you know, like learning something about the players and the players learning something about themselves. Drilling versus playing. Yeah, so I think drilling is a mirror on human nature. Humans like the path of least resistance, so drills are an example of the path of least resistance. So they create certain stresses in a kind of a clinical environment or a closed environment that really isolate certain facets. Doesn't mean they're good, doesn't mean they're bad, but it's just they're very, very singular in what they ask of the person involved. And what they don't do is lend themselves to intrinsic learning or intrinsic coaching. What they do do, they're very explicit. The reason coaches kind of like them is because they're so explicit. They allow coaches to create a kind of a didactic metric or you dropped this number of passes, therefore your score is 50% or 70% or whatever it might be. And it allows them room to critique. So whilst critique is a function of performance, it doesn't necessarily or doesn't always lend itself to the prospect of growth. Because growth requires room for the individual to process information, process functionality, process risk and reward in their own way. And people do that at different speeds. And the reason why they do that at different speeds or manage that with different frequencies is because of their education, their environment, their upbringing, all these cultural impersonal influences who've made them the person they are. So oftentimes, adults will rock up and coach a 10-year-old in the same way they'd coach a 14-year-old in the same way they coach an 18-year-old or a 20-something. So they're just laying down and this I think part of the problem may be and this is a debatable thought, that this is what businesses do. They look to reduce things to a scalable model, which is kind of works for profit, but doesn't necessarily work for human growth. Or only up to a point because humans don't scale like widgets. So in a gaming environment, what you do is the challenge for coaches in a gaming environment is coaches have to really get to know their people and know their environment and understand what they're trying to achieve and also step away from their own ego. So didactic coaches are often a little bit more ego driven because they want to put their own stamp, their own watermark onto the environment. A coach who embraces gaming is going to be challenged by things that they don't know. So you're walking into a new world of discovery. Is it recording? So I as a coach don't expect everyone to be a clone of me fundamentally because that's not how you compete in a game, right, and the gaming all teams whether it's a business team or a sports team is the product of the sum of its parts or more than the sum of its parts. So the individuals make the team, the team doesn't necessarily make the individuals. So what gaming does, it allows you to get an understanding of who your people are in a pressure loaded environment. What it should do in its optimal sense, it should give all of those people, 100% of the people that step into the game are in a space where they can express themselves freely within the framework of the game and that's the challenge, right, because many many coaches want to say X is right and Y is wrong or Y is right and X is wrong and that's where drills are reductive because drills allow for that. You've got this wrong, you've got that wrong, you've got that mechanic wrong. Now for me personally, and I'm very strong on this because as an athlete, I'm left footed for kicking a ball and I'm left handed for passing and I grew up in an environment where I'd say more than 90% of coaches, probably more than 95% are right handed. The majority of the world is right handed so no one ever saw the world through my lens. There was no empathy in coaching, there was no empathy in sport and there was no empathy in education. As a left hander in a right handed world, I was basically an outlier. So what that meant for me was I either have to rewire my own mechanism to suit the right handed view of the world, which you do as a kid, where your learning is, you can do that. But what it does on the other side of the fence is it restricts growth, it restricts creativity because all those people who are in that right handed echo chamber never have to look at what they're doing through a different lens. So why is that relevant? Because in the world of gaming, you create a platform and you then have to step out the way to allow the people to flourish and to get the best of your, particularly athletes. Athletes will want to compete, they're either competing with themselves or with the system, which is fine, but fundamentally they need room to express themselves. And intrinsically as people, if we don't like the form of expression, we try and shut it down. Right. Right. Which you have to, as a coach, you've got to be able to step away from that. You've got to be able to look at that form of expression and ask yourself why, what's the trigger? What's the motivator? And how do I harness this for the good of the team? In a North American environment, particularly, you hear these phrases all the time, oh, so and so's dead to me, cut, they didn't make the cut. I think one of the most brutal phrases in coaching is so and so didn't make the cut. That's to me is not a reflection on the athlete, that's a reflection on the coach. And so what the gaming environment does, so intrinsic learning, so and I ran an experiment on this. Let's use rucking as an example. And I did this in New Mexico with a bunch of college players and I said, all I want you to do is, we're going to just, in the contact zone, so it's a volatile space. It's a combative space. And what we're going to do, we're going to just for two minutes, ruck and counter ruck. That's the game. It's just ruck and counter ruck. And what we're going to do is have a look at how many decisions you're processing as an individual in that environment. So it's a game. It's a game environment. It's combative. It's contestable. There's a winner and a loser. There's risk and reward and the players just got after it. But we worked out in a two minute window, the average player is probably processing or having to process under pressure, not in a standard, not like I'm in the supermarket. Do I buy chips or potatoes? It's kind of, I'm in a combative environment and they're required to process. I think it was, it came out at more than 60 decisions to be made in a two minutes. Every two seconds, they've got to process option A, option B, option A, option B, option A, option B, under pressure, continuously all the time. And that's a massive stress on an athlete. Now, so what gaming does, if you use the game wisely, set up the rules, the environment and the conditions, you can create flexibility or you can create constraints that allow the athletes to engage the challenge on their own terms. I think we spoke in a previous recording about different shapes, different sizes, performances today. Coaches need to understand right now, performance is today. Doesn't matter what I did yesterday, we'll wait and see what I do tomorrow, but today I have to take you on your terms. You could have had a really bad day, or you might be acquiring a sickness, or you might be dehydrated, and whatever you did yesterday is going to be off today, and it's no point me cracking, I was about to say crack the shits, it's no point me getting mad at you today. I've got to kind of, okay, what's going on here? Because whilst performance is today, humans create a pattern of behavior, and so you've got to know if you're on point, off point, what's going on in your world. And gaming allows for that. Gaming allows you to adjust for the moment, in the moment, deal with the rules based on your mood and your capability right now, today. And it doesn't allow for a didactic, dictatorial direction. You look at ball movement in space, if you tracked a rugby ball across a game, in a premiership game, a championship game, a semi-pro game, an amateur game, you will never get the same set of trajectory data, because everything's influenced by the capability of the players in those environments, and all the contexts are different. So when we watch a game of professional rugby on TV, we assess it by what we know in our environments, not by what they're doing in their environment. So that's why we have so many emotional highs and lows. So the benefits of gaming, very simply, allows for individual executive functioning, allows players to engage and involve themselves in the game based on who they are today, not who they were yesterday, and allows for flexibility, in that sense therefore allows for flexibility of performance, we're not holding them to an artificial bar, you know, or an artificial set of data points that are not really realistic of who they are as a person, or an arbitrary framework that's been created by another environment, because we've downloaded a drill set that says, you must do this, that, or the other. It allows players to develop strategy and tactics within their own environment, and then all the things that come with that, social interaction, emotional interaction, communication skills, and not just executive functioning, but the ability to actually create a process, articulate a process, and work together to complete an outcome, which all of these things are totally missing in a drills-based environment, and completely unallowed for. So there are clearly a lot of benefits for, just like from the player's perspective. There are obviously other participants in this effort, right, there's the person who sets up the game, and if I just go back to my experiences, in some cases that was like a democratic process, right, so you get a couple of people together, you say we're going to play a game, and you say that like under certain conditions we're going to add some new rules to the games, or to the game we're playing. I've seen like little kids do this, right, like we'd be playing soccer, we'd say okay, well when like this or that happens, then a new rule gets added.

We don't know what that rule is going to be yet, but that's something that can happen. So there are obviously these different participants. When the person sort of facilitating everything is very deliberate about the rule setting, they can extract very specific information. But there are obviously also scenarios where maybe you open it up to a group and say, okay, look, the basis for our rule set was this. We've now like finished the game. We're all break. Let's create an opportunity. We're setting, giving an opportunity to add another rule. And sorry, when the little kids are playing soccer in the yard, sometimes I'll let the team, let's say one team scores a goal. I let the other team add a new rule. Now the age of the kids that I'm talking about, they're not necessarily always sophisticated enough to create a rule that would benefit themselves, or they're not always able to do it in a way that doesn't skew the entire game. So the kids inherently have the ability to set up little games because if you leave them alone in a room without electronics, they're going to start playing something. It's inevitable. Or you put them outside and you leave them alone. They will start playing something and they will develop some sort of rule set. So I guess like if we go back and we're just like completely open state, you're talking about the sort of the philosophy of things. We're not trying to build any particular games. Is that something that you ever do where like a player puts their hand up and says like, hey, can we have this rule or that rule in this game? Does that ever happen? I do it all the time. I do it all the time. And actually the team I'm coaching now, because they're mature adults and some of them are professional adults, I actually go to the leadership group and said, you know what you need to deliver the goods. So you tell me and the coaches what you'd like us to do to refine the sessions. In an American environment, that's completely alien. And it's taken them maybe three months to warm up to that. So can you give me, I know this is probably a tough ask, but are you able to give me like sort of an example to epitomize that? Yeah, that's kind of easy. Let me come back a couple of steps though. So what you said about, because I want to put something in there, a marker around athlete development. So chronological age versus athlete age. Kids are naturally unselfish. So if you leave adults out the way and put a group of young people with same or similar age in a space, they will create a way to play together. And the interesting thing about that is when you get to, to my mind, to higher level athletic performance, coaches kind of need to adopt something that they lost 15 to 20 years previously. Depending on how old the coach is. Yeah. So kids are very interesting because you give them a space. You say, here's your safe space. Here's where you play. You need to learn to get along. And kids will work it out because they're not impacted by years of age, experience, life and whatever. So when it comes to the coach in that time, you always have to prioritize being a facilitator versus being a lawyer or a doctor. Right. And this is what I see over and again with coaches. And this is a big red flag, particularly adult male coaches versus maybe say a female coach, but adults versus this often can be really dogmatic or entrenched in their thinking. So what I mean by lawyer and doctor, what you have to do is lawyers are really good at leading people where they want them to go. You see that in a court of law with leading questions. Which is why a judge in a court of law has to regulate lawyer behaviors because they will lead the witness. And it's the same thing with coaches. More extrinsic coaches will be more inclined to lead the players to where they want to go into an arena or an environment that perpetuates and it's not implicit bias. What's the other bias? Confirmation bias. Right. So they lead the players down this avenue and go, oh look, look what you've done. That's exactly what I told you. Right. Which it's a useful tool, but shouldn't be end game. Because again, you're getting the players to do something that allows you to confirm something that you need them to do in a good way. But if you make that end game, what it means is you're cutting out the things you don't know, or you're cutting off opportunities for them to learn or express themselves or discover who they are to be an optimal athlete or an optimal performer. That's that piece. The doctor piece is, I've got a prescription for you. So the coaches who are doctors, and oh you fell over, yeah this is what you need to do. This is what you need to do. This is what you should be doing. This is how you cure your problem. And young coaches, particularly super ambitious coaches, are guilty of that. Because they really want to prove a point. Their ego is so wrapped up in their coaching environment that they want to prove that they have the answers. So that they will prescribe the answer. They won't give the players a chance to for their own expression. Because their own personal ambition gets in the way of the expression of the athlete.

So gaming, whilst it has, like you explained there, conditional gaming, has its benefits, it can be very easily undermined by the coaches, the lawyer or the doctor. And the lawyers and the doctors want to bring it back to a place that they can control, so they can prescribe the solution or direct or lead the athlete to where they want to go. And you see that again, those are things that manifest themselves a lot in the coaching environment. So coming back around to your question about, can I give you an example, yeah, very easily, so if you get into a place where, I was talking with my players just yesterday about training versus competing. So the team I'm working with right now, generally they train, but they don't compete, because I'm having to train them up to a point where they can compete. But now we're in a situation where, and I'm saying, right, our focus today is on these subjects. So I used material from yesterday, and we're going to play a game this weekend, the team we're playing against, here's a SWOT analysis, you know, strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats on who they are, and in a traditional sporting environment, you hand that off to the coaches, and the coaches go and train the team the same way they've been training them for 80%, 90% of their sessions. So in that situation, they go, we can't do this, because the prescription doesn't solve the problem. We're going into a new environment with new challenges, so we have to face those challenges. So we have to skew our session to the requirement of the situation. And then the next week is different. And the next week will be different than the next week. So coaches hate change. Coaches love players to perform and hate change. They hate the fact that they might have to change this week, or change, we have two sessions this week, session A and session B might have to change. And then next week, session C and D might have to change again. So that doesn't actually optimize player capability. I'm not even going to say performance, I'm just going to say capability and competency. So using that as a specific example, yesterday I had one of my players say, right, the team we're playing against, our strengths as a team are counterattacking and kick with a kick chase. So outside of our basic pattern, I'm going to skew all our contextual gaming to those things. For the players, it's super stressful, because they're in their comfort zones, because they can rock up to training, in for 80% of training, do the same as they did last time and last time and last time. And what I do with a game, and this is again, why people reject games, the game go, no, I'm going to drop this in here. Because what it does is it exposes them. And they don't like being exposed. No one likes being exposed. No one likes feeling vulnerable. So what they have to do is feel vulnerable and then solve their own problems, so they're no longer vulnerable. And if you look at in the modern world, education, work, what else do we do? We don't do anything else. As people, everything's about conformity. No one ever has to be challenged or change or deal with that in the moment process. So if again, you look at if 80-90% of coaches come from a standard living environment, they're never going to encourage or embrace change. Then they're going to struggle to contextualize gaming for the purposes of the athlete in the environment that they're playing in. Which means you end up back on that path of reductiveness. So specifically gaming yesterday, I said, so based on what we can see of the team we're playing this week, you're going to get all that stuff and then 20% of this session will be spent just dealing with this situation. So you're disrupting the mechanism. So failure is inevitable. So in a 20-minute window, you have to, and this is where the stress is and the pressure comes in, you have to trigger failure so they can create their own solution and be confident going into the next game or environment. We were talking about players chiming in and I think a lot of what you were just talking about is the structure of the game creation. When it comes to the game's already been set up, do the players then occasionally come to you and say, look, we know we're not great at this. Maybe we introduce a rule to expose that. Or we know that our opposition is really good at this. Let's introduce this rule to expose us to that a bit. Yeah. Yeah. And totally. So the thing about gaming and conditional gaming, the conditions should be used to define. So ultimately, the purpose of the condition is to create success, not to create failure. But to get to success, you have to explore failure. And in Lean Six Sigma, it's FMEA, Failure Mode Effects Analysis. So in a rugby gaming environment, you should be doing that week in, week out in a league season. So you have to trigger that FMEA situation. So unless you put a stressor on the team, they're not going to be able to deal with the situation. Now, in a rugby environment versus a manufacturing environment, you can find the opposition, watch their last game, last two games, you see how they perform in certain ways. But what you're looking for in gaming is, or in a competitive match environment, is we want to win the game. So we have to find a chink in their armor. So unless you take that information from how they play, drop it down into your gaming, your players will never know how to exploit that weakness. And you can't do that. The drills environment has no capacity for any of that. It has no capacity for human empathy. It has no, very little capacity for executive functioning, has zero capacity for risk mitigation or using Lean Six Sigma, Failure Modes Effect Analysis, zero capacity for that. Doesn't allow for that in any real sense at all.

So, game creation is not easy. Which is my one biggest learning over time because I find it exciting and I'm curious about it as a coach. I love it. As a coach educator, having spoken to it for so many years, it took me forever to realize to your point, it's not easy. This actually isn't easy. Right. And we can find a summary on the internet about gamifying things, but fundamentally what it comes down to is we're born with the innate ability to create games, especially when we're in little groups. It is not easy to do necessarily, and it's not like kids create perfect games. Those games, it's not unusual for them to be skewed or extremely flawed, but sometimes they get it right. And through practice, obviously, as they get older. As we then get much older, I would argue probably around 12, 13, 14 years old, you kind of see kids lose that ability more and more. Again, I'm just talking from my own experience and watching my own kids. There's less time to make games. The time is very dedicated, right? You wake up early in the morning, you get on the bus, you go to school, you come back from school, you do your homework, go to sports practice. All of this is completely structured. You don't have to think about it. You just show up and you do. And then you've burned through the time of the day and now it's nighttime, you go to bed again and you sort of rinse and repeat. That's what your five days of the week looks like. For many kids, Saturday is also structured. There's sports here, there. You've got to kind of go do these things. And so maybe you have Sunday to be a bit creative and think about things. Well, and to that point, it's just horrendous, isn't it? But to that point, think about this. Sports, gaming via coaching, I would argue today is so much more important than it's ever been because in a developed Western society particularly, the last place a young person has to express themselves and discover themselves is on the sports field. And in Santa Fe. Well, God bless Santa Fe. But again, I've also coached in second and third tier nations and it's kind of the same, same but different. So in those agro, sorry, agrarian cultures where education can be eschewed for working the farm, the kids have nothing. Start work at a young age. So again, we've lost. It is important to understand the true import of sport on society. And because of the product of sport as an entertainment spectacle, the multimillion or in the case of some sports, multibillion entertainment spectacle. Coaches have kind of misplaced the role of sport in society. So in a tier one nation where young kids, by the time they hit puberty, their whole life is regulated by that societal, by societal construct. Therefore, we have socially, social issues related to the fact that these kids never know who they are as a person because everything's prescribed by adults and or adults in a hierarchy or a bureaucracy that says, this is how you behave. So there's no room for exploration, nothing, nothing in modern society that allows young people to explore anything, fall down, get up, get caught, climb a tree, whatever, get a bruise. And, you know, Finland might be an example because it allows young kids in school to do woodwork, hammer a nail into a piece of wood. In other more constrained society, that's a litigation issue. So we just take away the, right, take away the point. So in developed societies today, the value of team sports is more than it's probably ever been. Purely because of the lack of opportunity for young people to express themselves or evolve in an environment like, let's using, if you go back to different countries like the punk era, the rock and roll era, and those creative eras of music were a sign of the times where people were, were freeing up from constraints of society. And that's what coaching is supposed to be. It's not really meant to be. Well, okay, we're getting deep into the philosophy of sport versus the philosophy of coaching. People play a sport and the key word is play, right? I play rugby, I play football, I play tennis, right? That's it. Coaches change the word for play, you know, I drill rugby. I don't coach it, I drill rugby, I drill tennis. So if you ask a coach, would you coach? Very quickly, you'll hear the word drill come out in a conversation. So just language is a gateway to mindset. So if the language is all about the drill, it's therefore, you can tell straight away that that's a filter, we've lost sight of the game. Right. So if I go back to the sort of the benefit to the players, you talked about societal benefit, which is interesting, that's something that I didn't even consider. But we can argue that that's true. Playing sports, especially team sports, has that societal benefit for, like occurring regardless of the specific type of sport, if it's, if it's applied properly. We talked sort of about the benefits to the players. And we didn't really drill into the benefits for the coach, which is something that you brought up early on, which is, you know, like the amount of information you can learn from a person by just playing a game. Yeah. And, you know, a game that I, in, you know, obviously, we've played many, many games over the years. But the Finnish game of Morky. It is interesting when you play that game to sort of see personality sort of show up. So I'll give an example. So, you know, like there are people that you and I both know, that have certain personality types, that took us some time to sort of uncover, where when you play a game of Morky with them, for example, it almost shows up immediately. Yeah. Right. So you can learn a significant amount of information about a person and how they handle situations or just like how they behave socially, by just playing a well structured game with them. And the game could be tailored to extract that information. It, you know, kind of flows back into the, like, how do I interview someone kind of, kind of conversation, right? Like, we have, we've, we've talked about this a lot. But, you know, if I had to interview someone, and I sit together with them over a Zoom call, or even in person, if I've got 30 minutes to an hour, it is easy for me to assess if that person has the, let's say I'm there with them in person, and I'm interviewing them for like a technical or a business role, like somewhere where I can test their like strategic knowledge of the specific industry, or their technical knowledge about the specific industry, I can sit there and ask questions, like in one hour, they can probably give me high level answers that would satisfy my questions. And if I'm really anal about it, I can probably drill in and say, like, how would you do this calculation? How would you code this or whatever, right? And they might still scrape by. Or maybe they are technically very savvy, and they can legitimately answer those questions, even if I dive very deep. What I'm unable to uncover in an hour long conversation is what type of person are you really? Are you going to gel well with the team? Right? Like, because it's not like you gel well with one team, and then don't gel well with another team. You're either like socially adapted so that you can like, work well with, with like people with groups of people, or you're like an arsehole. And it's difficult to work with you wherever you go, period. Uncovering that in an in a half an hour, hour, even two hours or three hours is quite, quite challenging unless you like introduce additional things, right? Like so I can pour wine down someone's throat and see like, sort of have them expose their true personality. Or I can stick them in a game environment where things are a bit stressed, right? Like, and it's like, will they rather sacrifice a teammate to push themselves ahead? Or will they, you know, will they will they bend over a bit and, and help the rest? So, so what I'm getting at there with, I like we talked about the benefits to the players, talked about societal benefits. We talked a little bit about coaching. And from a sort of from the, from the game, from the gaming perspective, and the benefits that you as a coach get out of it. Yeah. What's the question? The question was, can you talk about the benefits for you as a coach when you design the games, you put the games out there. We talked about the benefits to the players. The benefits to me as a coach from gaming. Yeah. Okay. Yeah, absolutely. So the question is the benefits of gaming for a coach. Yeah. Not necessarily the effort of game design, which we've agreed on is difficult, but if you can do it well, what are the benefits of doing it? Well, what do you get out of it? So when I, at the point of answering this question, I've been coaching for 16 years.

And for 16 years, 16 seasons, I have almost always steered towards creating game situations in coaching. The reason for why, when I look back at my military background, drilling was something everyone hated. Everyone hated drilling. There's a thing you did because it's disciplined and there was a purpose to drilling. Weirdly, I kind of enjoyed it. When you're drilling on the parade ground, it creates some form of synchronicity. You can create very symmetric and exciting displays from a drilled environment. Where do you see drilling manifest itself in real life? If you go to a military tattoo, if you see a military marching band, on a golf range maybe, on tennis players, they've got to get that ball over the net, so they've got to get those reps in. In drilling, it's like play that ball back over and over and over and over again. You're playing against an automated serving machine. That to me is what drilling is. It's developing that mitochondria, so it becomes an instinctive reflex versus a mechanical action. It's how we learn to walk, it's how we learn to write, it's how we learn to drive a car. We kind of drill it through reps. When I first started coaching, I had a very well-established group of high IQ rugby athletes from all over the world who totally knew their game. I say their game because their game wasn't my game. Because again, you look at a game of rugby and football, any team sport. You look at it through the lens of their culture. I don't know their culture, so I don't see how they see the game. You only know that through learning and sharing and time spent together, experience. The path of least resistance was to drill those players. But then I never uncover what I don't know. I never know what they can deliver under pressure or in a stress environment. And ultimately, again, same thing is naturally, we go into a game, we like to win, but we go to compete. You've got to be competitive before you can win. Forget winning unless you can be competitive. But then when you start stripping back what's competition, how does that look like, you ultimately end up back in a game. Because if your training session doesn't look like the game, what are you basing your suppositions on? If you went into any market space in the world, I love coming back, let's use a very human industry, hospitality. If your restaurant doesn't serve food that people like, guess what, people are not coming to your restaurant. It's the same with coaching. If you're serving up a product that people don't like, guess what, you're going to lose your players and you're only going to end up with that group of players who kind of really care, almost zealously, to play. And they will play in spite of you, not because of you. So what gaming does is coming back to the right game allows people to express themselves. The advantage to the coach is in a non-linear, non-sterile environment, you get to see who they really are under pressure. So if you look at a simple catch-pass solution, they can't catch pass, all right, let's drill it. Put them in a clinical environment, a drill, and they're getting 90% success on their catch-pass completion. 95%. Why? Because they're trying to put them in the game. The game changes shape, the space changes shape, it's not a clinical context. And suddenly their 90% drops down to 60%. 60% completion not just has an impact on the team, it has an impact on that person of mental, emotional impact. And depending on the type of person, so this is a first benefit. Do they solve their problem? Which means, oh, they solve their own problem. Let's look at how they solve the problem. Now let's look at how do we transition that skill of problem-solving across the team? Or how do we use this person as a role model for problem-solving? Or, oh, they've solved their problem, is there a solution in there that I haven't seen before? Which you'll never get any of that, those things. You'll never get any of that out of a drill, basically. I know how I pass the ball. Going back to passing a rugby ball, I remember being told this is how you pass a rugby ball. Being shouted at many, many times, or this is how you kick a football. Because none of the coaches understood I was left-handed, so I couldn't pass a rugby ball as instructed by a right-handed coach, there's no empathy in it, it was just pain. So I had to work out myself how to do it, because fortunately for me in rugby, I loved rugby enough that I wanted to stay in the game, so I worked out how to pass the ball myself off a left hand, or pass it to the right of my left hand, or to my left of my left hand versus the right hand. Everything was buried back to front. But for the longest time in rugby, I had no instruction or coaching on that. I just ended up in an environment where physicality defined my game, because there was no coaching on or coaching empathy around catch pass. So what you lose by not doing it, is you lose solutions that are relevant to a large percentage or a subset of your team, that cannot be discovered or explored if you just do a pure coach drilling environment. If you're sharp enough, maybe you're a sharp enough coach, and you're not doing games like gameplay during training sessions, you might be able to pick up these issues by observing like an actual game of rugby, because that is an actual game, not a drill. So let's look at that. So if you've got an Australian and a New Zealander and a South African, and for argument's sake a Frenchman, all in that same game scenario, that'll tell you the same thing with different language. And if you don't game it, you don't understand how they view language is the gateway to their culture. So they all, what did I say, a New Zealander, Australian, Kiwi, South African, Australian, French person, and let's just throw in an Argentinian and an Englishman and a Welshman for example, all see the same game through a different lens, all can express the same opinions with different language. If you do not game the situation, you will not discover the solutions each one of those people can present to a single problem, because a single problem has multiple solutions. Now in the world of drilling, catch pass, make a tackle, ruck and counter ruck, it's body mechanics. It really is body mechanics, it's not, and we get so obsessed with processes, coaches, we don't understand body mechanics, so I'll give you two live examples, fresh examples. I'm with my players, talking to my number 10, he's saying, the guys outside want me to make all the command calls, which as a spectator of rugby, if you watch it on TV or you're an amateur coach, yeah that's fine, what's wrong with that? That's what we drill for, that's what we train for. But what he's saying is, I am in the driving seat, which is the pressure load, I've got all the pressures, which I explain to players, your 10's in a 360 pressure load. The last thing he can really do or cope with is your issues in your universe. So he's saying, instead of me shouting instructions to you, I'm the guy in the most high pressure spot in this part of the game. How about you feeding options into me that ahead of time, I can process data and make the right decision. What you get in a business world is market intelligence. Businesses are always looking for market intelligence before they make a decision to go down path A, B or C. It's the same thing, just in a more constrained environment. But if you don't game, if I didn't game to these guys, they would have never learnt that piece of information. And by learning that piece of information, they're going to learn that piece of information.