

## CSM meeting with CCP, 18<sup>th</sup> to 20<sup>th</sup> of February 2010 Iceland

CSM attendees: Tomas – ElvenLord, Greg – Alekseyev Karrde, John – Zastrow, Jason – TeaDaze, Asher – Mrs Trzsbk, Andrey – Korvin, Denis – ZOD, Jaime – Song Li, Tim – Sokratesz

### 2010-02-18, Thursday

#### The CSM

CCP Attendee: Pétur – CCP Xhagen

General introduction was given by Pétur and Ágúst, the independent meeting director.

Pétur suggested the CSM term be increased to 1 year. Each CSM would then be flown twice to Iceland for meetings. The idea was well received as this would help the delegates to get into the job, which takes the better part of 6 months. This should also enhance accountability since there would be time for both decisions and follow-up.

It was discussed whether the chairman and the secretary should then hold their post for the entire term or whether there should be a switch mid-term. Pétur suggested that they have the option of requesting a replacement after 6 months.

The CSM expressed concern that they might be underutilized. The feeling is that CCP should be more proactive in coming to the CSM with issues to get input. They strongly feel they could contribute more if they were kept more in the loop.

The CSM requested easier access to feedback from CCP on things like the feasibility of certain suggested features, to avoid wasting time on discussing items that just aren't going to be feasible. Pétur suggested that they send such questions to him, which he would in turn look for answers within the company.

The CSM would like to see more of the work being done before the summits in Iceland. The feeling is that the number of issues on the agenda is a bit excessive and that they are largely unprepared for many of the issues. They suggest that they send a referendum on their issues to CCP and receive feedback in advance of the meetings.

The idea was raised and supported that the summits should only be held on weekdays. This would help with scheduling.

The CSM does not see a need for a term limit as sitting for a whole year would mean greater changes to the political landscape of EVE and thus make reelection improbable. Should this turn out to be a problem it can be revisited at a later date.

## Summary

- The CSM agrees that increasing the term to 1 year from 6 months would be beneficial, allowing CSMs to ease into the job and allow them to follow up over multiple development cycles..
- The CSM would like to be utilized more and would like CCP to be more proactive in bringing issues to them.
- The CSM requests greater preparation for the summits by having issues discussed in advance.
- The CSM would like to see the entire summits held on weekdays.
- The CSM does not see a need for a term limit.

## Account Security

CCP Attendees: Kjartan – CCP Sinister, Anne – CCP Alice, Einar – Lead GM Grimmi

Incidents of unauthorized account access have increased dramatically. Far from being an EVE only problem this is plaguing the industry as a whole. One component of the problem is that players use the same login names and passwords for multiple games meaning that if one system is compromised it can cause a landslide of problems.

Account log-in security can be improved with things like CAPTCHA but care must be taken not to cause nuisance to the players logging in.

It was suggested that increased security that required increased effort from the players should be entirely optional.

Reminders to players to change passwords were suggested. Furthermore CSM suggested an option to use a different password for the forums and for account management.

One option is to sell random number generators but the CSM expressed doubt that a significant number of players would utilize that option.

The idea was put forth to prevent character sales for a period of time after an account's email address is changed.

Optional IP-restrictions are one possibility.

There are some minimum standards of password security that can be imposed, such as strength of password and verification after sign-up.

The CSM suggested that players should never have to give out their account name for things like character transfers. A system to replace that would be needed.

### Summary

- The CSM stressed that improved security measures that require more effort from the user should be optional.
- The CSM feels there are some minimum standards of password security that can be imposed and don't have to be optional, such as a minimum strength of password and verification after sign-up.
- The CSM encourages CCP to publish devblogs and other material on the size of the problem to increase awareness among players and to explain what they can do to increase their password security.
- The CSM suggested that players should never have to give out their account name for things like character transfers. A system to replace that would be needed.

### Customer Support (CS)

CCP Attendees: Svenni – Lead GM Guard, Einar – Lead GM Grimmi, Ingibjörg – Lead GM Lilith, Hrabba – Lead GM Q, Rabbi – Lead GM Ender, Reynir – Lead GM Fate

The CSM expressed concern over the perceived lack of consistency in handling petitions. The CSM stresses the need for the training of new GMs to reduce the time-consuming need for escalation of petitions to more experienced GMs.

The GMs explained that training had been stepped up and that documentation of petition procedures has recently been updated. CS also pointed out that escalated petitions only amounted to 1-2% of all petitions. Even with the seldomly escalated “stuck” petitions removed from the equation, the percentage would still be a low single digit. This means that the vast majority of petitions are handled by regular GMs from start to finish despite us never denying escalation when requested.

The CSM complained that GMs often didn't seem to read the petitions properly before answering. CS acknowledged this as something that happens from time to time. This is a quality issue that is kept on the radar for during quality audits and is something is dealt with when it comes up. It was emphasized that players should request escalation if they ever received such service.

The CSM feels that Customer Support is overusing standard replies in petitions where they're not applicable. CS acknowledges that standard replies are used somewhat widely to save time in categories where the replies are often very similar, mostly as a first reply to common problems. This is done to save time and speed up the overall service. CS explained how GMs are trained to use standard replies responsibly, and how the internal policies are on standard reply usage. Some of the core rules are that standard replies must fit the customers query perfectly, and that they must not be used excessively in

the same petition. This is also something watched out for during quality audits and in escalated petitions.

There's a wish for more delicately worded replies to petitions where players are denied reimbursement for a major loss.

The CSM would like CCP to add date and time to reimbursement petition ship list. CCP agreed that this would be a good addition and we will look into having it implemented.

The CSM feels that response time has improved immensely but at the cost of the quality of the contact between the players and the GMs.

The CSM feels that the GMs should be more transparent and visible in blogs and on the forums. While everyone knows that real people are dealing with these issues the impersonal nature of the petition system mechanizes the processes. CS agreed that more could be done for transparency and suggested a monthly status blog. The CSM likes the idea and Customer Support committed to it.

## Summary

- The CSM expressed concern over several things in Customer Support such as lack of persistency in replies, petitions sometimes not being read properly, standard replies often overused and used on petitions where they're not applicable.
- The CSM stresses the need for the training of new GMs.
- The CSM feels that response time has improved immensely but at the cost of the quality of the contact between the players and the GMs.
- The CSM wants to see the addition of date and time to reimbursement petition ship list.
- The CSM would like to see more transparency from Customer Support.

## EVE Production

CCP Attendees: Torfi – CCP tOrfifrans

Torfi explained the development process.

The CSM pointed out that CCP usually puts out a devblog which outlines their vision for certain expansions. The fluid development process then changes the expansion drastically, by necessity, but these changes don't get communicated to the playerbase. The end result is that players' expectations don't match the released expansion.

The CSM criticized the handling of the changes to capital ships in Dominion and cites it as a prime example of expectation management gone wrong.

EVE Gate got discussed quite a bit and various ideas put forth. Torfi explained the focus of the first release of it. CSM asked whether players could design application on top of EVE Gate but Torfi explain that this was not on the agenda, but didn't rule out that it might be allowed in the future.

The CSM explained to Torfi the point from the previous session that they felt underutilized and wanted to contribute more to the development. The possibility of getting CSM feedback to scrum teams was discussed. Direct contact is out of the question but the frequency of communication with CCP could possibly be increased.

## Summary

- The CSM calls for better expectation management by CCP.
- The CSM wants to see devblogs with updates to CCP's vision for expansions.
- The CSM criticized the handling of the changes to capital ships in Dominion.

## Fleet Fights

CCP Attendees: Erlendur – CCP Explorer, Nonni – CCP Atlas, Einar – CCP GingerDude, Svenni – Lead GM Guard

CCP explained their view on the issue. Dominion introduced some memory problems which were subsequently fixed. Another problem appearing in Dominion was one of Database session starvation, in English some queries made to the DB took abnormally long time for no apparent reason. The reason was however found and fixed. Less memory is now being used per user minute than before Dominion. The main remaining issue is the problem of grids not loading, which favors one side of battle. Solid progress has been made in discovering the culprit and a solution is on the horizon.

The debate is whether to encourage or enforce smaller fights through game design or whether we have to focus on supporting even bigger fights or distribute the lag more evenly between the fleet jumping in and the fleet that already is already there and already has the grid loaded.

CCP is currently limited to one node per core. There is little CCP can do about that in the short term. There are however plans to put stations on a different node than the system. That probably won't have a significant effect in nullsec systems.

There were reports of desync problems resurfacing. EVE Software Division does not have any bug reports on the issue and requested these. It was suggested that the bug reporting process be streamlined.

CSM strongly feels that the bug reporting system should be streamlined and enhanced and CCP agrees, albeit no specifics were discussed.

CCP asked for info on actions or tactics that cause lag. Switching between fleets was said to cause notable lag. It was reported that weapons grouping subjects players to the risk of all guns getting stuck instead of just a few of them.

### **Summary**

- CCP explained the memory problem that had been fixed and found after Dominion.
- CCP gave information about the database session starvation problem that surfaced after Dominion and how it was fixed.
- The remaining lag problem that is being worked on is one of grids not loading for the fleet jumping to the grid, which gives an unfair advantage to the fleet already there. A solution is in sight.
- The CSM would not like to see very large fleet fights discouraged through game design but feels there is a need for a fair distribution of lag caused by grids not loading.

## 2010-02-19, Friday

### Alliance Tournament Discussion

CCP Attendees: Ian O'Brien – CCP Claw, Oliver – CCP Charlie

CCP inquired about the CSM's opinion on whether the tournament should be independent of the game's economy or not, i.e. whether alliances should be using their money on ships and fittings. The consensus was that this should be played for alliances' own money.

The idea was raised to establish a league to make it a continuous e-sport event, which CCP has looked into. However, the Alliance Tournament should still be the main event and the consensus is to make it less frequent, most likely once per year.

The CSM expressed concern at the practice of entering bogus teams that were just used as placeholders to bar others from entry. Possible ways to counter that include reserving slots for the top 16 teams from last tournament and auctioning slots, for instance through a [Dutch auction](#).

The CSM approves of the current rules but CCP wants to make some modifications to make things more interesting. The CSM does not feel that such changes are needed.

The CSM put forward the idea of giving teams a score bonus if they win with teams that don't fully utilize all their points and thus play with a handicap.

### Summary

- The CSM agreed to the idea of having the Alliance tournament once per year.
- The CSM approved of the idea of having an e-sport league running parallel to the Alliance Tournament.
- The CSM expressed concern at the practice of entering bogus teams that were just used as placeholders to bar others from entry.
- The CSM agreed with the ideas of reserving slots for the top 16 teams from the last tournament and of auctioning a part of the slots.
- The CSM approves of the current rule system but CCP want to do some modifications. The CSM feels the rules should not be changed in a significant manner.
- The CSM put forward the idea of giving teams a score bonus if they win with teams that don't fully utilize all their points and thus play with a handicap.

## Economics

CCP Attendees: Eyjó – Dr.EyjoG

Eyjó asked three questions:

1. Will complex financial markets emerge from player behavior under the current system?
2. What do we do about it?
3. What kind of regulation is needed and who would be the regulating authority?

A fundamental issue with these kinds of markets is how to enforce people to honor their obligations. Putting up items as collateral would rarely work since it prevents the owner from making money with them and if they're not being used for income, then they could just as well be sold. There might be ways to put blueprints up as collateral and still keep them producing.

The idea was mentioned to make defaulting player killable by everyone.

There's always the problem of people moving the money to an alt before defaulting.

Contracts for shares could work as collateral.

There's matter of how shares on inactive characters work.

There are issues with the current shareholder voting system. Having 5% of the share and the majority of the voting shares in a particular vote, you can wreak any amount of havoc.

Rating systems are open to abuse through alts and dummy corps.

The CSM did not agree to have account implications of defaulting, such as bans.

The reason for the lack of financial markets is a lack of trust and a lack of tools to replace it.

Chribba was mentioned as the best example of reputation and trust. The interesting question regarding that is how such trust is built up. The visibility of players' actions is probably the key in that regards and EVE Gate may have potential in increasing such visibility.

Financial markets can and do evolve within small communities within Eve, such as corporations and alliances because there is the option of punishing through dismissal from the group.

Eyjo asked if CSM could provide him with detailed descriptions of financial services being run within corps/alliances so he could better understand how and why they function. Assisting the CSM with that would be very much appreciated.

## Summary

- The reason for the lack of financial markets on a large scale is a lack of trust and a lack of tools to replace it. Enforcing players to honor obligations is the essence of the problem.



- Financial markets can and do evolve within small communities within Eve, such as corporations and alliances because there is the option of punishing through dismissal from the group.

## **EVE Gate**

CCP Attendees: Ben – CCP Caedmon, Helga – CCP Priya, Matt – CCP Greyscale

CCP explained why they're developing EVE Gate and what their vision is, having limited access to EVE (to begin with EVE mail, some corporation management, event organization etc.) through EVE Gate

The use of EVE Gate was discussed, including the potential for abuse.

It's believed to appeal more to newer players than old veterans for the simple reason of veteran players already having the entire community structure such as forums, out of game chat channels, killboards, voice programs etc. in place.

There was a discussion about the pros and cons of including the member lists of corporations. The main con is that high sec corporations will not be able to hide their member list which makes it easier for hostile corporations to locate them. It therefore makes griefing a bit easier. The reason CCP wants to include the list is that it's already possible to obtain this list, albeit through advanced means, and CCP feels it would level the playing field if everyone had access to it. CSM stressed that obtaining lists like that provides an effort that should exist, but pointed out strong objection to making members lists public.

The new system will separate the buddy list into a friends list and a watch list. The current buddy list will not be directly transferred to the friends list so it won't include current enemies on the buddy list.

There will be spam filters in place to combat spamming, which will be most relevant to NPC corps.

CCP explained planned changes to the standings system which will affect EVE Gate.

## **Summary**

- The CSM was not in agreement on the issue of whether the member lists of corporations should be made public through EVE Gate.
- The CSM feels it's important that the link to EVE is always clear so EVE Gate doesn't feel like a standalone application on the side.
- The CSM emphasized the need for spam filters in EVE Gate.

## General Discussion About Nullsec Gameplay

CCP Attendees: Kristoffer – CCP Soundwave, Noah – CCP Hammer

The CSM asked about the vision CCP had for the sov changes in Dominion. i.e. whether the plan was to get more people out to nullsec. CCP wanted more people to move to nullsec but the CSM feels that this effort was unsuccessful.

The CSM feels that the risk versus reward in nullsec doesn't make it worth it to move out to 0.0, especially compared to doing level 4 missions in high-sec.

The CSM feels that there are too many cruiser and frigate size NPCs in nullsec and feels that this should be changed.

The CSM feels there's too little incentive to upgrade infrastructure in nullsec because the rewards are too small. Furthermore, upgrading your infrastructure benefits anyone that comes there but may not give anything beyond that to the alliance that spent money on it.

CCP asked how nullsec alliances could benefit from planetary interaction. One idea is to tax income from planetary industries, for instance by sov holders taxing space elevators, cargo rockets etc. Planets in nullsec should also have far more valuable resources.

Access to far out nullsec systems is a problem. Having to go through other alliance's territory makes it prohibitively difficult. Furthermore, needing an extremely expensive outpost to have access to a market makes it unfeasible for small alliances to move to nullsec.

The CSM feels that the treaty system is sorely needed to further populate nullsec.

Moving datacore production to nullsec was identified as a possible means to give players incentives to operate there.

The CSM wants CCP to look at the possibility of increasing the number of access points to nullsec because it's too easy to block all entries.

### Summary

- The CSM feels that Dominion was unsuccessful in giving players incentives to move to nullsec.
- The consensus is that the risk versus reward in nullsec is not worth it.
- The CSM feels that there are too many cruiser and frigate size NPCs in nullsec and feels that this should be changed.
- The CSM agrees with the idea of sov holders being able to tax planetary industries in their space.
- The CSM feels that the treaty system is sorely needed to further populate nullsec.
- The CSM would like CCP to investigate the feasibility of improving access to nullsec.

## General Dominion Discussion

CCP Attendees: Noah – CCP Hammer

There was a discussion on how to encourage small scale PvP in nullsec. Do roaming gangs need targets to engage that will force defenders to come out to fight? The preferred target seemed to be station services, which is possible now but they have far too many hit points to become valid targets for roaming gangs. Reducing their hit points might create such an incentive. While it might not force defenders to fight, it would give the roaming gangs some purpose.

Noah asked what the CSM thought of a feature where ships that were scrambled or under other module effect could not dock. This was received with mixed comments but it was pointed out that it would open up something which would give unfair ganks. Noah asked if it would change anything if you could get overview information before undocking. There were more mixed views about that and nothing conclusive came out of subsequent discussions. [The CSM, upon further reflection during the weekend, rallied behind the idea. See Saturday minutes for further information. Xhagen]

The CSM raised the issue of the balance of different types of guns, claiming that projectile guns seemed more powerful than others. Furthermore, the Gallente seem underpowered in general. Their short range blaster specialty doesn't combine well with their slow cumbersome ships which prevent them from determining engagement range.

The CSM inquired about the use of doomsday devices in low-sec and CCP's design idea regarding that. Noah made a point of look into re-introducing doomsdays in low-sec.

There was a short discussion on the use of jump bridges and cynojammers but no consensus.

Song Li is not ElvenLord's friend.

### Summary

- The CSM suggested more purpose to roaming nullsec gangs that encounter foes staying docked. The prime suggestion was to reduce the hit points of station services so small gangs have targets to hit and ways to harass enemies that stay docked.
- The meeting discussed possible changes to the mechanics of the „undocking game“.
- The CSM raised the issue of game balance, in particular regarding the Gallente, railguns and blasters.
- The issue of the use of titans and doomsday devices in low-sec was discussed. CSM believes that low-sec use of titans and doomsdays should be reinstated.

## Unfinished Expansions

CCP Attendees: Arnar – CCP Zulupark

The CSM inquired about CCP's vision with Dominion. CCP explained that it was more meaningful nullsec warfare. The CSM feels this objective was not met. A lower barrier of entry into nullsec was a secondary objective but this had to be abandoned during the development.

The CSM stressed the need for the treaty system and feels it is essential to the new sovereignty system. They pointed out that it would help against blobbing if treaties could provide blue standings in limited parts of an alliance's sovereign space. That way everyone blue in an alliance's space doesn't automatically become eligible as padding to the alliance's fleets.

The CSM is unhappy about the fact that important features that get cut from expansions never seem to get picked up again. Factional warfare is mentioned as a prime example and the fear is that the same will happen to treaties.

The CSM suggested that they should receive a development budget for projects that they prioritize. Arnar was **aroused** by this idea. [Further discussion about this topic can be found later in these minutes. Xhagen]

The CSM calls for an increased dialogue with CCP regarding game design during the actual development process rather than after release of an expansion.

### Summary

- The CSM is unhappy about the fact that important features that get cut from expansions never seem to get picked up again. Factional warfare is mentioned as a prime example and the fear is that the same will happen to treaties.
- The CSM stressed the need for the treaty system and feels it is essential to the new sovereignty system.
- The CSM would like to have a budget of development time dedicated to going through a backlog of projects that they prioritize.
- The CSM calls for far more dialogue with CCP regarding game design as it is happening rather than after its release.

## Unholy Rage – RMT Fighting

CCP Attendees: Einar – Lead GM Grimmi, Eyjólfur – CCP Dr.EyjoG

CCP went over the progress of operations against the RMT trade.

The CSM encouraged CCP to delete banned trial accounts. This is being considered by CCP but one of the reasons for keeping them is to keep the evidence accessible.

The introduction of easier spam reporting has not been abused as was originally feared.

CCP is tackling RMT both through targeting RMTers directly and by selling PLEXes to compete with them.

The next focus area will be the fight against hackers.

The idea was aired whether it should be allowed to transfer ingame money into real life money. The idea was badly received and CCP explained they want to keep it a closed economy because the alternative of an open game economy would subject the game to real life laws and regulations, for example on banking.

PLEX for Haiti was discussed. There are some mixed emotions among the playerbase. Some argue that all donations should go directly to the organizations but the counter-argument is that this programme is there to enable players to donate their ISK, which they can't donate directly to organizations.

### **Summary**

- CCP went over the progress of operations against the RMT trade.
- It's the general perception that the introduction of easier spam reporting has not been abused as was originally feared.
- The next focus area will be the fight against hackers.
- The CSM took a stance against RMT but generally support the sale of PLEXes.
- The CSM supports the PLEX for Haiti programme but reported mixed emotions about the programme amongst the playerbase.

## 2010-02-20, Saturday

### Various Issues

CCP Attendees: Erlendur – CCP Explorer, Torfi – CCP t0rfifrans, Noah – CCP Hammer, Colin – CCP Chronotis, Christian – CCP Wrangler

The CSM inquired about the possibility of a **battle recorder**, a tool that stores the data stream from the server which would enable re-rendering of events and therefore help with videos. CCP explained that this is technically possible and actually exists as an in-house tool. However, quite a bit of development time is needed in order to release it to players. It's therefore a question of prioritization.

The CSM raised the issue of **self-destruction of ships in combat** in order to deny opponents the killmail. This is mainly a problem with very large ships like motherships. It suggested that the last opponent to shoot at the ship would get a kill mail for it. CCP considers this a reasonable request and will look into it.

The CSM feels that **Black Ops ships** are nearly useless due to almost no practical role, except to bridge in stealth bombers. The Black Ops ships are considered too weak and too expensive. The CSM suggest an increase in jump range, improvement in scan resolution and a role bonus to reduce the targeting penalty of cloaking devices or a reduction in cost. CCP will review the Black Ops class.

The CSM would like **warfare links and information warfare** looked at. The council considers the effect of them not worth the while on a fleet that is already boosting these effects by other means, due to the stacking penalty. CCP will consider whether they need to be changed but is concerned about making them overpowered.

The CSM inquired about CCP's vision for **destroyers** and whether they were still to be considered frigate killers. They are considered far too vulnerable. The CSM pointed out, as a possible solution, increased powergrid for the Catalyst and the Cormorant, a review of destroyer bonuses as well as of signature and hit points. CCP will add this to the rebalancing backlog.

The issue of **the docking game** was discussed again. The CSM, having had time to mull things over since the previous day, approves of the idea put forth by CCP preventing ships that are scrambled or under other module effect from docking. That option however HAS to go hand in hand with making the overview available within stations to show what's waiting outside.

The CSM inquired about **factional warfare** and CCP's plan to both re-iterate on it and to fix existing bugs. Several examples were cited of bugs which allow exploits. CCP explained that they already had made a fix regarding timers and cloaked plexing. The fix had a negative effect on the server and therefore had to be retracted. It will be redeployed as soon as the server issue has been resolved. CCP prefers to use development resources on improving nullsec warfare rather than on factional warfare, but is still committed to fixing existing exploits and views it as a high priority.

Asher (aka Mrs Trzrbk) stated that low-sec is also an emergent sandbox, only it's about 3 inches deep and full of cat poop.

The CSM asked about plans to redo **starbases**. CCP does not have any immediate plans to do so. However, revisiting older features will come more into focus once planetary interaction and Incarna are fully implemented.

The CSM was unhappy about a recently installed 5 minute cool down timer on **forum posting**. CCP announced that the timer will be reduced but should the problem, excessive spam messages, it was designed to curb return the changes will be reverted.

It was suggest that mercenary corporations should be allowed to post **corp logos on the crime and punishment forum**.

The CSM expressed concern over **forum moderation** appearing heavy handed. It was suggested that removed posts should be replaced with a statement about the post being removed as it breached the rules, rather than just deleting it. CCP pointed out that it was deleting rather than editing out the content in order to prevent the poster from re-editing it. The CSM prefers to make such a re-edit punishable rather than delete. The CSM would very much like **a line that separates the forum post from the signature**.

The CSM feels there needs to be an improvement in the **role system**, which is too limited. CCP explained that this is technically possible but that it will require significant development time. CCP likes this idea and finds it useful. CCP also fully recognizes the need to overhaul the role system. The benefits an overhaul to the game emergence and the player experience are undeniable but due to the development time, and more importantly the risk involved, feels it cannot make a commitment to it at this point.

The CSM brought up the issue of **suicide ganking** and feels it is too easy. The main problem is that this is in effect subsidized by insurance. CCP is aware of the issue and has discussed it at great length in-house. CCP feels it absolutely needs to compensate newbies that attack players by mistake in high-sec. This may get changed in the future but not in the summer expansion. It was made clear that suicide ganking is an accepted game mechanic.

The CSM would like to see the introduction of **corporation bookmarks**. This is identified as being of major use to corps in wormhole space. CCP approves of this idea and has it in the backlog. While this is not currently in development it does not require much development and there is the will to implement this. CSM made the suggestion of being able to warp to corporation assets in system, e.g. pos towers, jump bridges etc, invalidating the need for bookmarks for them and making it easier for people to settle in 0.0.

The meeting reviewed an **overview of previous issues put forth by the CSM**. The CSM would like to have overview reviewed regularly to be able to track what moves from the backlog towards implementation.

To increase **transparency** to the players 4 things are deemed needed:

1. The meeting minutes will have to be made public as soon as possible.
2. A retrospective blog by Pétur on the CSM summit.
3. A separate devblog on the status list for issues raised by the CSM in the past.
4. A devblog by Torfi on the CSM and the use that CCP and EVE get out of it.

## **Development budget**

The CSM put forth the **proposal** of having a development budget to allocate to projects that they want to bump to the top of the backlog. CCP is hesitant to provide such a budget because many departments within the company have been requesting the same without success.

CCP made the **counter-proposal** of involving the CSM more in the prioritization of the backlog but without committing fixed development time. Under the system the CSM would provide a list of their main wishes. CCP would then estimate the development time and report back for possible re-prioritization by the CSM. Another round of feedback is required after the revised priority list is submitted, so that the CSM and the players have transparent and accountable explanations of why the CSM's priorities were or were not included in that round of development.

This is the same system as stake holding departments of CCP have for getting their requests through. This change would therefore be a recognition of the CSM as a stakeholder on equal footing with stakeholder departments within CCP.

The CSM feels that this system must have a recognizable result within a fairly short timeframe. This result will need to be made quite clear to the community in order to prevent the playerbase from losing faith in the CSM.

- 5.
- 6.
- 7.
- 8.

The CSM's prioritized list will have to be sent to CCP before April.

## **Summary**



- The CSM inquired about the possibility of a battle recorder, a tool to re-render events. CCP explained that it is technically possible but will require quite a bit of development time.
- The CSM raised the issue of self-destruction of ships in combat in order to deny opponents the killmail. It suggested that the last opponent to shoot at the ship would get a kill mail for it. CCP considers this a reasonable request and will look into it.
- The CSM feels that Black Ops ships are too weak and too expensive. CCP will review the Black Ops class to evaluate the need for changes.
- The CSM would like warfare links and information warfare looked at. CCP will consider whether they need to be changed but is concerned about making them overpowered.
- The CSM brought up the issue of destroyers being too weak and vulnerable. CCP will add this to the rebalancing backlog.
- The issue of the docking game was discussed. CCP put forth an idea of a changed mechanic which the CSM approves of.
- The CSM inquired about factional warfare and CCP's plan to both re-iterate on it and to fix existing bugs. CCP prefers to use development resources on improving nullsec warfare rather than on factional warfare, but is still committed to fixing existing exploits and views it as a high priority.
- The CSM asked about plans to redo starbases. CCP does not have any immediate plans to do so.
- The CSM was unhappy about a recently installed 5 minute cool down timer on forum posting. CCP announced that the timer will be reduced.
- It was suggested that mercenary corporations should be allowed to post corp logos on the crime and punishment forum.
- The CSM expressed concern over heavy handed forum moderation.
- The CSM feels there needs to be an improvement in the role system, which is too limited. CCP approves of this idea but due to the development time, and more importantly the risk involved, feels it cannot make a commitment to it at this point.
- The CSM brought up the issue of suicide ganking being subsidized by insurance. CCP is aware of the issue but has not decided on action at this point. CCP made clear that suicide ganking is an accepted game mechanic.
- The CSM would like to see the introduction of corporation bookmarks. CCP approves of this idea and has it in the backlog.
- The meeting reviewed an overview of previous issues put forth by the CSM. The CSM would like to have overview reviewed regularly to be able to track what moves from the backlog towards implementation.
- It was agreed that CCP formally recognizes the CSM as a stakeholder in EVE development on equal footing with stakeholder departments within CCP, allowing the CSM much greater influence on development prioritization.