

CSM meeting minutes – Iceland, 30th of May to 1st of June 2012



As assembled by the

Seventh Elected Council of Stellar Management for EVE Online

([@CSM7EVE](#))

Contents

Wednesday, May 30th	2
CSM: Introduction and White Paper discussions.....	2
What is a Stakeholder?	32
Winter 2012 expansion.....	42
EVE Future.....	44
The state of Incarna	50
Live Events	52
Thursday, May 31 st	57

Industry and mining	577
Starbase rework	633
EVE/Dust link.....	69
EVE UI	75
Null sec	83
Corporation management	88
War decs and Crimewatch	93
Player experience – launcher	101
Friday, June 1 st	107
Factional warfare discussion	107
Art session.....	117
Ship balance and iteration	121
‘Player to player contracts’ (feature working title)	135
Content	140
Security	145
(New) Player Experience	150
EVE Economy.....	160
CSM minutes credits	165

The Council of Stellar Management (CSM) is a player-elected council to represent the views of the players to CCP. More information about the CSM, their responsibilities and their procedures can be found on Evelopedia here: <http://wiki.eveonline.com/en/wiki/Csm>

Wednesday, May 30th

CSM: Introduction and White Paper discussions

Present: CCP Xhagen, CCP Diagoras, Alekseyev Karrde (Lync), Dovinian (Lync)

Executive Summary

Editor’s note: this is a full transcript of this session, with very little paraphrasing done and only a very minor change to the language used by every individual. It was decided to test this format to see

if there was an added value. As can be seen in other sessions this format was also partially adapted in other write-ups.

CCP Xhagen gave new members a brief introduction to how summits work. A bribe was offered to the devs working on the Unified Inventory. The fallout from the resignation of The Mittani was discussed (there was none).

[White Paper](#): a broad discussion of potential changes to the way the CSM is elected and operates internally. Topics included:

The possibility of letting people run for CSM anonymously (probably not).

- * What to do if someone's not working or being a troublemaker (hard to quantify, process could be gamed)
- * Doing full transcripts of [CSM](#) meetings (an experiment is planned).
- * Importance of broad representation on CSM.
- * Bringing in the bubble-boy (#15) if someone resigns (probably not going to happen because it provides gaming opportunities)
- * Should candidates be able to scam for votes? (yes)
- * Should voters be able to retract and revote? (no)
- * Changes to the voting system (lots of research and public discussion needed)
- * Possible change to CSM's position in the organizational chart (to the Community division) may put CSM more "in the loop".
- * Possible removal of the [Assembly Hall](#) (up in the air)
- * Making it easier for players to EVE-mail the CSM (good idea)
- * Discussion of roles of CSM officers.
- * Discussion of making Chairman elected by the CSM (will be done, mechanics need to be worked out)

Full Transcript:

The following transcript of the meeting is only lightly edited for clarity. This is an experiment to see if this style provides added insight to the community.

Producing this kind of transcript takes approximately twice as long as producing "traditional" CSM minutes.

The session opened with the ceremonial CSM complaints about the horrible 'guest' WiFi at CCP, which blocks SSL email and requires re-authentication every 15 minutes.

CCP Xhagen gave some introductory comments and gave the new members a brief intro to how summits work and how best to interact with CCP personnel.

The CSM tested the new [Lync](#) panoramic camera setup and it became immediately obvious it was a great improvement. Alekseyev Karrde (Alek) and Dovinian attended the meeting via teleconference.

Seleene noted that he was glad the CSM has the Unified Inventory to complain about because otherwise the summit might be boring.

The team working on Unified Inventory were offered a bribe -- a [crystal skull filled with Vodka](#) -- which will be held in escrow by CCP Xhagen until a certain feature ("favorite containers") went live on TQ. This bribe was originally negotiated between Trebor Daehdoow (Trebor) and CCP Soundwave, who will probably want a cut.

There was a brief discussion about the effects of The Mittani's resignation. Elise Randolph (Elise) inquired as to whether there had been any fallout at CCP, and CCP Xhagen replied that there had not been any; the 30-day ban was directed at the player, and did not affect the CSM as an institution. Trebor praised The Mittani for handling things in a mature way -- by burning Jita -- and CCP Xhagen noted that this resulted in CCP discovering some bugs in Time Dilation.

UAXDEATH asked about CCP's media efforts at [Fanfest](#) regarding [DUST 514](#). CCP Xhagen replied that CCP's focus was on getting EVE players to get acquainted with DUST, but the response was much more positive than expected. People inside CCP are generally happy about the reception DUST is getting.

The CSM discussed their experiences in the DUST 514 beta and its progression. However, all discussions of DUST 514 beta are under still NDA ([non-disclosure agreement](#)).

Seleene made a pointed comment that perhaps the group should talk about the CSM.

CCP Xhagen initiated a discussion of the White Paper. Trebor suggested it be thrown out and replaced with a different-colored paper. UAXDEATH suggested the current CSM be retained in perpetuity; Trebor added that CSMs should be allowed to be removed for good behavior. CCP Xhagen left the room in disgust.

CCP Xhagen pointed out that CCP would be flying the CSM in when they were 50 years old. He then pointed at Trebor (who is 53).

CCP Xhagen described the recent updates to the White Paper, most importantly, the removal of the concept of alternates.

Trebor expressed his desire for changes in the way the CSM is elected and operates. In his opinion, both the role of the CSM and the required skillset of effective CSM members has changed over the last few years, and the political environment of the elections has also significantly evolved.

Seleene listed a number of topics CSM members had raised during summit prep (CSM made extensive use of EtherPad for this note-taking): voting systems, election of officers, summit changes, required duties and the future of the Assembly Hall.

CCP Diagoras asked if CSM had done similar prep for all the meetings. Short answer: "yes".

Trebor trolled CCP Diagoras: Just because he does not see the CSM working doesn't mean they aren't actually working. And come to think of it, CSM never sees him working...

Election Reform: Seleene mocked the "like" system. CCP Xhagen characterized it as "easily exploitable". Trebor asked CCP Xhagen if he remembered what advice CSM gave him about this before the elections. Seleene noted however that the number of candidates significantly declined vs. the CSM 6 election. Two step questioned if this was relevant: only two people didn't get enough likes.

CCP Xhagen noted that a side-effect was that you had to go to the effort of putting up a forum thread.

Two step stated that unless the voting system was changed to reduce the number of wasted votes (undervotes), the best alternative was something that would reduce the number of candidates. He suggested a primary system might be worth looking at.

CCP Diagoras suggested selecting candidates in the same way Alliance Tournament teams are chosen -- out of a hat.

Two step noted that CSM 7 has a broad representational base -- just about every play style in the game is represented. He believes this is really good, and doing something to ensure broad representation is important. He further believes that if a single organized group is able to "get 3 members into the top 7" that would be bad for the CSM in general, because having 3 voices saying basically the same thing isn't helpful.

Seleene believes that "we got lucky this time" and that the elections delivered a very diverse CSM, but it was clear that people were learning how to game the system, and some people would be spending the next year trying to figure out how to maximize their results. He also brought up a side issue -- whether or not candidates could run without divulging their real-life identity. He is of the

opinion that you run as "you, not your character", but that this doesn't always happen -- people vote for the character (as a member of their bloc), not for the person.

CCP Xhagen noted that CCP feels that they cannot guarantee anonymity; they cannot protect your identity when they are flying people to Iceland. In response to a question, he noted that some people do not run for CSM because they don't want their real-life identity associated with their in-game character.

UAxDEATH and Seleene said they understood that CCP could not guarantee anonymity but that nobody was asking for that guarantee. CCP Xhagen replied that people will ask for that. Trebor noted that it would create the potential for legal liability.

CCP Xhagen agreed, and also noted that running under real names filters out a lot of "dicks on the internet".

UAxDEATH pointed out there was a downside; for example, because his real-life name was known, The Mittani and his wife were subjected to real-life harassment in the aftermath of Fanfest.

CCP Xhagen agreed, but pointed out this was not the first time this had happened.

Seleene noted that this question keeps coming up, and asked what answer should we give to the community? Do we say, "HTFU, don't run for CSM unless you're prepared to be exposed to the world"?

CCP Xhagen: Yes.

Seleene: So that's literally the answer?

CCP Xhagen: Yes.

Trebor: If you are running, you are asking people to trust you, and saying you are going to represent them. So you ought to be responsible for your actions, and shouldn't be able to hide behind anonymity. If you want to take this job, you ought to HTFU and have it reflect on you in real-life.

Two step had some concerns, pointing out that one candidate in the recent elections apparently held some extreme political views in real-life, and it was determined by the forum moderators that discussion of these views was not permitted. "We're running as real people, yet our real-life views don't enter into it?" What if someone looks one of us up and says, for example, "he works for the Department of Defense and they kill babies" -- where do you draw the line?

Trebor pointed out that when you're running for office in the real world, these things are fair game. CCP has to put some limits on what can be discussed on their forums for legal reasons and because

the rules on free speech vary around the world, but you can still take your concerns about a candidate to a forum that CCP does not control.

Two step questioned whether CCP really does have a legal liability, and stated that he thinks CCP has to clearly define where the line between appropriate and inappropriate speech is.

Alek asked via Lync that given the possible fallout (i.e.: what happened to The Mittani) would CCP be willing to provide any protection to CSM candidates (admittedly, it would not be that much)?

Two step: What happens if I start getting death-threats?

CCP Xhagen: Contact your local police.

Two step: But by publishing my real name, you're enabling that.

Trebor: Anyone who really wants to find out WTF you are will find out WTF you are.

UAXDEATH: But this makes it very easy.

Two step expressed that he can't see the benefit of disclosure, except to CCP. However, he noted that if someone ran for CSM under two different characters, CCP should disclose this fact.

Trebor: That would just get lost in the noise, unless you had a rule that you always had to run under the same character. And then you'd have two groups -- those who had previous run, whose identities were known, and the new anonymous folks. So people would be free to savage us.

Two step: Just because we're vulnerable doesn't mean future people should be. I don't see any benefit for CCP to reveal our real names -- you need to know them, but not disclose them. "They're not voting for Josh Goldshlag, they're voting for Two step"

Seleene: That is one thing I do agree with -- people vote for the character, not the person. Can CCP not reveal candidate names with the disclaimer that they are not responsible if the name gets out?

Greene Lee: You are the data, the character. There are billions of Vasilievs, so why not disclose?

CCP Xhagen expressed concerns about accountability. "How do you ensure that you behave like civilized people?"

Two step: Do you think having my real name...?

CCP Xhagen: Yes

Elise: Definitely, if you do something crazy and outlandish, you know it's going to be reflected on your person. I'm not worried about anyone here, but in the future, if there total or partial anonymity...

Seleene: Interesting point.

CCP Xhagen : I decided upon this specifically because of accountability and social awareness -- if you do something stupid, your real life name is associated to the character, and you get a reputation in real life...

Two step: But part of that is your Icelandic point of view, Pétur. If I had a generic-sounding name... but there really is only one Josh Goldslag, because of the unique spelling of my last name. But with more common names, you could have 10 John Smiths, even if you publish the city they live in. So there are different risks depending on how common their names are. Are you really that concerned that someone will come here and do something stupid?

CCP Diagoras: Do you want the EVE community to think that it wouldn't happen?

CCP Xhagen also pointed out that CCP did a video statement with Arnar and Alex last summer.

Two step replied that that wasn't a statement by Arnar and Alex, but by Arnar and The Mittani.

CCP Xhagen: We couldn't have made that statement without revealing his name.

Two step: It's perfectly reasonable to say that if you run for CSM, your likeness may end up on things.

CCP Xhagen: And that equals "we will be publishing your name".

Two step: Not really, if someone saw my picture they wouldn't necessarily associate it with my identity.

Trebor: If you have a good picture, you can do a similarity search...

Two step: I'm just saying, don't make it easy.

CCP Xhagen: The answer to "why are we using real-life names" is "practical matters". We are playing on human nature, creating accountability, and we can't guarantee you will remain anonymous when you run for CSM, therefore it's just easier -- the simple solution to all this is, "we will just publish your real-life name". If that reduces the number of candidates, then we are willing to pay that price. It also means that if someone starts to threaten you, you have a certain safety-net with the authorities because they are threatening you as a real person, not as an EVE character.

Two step pointed out that it does potentially reduce the diversity of the CSM, and also reduce the likelihood of getting the real assholes. Maybe that latter is a good thing, but it isn't accurately representing the community.

Seleene noted that anonymity does allow people to go the extra mile and be total dicks, so he had to agree with Trebor. Being on CSM requires a certain amount of responsibility and boldness, and if you're not willing to put yourself out there, maybe you shouldn't run.

CCP Xhagen commented that this discussion had replayed the arguments he went through when deciding this in the first place. "We might not get the best people but we gain more than we lose."

Alek (via Lync): Would you provide real names for characters who make threats?

CCP Xhagen: Not to you, but we can reveal that information to the police.

Seleene exercised his chairmanly powers, declared the topic beaten to death, and moved the discussion on to the Required Duties of CSM members.

CCP Xhagen: Duties and Responsibilities... Why do some people spend all a lot of time and effort getting elected and then do nothing?

Two step: But how do we enforce participation, especially now that we no longer have weekly meetings and required attendance?

CCP Xhagen: That's up to the CSM. If the chairman wants to have frequent meetings, he can just call them. You have to work under the rules you set up, I don't, so I can't come in and say "do this, do that, and if you don't I'll kick you out". CSM6 worked well because Alex's way of doing things was a good fit for that group, but maybe that doesn't work for you guys.

Two step: The concern I have is about people who are inactive yet still reap the benefits of being on CSM. If I don't show up, post on the forums, participate on Skype, why should I get a year of free game time and maybe go to Iceland?

CCP Xhagen: There is a clause in the white paper that says CSM can set up conditions and if a member does not show up for several meetings, he can be kicked.

Two step: But we don't have those meetings anymore, so is there a method by which we can define a certain minimum activity level? But who decides if you are meeting that, and how do we decide that in a fair way?

CCP Xhagen: Hold meetings every other week...

CCP Diagoras: I am sure we would appreciate some suggestions about criteria we could use to determine what is activity and what isn't.

Two step: That's why I put down (in CSM's pre-summit briefing document) "Have everyone write up a summit session for the minutes, and if you don't do minutes, you can't go to Iceland".

CCP Xhagen: To be fair...

Seleene: That's horseshit, and I know you're talking about me...

Two step: No no no... I'm not targeting anyone.

CCP Xhagen: Let me interrupt. I expect the meeting minutes to be of a certain standard and quality. It's been my experience in the past that some CSM members will write up first drafts but it's more work to make those drafts coherent and understandable than it would be to just do it from scratch. So while I welcome the help (CCP Xhagen does many of the first drafts) I am not enforcing such a requirement because some of the CSM guys do a shitty job and I have to do twice as much work.

UAXDEATH: For example, English is not my first language, so for me writing something in English is very hard.

CCP Xhagen: But looking something over, proofreading and making sure it's correct, that's something that I can't do myself. But writing stuff up like I want it to be, well I'm going to be draconian and say I want shit to be right.

Two step: I thought of the minutes as a place where we could have required work...

CCP Xhagen: I understand, but they are not the correct venue. But like I said, you have the tool in the White Paper where you can set up conditions where if a guy doesn't show up to two meetings in a row, he can be removed from the CSM.

Two step: It seems silly to call a meeting every two weeks on Skype just to eliminate inactive people.

Trebor: People will just show up for the meetings. This is a problem you can't solve; once you're elected to the CSM, you're expected to do the work, and if you don't, there's really nothing anyone can do.

Two step: Well, there are some things we can do. For example, in the minutes, many people have requested we have much more of "this person said this".

[Your humble transcriptionist, Trebor, pauses here for a moment of self-referential irony]

Two step: At least for people who come to the summit, you'll be able to say "Hey, this guy went to Iceland and did nothing but sit in the corner. Maybe he's not worth re-electing." This would be a change many people would appreciate, it's by far the #1 request about the minutes.

Trebor: Well that's something we've already agreed (in pre-summit discussions) to fix and now (points to the nifty Lync panoramic camera) we have the tool to do it.

Seleene: The question is, how do you do that without literally doing a transcript.

[Further self-referential irony pauses will not be noted, since they become quite frequent during this section of the minutes]

Two step: If it were up to me, I'd hire a court stenographer, and then X out the stuff that's NDA, and then you'd have your minutes.

CCP Xhagen: That would be horrible reading material.

Trebor: It can be edited down. Quite frankly, if I had a full transcript, I could pretty easily edit it down (for clarity).

Two step: And we could have a summary. I think there are some people who are interested enough in the process that they want to know "did this person say this thing". There was a big controversy between me and Stephan (Meissa Anunthiel) because I said he said something about the wormhole stabilizer stuff and he said he didn't. And I in fact went back to the video and he did say it, but without an actual transcript you can't say "yes you did say this", and there is no accountability.

CCP Xhagen: Well, you could have just gone to the video.

Two step: Well, I did... but all I could do is say to him "hey I looked, and you said it", but I can't necessarily say that to the public because of the NDA. But if there was a transcript plus a summary.

CCP Xhagen: Well... the video is NDA, but if the transcript is edited then...

Two step: I think you guys should have a full transcript, and then...

CCP Xhagen: (Head in hands) We are getting buried in the details... we want more accountability...

Two step: To demonstrate the difference of opinion. Say we're talking about Titans, and five different people have five different opinions because we're EVE players, but people want to know which people had which opinion. They should know that "Mark (Seleene) always says that Titans should have a remote doomsday". He wants that and people should know that he expressed that.

Trebor: A suggestion. Why don't we take this first session and get a full transcript made of it, and see how much work it is to edit that down to a more concise transcript that still covers the meat of the meeting, and then see if that is useful for sticking in the minutes or needs to be further condensed. If we could do that for this one meeting, and get that process started -- get that job farmed out -- this week, then that transcript would be available for us to edit a day or two after we got home, and we would very quickly be able to tell whether or not it would be worth doing for the other meetings. This would seem to be a really cheap experiment. We'd be able to see how fast it could get done, how useful it was, whether it was easier to edit that down, and whether it was significantly better than us doing a more detailed transcription directly. This might be a good thing to test.

Two step: I've heard medical transcription (for example) is really cheap.

Trebor: Well, not as cheap as you might think. A good transcriptionist can make some serious coin.

Two step: Is there anyone in Iceland who can do this?

Trebor: It would have to be someone who can be under NDA. They'd have to be hired by CCP to do it. It would seem to be a reasonable test, and if it doesn't work, it doesn't work and we can try something else. But it wouldn't affect getting the minutes out this time, and if it works, and in particular if it significantly reduces the workload of getting out expanded minutes, then it's a huge win.

CCP Xhagen: Yeah, okay, I'm willing to do it.

[This experiment was tried. The resulting transcript was not considered useful, because the transcriber did not have the background to properly understand what was being said, so there were lots of mistakes. It was decided that transcriptions should be done by the participants]

Two step: There's definitely a lot of people who complain that "I elect someone, but I don't know if they did a good job at the summit."

Seleene: I agree with what Robert (Trebor) is saying, but there's an element of personal responsibility as well. If you're not communicating to your constituents or talking to the playerbase at large, using social media or whatever, then those questions are going to come up anyway. If you get elected and drop off the face of the earth, you never talk to anyone, you never explain anything, you never answer questions, you don't respond to EVE mails, you don't get on the forums, people are going to raise questions about you. As far as the minutes go, this is something everyone has said they wanted and that's fine, but there are other ways you can communicate.

Two step: Yes, but you can say one thing on those media and say something else at the summit, and then there's the concern about NDA...

Seleene: As long as you're honest, you're fine...

Two step: Of course, and we haven't had a problem yet, but what's keeping me honest about that stuff? What's stopping me from saying "I was the one who did all the talking during the ship-balancing session, it was all me", and when people call me on it I say "they're all full of shit, they're lying".

Seleene: I understand that you're upset because there was a particular case that involved you.

Two step: That's not why I'm upset about this...

Seleene: Yeah you are, a little bit, and I'm agreeing with you about all this stuff. All I'm saying is that your accountability isn't just the minutes. The question was, how do we let players know we are doing things.

CCP Diagoras: If a CSM member claimed credit for something at the summit and the NDA precluded another CSM from disputing that, there's nothing precluding CCP from stepping in and clarifying the facts.

Trebor: Because they decide what's NDA. Josh (Two step), quite frankly, you've won, now accept victory gracefully.

Two step: I'm just saying there's a lot of value in that stuff.

CCP Xhagen: I've always considered the CSM to be an entity, the people can be changed out but the CSM continues...

Trebor: We're like cells, we can die...

CCP Xhagen: ...but the body goes on. There was a discussion in CSM 3 about giving credit to that CSM for something they did, but I'm a socialist about that and just don't understand that thinking. CSM did something and at that point you were part of CSM so why not be proud of that? But if you want to associate certain statements to certain persons then I don't have any problems with that.

Trebor: I don't think anyone does (have problems). It was always a matter of manpower; if we can deal with that, and I think we've gotten some ideas on addressing that, then that's fine.

Two step: Another advantage of straight transcripts is that there's no modification needed on your part. It might take longer (to do) but there's no interpretation.

Trebor: If you have a full transcript then the amount of editing to get it to a NDA transcript is relatively minor. It's grammar, spelling and a few NDA things. There will I think be a requirement to do a more concise "minutes" version; most people will want to read that, and the people who are

really interested may want to look at a particular transcript. So if we do get full transcripts made, it will make it easier to produce those condensed minutes with a greater level of detail than in the past, but we'll still have the full ad-nauseum version.

CCP Xhagen: It's just that direct transcripts are horrible. It's because there's a conversation going on and then you jump back and then you go forward.

Seleene: Yeah, it's like in the old days when the CSM had bi-weekly meetings in chat. I would read those things and for the life of me, half the time I would walk away feeling completely dumb. At least the current meeting minutes are a summary of what was discussed. That part we need to keep, but if there is some way to get visibility on who said things, then that's what we're looking for, as kind of a middle ground.

Trebor: We're still going to need a full transcript as source material.

CCP Xhagen: I'll ask the girls in reception to research who can do a transcript.

Alek: (via Lync) Pétur, you playa.

Greene Lee: In Russia, when someone gives a speech, you need 3 people to translate it, because one of them will forget the "no" at the start of the sentence. Accuracy is a problem.

Two step: We can check that.

Trebor: We have the recording so once the transcripts come back, we can farm them out and each of us can check some.

CCP Xhagen: Like I said, I'm ready to run the experiment and I think we've got a good base. When I think about it, identifying persons doesn't add that much time to writing up a summarized minutes, but sometimes people are talking and an idea is born and it doesn't really catch where it comes from -- it just comes.

Trebor: The perfect is the enemy of the good. Let's make it better and leave it to CSM 9 to make it perfect.

CCP Xhagen: CSM 9? Surely you mean CSM 8...

UAXDEATH: He still thinks he is going to be in CSM 8 and he will leave this to CSM 9

(laughter)

Seleene: Going back to something you (CCP Xhagen) said earlier, you don't want CSM to have hard-coded draconian rules, when it comes to something like what we were talking about earlier -- we've

got this troublemaker, or someone who just doesn't do anything -- what if we came to you and said "we had a meeting, we all think this person is useless and making us look bad, and we voted unanimously that we don't want this person on the CSM." Can we do something like that? Should we do something like that? What are the ramifications? Right now, we're supposed to be 14 members, what happens if we become 12 or 11? How would that be handled?

CCP Xhagen: Regarding that, I decided (when The Mittani resigned) not to bring in a 14th member because in the past we didn't replace alternates if a full member dropped off. So the CSM would get smaller when that happened.

Trebor: I think that's the way you should do it.

Two step: I'm not sure I agree. Given that more voices is good, and especially since we've cut down the number of people coming to Iceland, having more people available, especially representing niche playstyles, is important. If we didn't have a FW or WH guy, and that guy was sitting at #15, and some random guy resigns, then not taking that voice is doing a disservice. If it's two weeks before the end of the term, why bother, but...

CCP Xhagen: There's nothing stopping you, a CSM guy, from going to talk to a player.

Two step: That's true, and people like Hans (Jagerblitzen) did that effectively in CSM 6, but at the same time it was difficult -- we got that big thing about Factional Warfare about a month before the term ended, and I was talking to Hans about election stuff anyway and I could ask him "What are your feelings about FW?" but I couldn't say "What are your feelings about FW because we just got this giant list of changes and I'd like your feedback". Ideally, I'd like to be able to show people stuff - "Hey look, they just proposed this mechanic, is that a good idea?" -- because we don't necessarily know.

CCP Xhagen: You have to work it out, and get the feedback you need without...

Two step: But then why not bring someone in?

Trebor: The problem is, when you get to position 15 or 16 out of a field of 20-some, how likely is it that that person is going to add a viewpoint that is not already represented? It's one thing if someone gets elected and (immediately) says I can't do it, or as in Alex's case, resigns before the term starts. I think there's a reasonable case in that situation for saying, well, "He died before taking office".

Two step: Well, if someone resigns 2 weeks in, given that these terms are a yearlong, it seems silly to deprive us of an extra person for 11 months or something, or even for 3 months. Why not bring the extra person in, what's the downside?

Seleene: He (Trebor) just answered that.

Trebor: I'm saying there's not much of an upside. You have a valid point...

CCP Xhagen: ...but in the past, when a CSM member left for any reason, we didn't bring a new person in. 14 person got in, 9 mains and 5 alternates, and if a main dropped, we promoted an alternate and went on with 9 mains and 4 alternates.

Two step: And I think that makes sense if you think of people as alternates. If you think of it as "there are 9 people on the CSM, and we have some extras" that makes sense, but if you're in a new world where all 14 are productive, useful people, then it doesn't make sense to me to say "now you are 13, just because". I don't see a reason not to bring in the 15th or 16th person... you can just say they won't be of a certain quality. They could be the best person but terrible at campaigning.

CCP Xhagen: Well, in the last few years we haven't really made much of a differentiation between main and alternates, it was just a name thing.

Two step: If you go back and look at the way alternates were treated, sometimes they were treated as full members and sometimes it was "we don't need to talk to you"

CCP Xhagen: That pretty much ended in CSM 5.

Seleene: The ones that were useful were treated right.

Trebor: CSM 5 made an effort to treat them as full members.

Seleene: Everyone's under the NDA and has access to the forums, so people are going to talk to other useful people regardless of "rank". I understand where Josh (Two step) is coming from, but...

CCP Xhagen: I do too, but we have a precedent about how to handle things.

Trebor: The one thing that is concerning about what Josh (Two step) wants is that it opens the door to bullshit political maneuvering, where it's like "we really want to get this #15 guy on, so who can we fuck over?"

Seleene: And this goes back to my original question... lets say the Goons or someone games the system and they get 3 or 4 into the top 7, and then they say "let's just get rid of the #5 or #6 guy and we'll have one more guy going to Iceland".

Trebor: I do not feel that the power to kick someone off the CSM should be in the hands of the CSM. It should be in the hands of CCP.

Seleene: We could express our desires to CCP, but where's the ultimate authority?

Two step: We could perhaps vote to impeach someone and then CCP passes judgment.

CCP Xhagen: Like I said, there's that provision in the white paper about attendance.

Seleene: But we don't have meetings so what do we do?

CCP Diagoras: Have an equivalent of a meeting.

Two step: That's what I was searching for. What are the required duties of a CSM? Maybe posting on the forums, being on Skype, being a productive person?

CCP Xhagen: That assumes CCP should create the duties.

Two step: I'm not saying that. I'm saying they should be baked into the CSM responsibilities.

Seleene: The way that we operate has changed so drastically in the last year or two.

Two step: For example, if you made the fireside chats a required duty -- that the CSM must communicate with the players once every two months -- that could be something where you don't show up for two of those, you're booted.

Greene Lee: How do you control that? If The Mittani wants to communicate with his electorate, he just posts in Goonfleet's forums.

Two step: What I'm saying is add a requirement that CSMs talk to the general playerbase is a reasonable thing.

CCP Xhagen : My question to you is, why not hold a CSM meeting every 3 weeks or something? I don't see it as an unreasonable thing.

Two step: What would we talk about?

CCP Xhagen: You would formalize the idle chat (in Skype) every 3 weeks and publish CSM meeting minutes.

UAXDEATH: I agree, it's supposed to be up to us as the CSM if we want to do this every week or every month, and CCP shouldn't be telling us "you have to do this!"

CCP Xhagen: You're killing two birds with one stone -- you're (1) holding meetings that people have to show up for, and if they don't you have a criteria in the white paper that will ultimately lead to them being booted, and (2) you're increasing communications with the players by publishing CSM internal meeting minutes.

Trebor: Part of the problem with those kinds of meetings is that there's always going to be a couple of people who are going to be dreadfully inconvenienced because of their timezone. This will particularly be the case when we get people from the Japanese community on the CSM, which I am pretty sure will happen next year. Quite frankly, I think we're wasting a lot of time in this meeting discussing an issue that may not have a good solution, so perhaps we should defer this to a later date. With respect to bringing the 15th guy on if someone drops, I have no problem with it as long as it can't be gamed for bogus reasons. Finally, part of the problem with setting up "rules" like (attendance requirements) is that they'll either be inconvenient for the good people or they'll get gamed. Perhaps we can reflect upon it and come up with a better solution, because I understand and appreciate what you're trying to do -- you feel that being on CSM incurs some responsibilities, and I agree with that. The problem is coming up with something that isn't onerous to the responsible people.

Two step: Yeah, that's why it's a difficult thing. Actually responsible people, if we had the town hall things, they'd show up, right? So making that sort of stuff more formalized sounds reasonable to me. Sure, we'll all miss one here and there because of real life, but...

Seleene: The only people who missed the first one we did were those who literally could not make it. We had like 9 people there.

Elise: And Joe (Darius III) (Note: Darius III attended the town hall, but as a member of the audience, asking questions)

Two step: I think it's clear that in this term, he's the only one who doesn't belong.

CCP Xhagen: He does belong, because he got elected.

Two step: Well, that's one thing I want to ask about. CCP already banned scams where people were induced to buy PLEXes or whatever; I don't think you should be able to scam for votes. Period.

Seleene: You know what, I mean, I love where you're coming from on a lot of this, but there's just no way you can enforce something like that.

CCP Diagoras: As an example, take Alex (The Mittani) in the last election. What if a bunch of Goons scammed votes on his behalf? Under your rules, would we ban Alex?

Two step: No... The person who scams.

Seleene: If we're going to get into ethics, why was Alex allowed to remain chairman last term. He was running around telling people "I'm the CSM Chairman, you can trust me, I've got a supercap to sell you"

Two step: He wasn't doing...

Seleene: Yes he was. So if you want to get into these rules of conduct issues, let's examine what happened last term.

Two step: I actually think that's a completely separate discussion.

Seleene: I don't. I sat by and watched this stuff go on...

Two step: We could set simple rules about scamming for votes -- it's not allowed. If you scam for votes, for yourself or anyone, you get banned.

CCP Diagoras: The problem is, it's genuinely not easily enforceable.

Two step: Why is it not enforceable?

Trebor: How does CCP know? Define scamming. Then someone petitions and says "I got my vote scammed"?

Two step: Yeah.

Trebor: And if it happens off the EVE server?

Two step: I don't care. If I say something at Fanfest, I can apparently get banned from the game for it, so you guys (at CCP) are clearly extending your reach. You're talking about voting, which is on the CCP website and part of the game process.

CCP Xhagen: I think you're being a little bit unreasonable there, because Fanfest is a CCP-controlled event.

CCP Diagoras: And if it's on the live stream.

Seleene: What about posting on the forums?

Two step: These scams were happening in-game. Darius III was sitting there saying he'd give a PLEX if you voted for him. You could ban that.

CCP Xhagen: Scamming for votes is allowed. Wherever it happens.

Two step: And I don't think it should be.

CCP Xhagen: Then the question arises : if I read about it on FailHeap, is it vote scamming or not?

Two step: Right now, as I understand it (Jester was talking about this a while back) I can't trick someone into buying a PLEX, turning it into ISK, and then scam that ISK.

CCP Diagoras: There was some discussion that Jester had on his blog regarding someone getting someone to spend a lot of PLEX's to outfit a supercarrier...

Two step: ...which they then killed...

CCP Diagoras: ...and they already had plans to do that.

Two step: I believe there's some rule about scamming that costs people real money (via PLEX's). I don't know the details. But you already have rules like "No RMT", which by definition happens out-of-game but you enforce it in-game. Again, I understand that's a big problem for you...

CCP Xhagen: Again, I think you're being a little bit unreasonable by dragging RMT into this discussion.

Two step: No, I'm saying that's an example of a process that happens out-of-game that you enforce in-game.

CCP Xhagen: You being a politician running for office, you can say "I'll do this, this and that if you vote for me".

Elise: Is it a scam if I say "I'm going to do this if elected" and I don't do it? Is that a scam?

CCP Diagoras: Would it be a better solution to allow people to change their vote anytime before the end of the election?

Trebor: Yes, that would solve the scamming problem.

Two step: I thought you guys had some moral objections to that because you could tell who voted for whom.

CCP Diagoras: That's the problem.

Two step: Being able to change your vote is maybe valuable. I would be OK with that, but frankly, I don't think you'd have to do much to just enforce a ban.

CCP Xhagen: If you declare something an exploit, you're forced to enforce it if it's reported.

Two step: I just think that if you declared it an exploit, the number of people who did it would be small.

Seleene: But the number of people who would do everything in their power to convince CCP that this guy was exploiting would go up exponentially! The meta-gaming would go insane.

Trebor: They'll try to get you (Two step) kicked from the election.

CCP Xhagen: My question is, do we want to run an election for the CSM, I mean we want accountability, but do we want to remove the CSM so far from the core of EVE that it becomes nearly unrecognizable as an EVE thing?

Two step: Clearly there's a line, if you're not allowed to scam for votes are you allowed to buy them? There's a lot of questions this raises, but for me, I don't think scamming for votes is reasonable.

Seleene: Well, I don't think CSM members should be going on the forums and spending their time belittling players as a daily ritual. I have a severe issue with that.

Two step: It wasn't every day, what are you talking about?

Seleene: I'm just saying this is another perspective you can use. It's not just scamming, you can also come from another direction. My point is, once you start down that path, where does it end?

Trebor: (To CCP Diagoras) To be honest, you have hit on the correct solution to this and a lot of stuff, which is to allow voters to back off a vote and revote. This can be done and still protect their anonymity with relatively simple cryptography. It's trivial to implement and could even be done manually at the end of the election if there wasn't a huge number of changed votes.

CCP Diagoras: I have no doubt it could be done, but it's more a question of no matter how we do it, we're still recording who voted for who.

Trebor: Actually, you can do it in a way that you can't know who is voting for who, but you can know that this is a valid vote to be retracted and changed; there are cryptographic techniques that will let you do this sort of thing. I'll give you the references if you're interested.

Two step: But in such a situation, I couldn't actually buy votes. I could buy a vote and they could resell them.

Trebor: YES! Just as in the real world.

Kelduum Revaan: And they might not vote for you anyway.

CCP Diagoras: As it stands now, there's no way to verify if someone actually voted for you, they could resell their vote over and over.

UAxDEATH: And there's no proof of a scam. You can say "yes I voted" and he can say "yes I'm going to give you a PLEX". Everybody lies, so what's the point of this argument? You could get a PLEX and then change your vote!

Trebor: (To Two step) I'm sorry, are you telling me you're against scamming legitimate voter-buyers?

(general laughter)

Trebor: I just want you to clarify your position for the minutes.

Two step: I'm saying you're making some stuff harder and some stuff easier.

CCP Xhagen: And I fully realized this problem when I was doing this in the beginning. I took the stance of "let's just allow everything", and when you push the vote button, you have to accept the responsibility that maybe you made a bad decision or fell for a lie. So instead of enforcing rules right and left -- this is allowed and this isn't -- I just said "everything is allowed"

Trebor: Which is very EVE-like.

Elise: Exactly, it's very representative.

Trebor: We don't have much time, so maybe we should go on to the voting system.

CCP Xhagen: My official stance on the voting system is that I don't think we can solve it here and now, but I do think we should commit to starting a thread on the internal forums and get the most basic ideas there, and then take it out to the public.

Seleene: I think we need to commit to more. We can do that in that thread, but I would like to get all of us plus you and John (CCP Diagoras) sitting down in Skype in a couple of weeks...

CCP Xhagen: Yes, of course.

Seleene: We need to have a couple of voice meetings to nail things down.

CCP Xhagen: One other thing I want to make perfectly clear is that I don't want to commit to changing the voting system just to change it. I want to achieve something with the change. So if we can't come to a relatively good conclusion before, say, Christmas, then we should postpone any changes until CSM 8... err, CSM 9. I want to have a good voting system that works, instead of a bad one that reveals a lot of flaws. I want the election to be solid and bullet-proof.

Elise: You don't want change [for the sake of change].

Trebor: You mean bullet-resistant. There's no such thing as bullet-proof.

CCP Xhagen: Like you (Elise) said, I don't want change for change's sake.

Trebor: In that case, I would suggest that for the purposes of this meeting, we discuss what the goals of a good voting system should be.

CCP Xhagen: What did you have (listed in your pre-summit prep materials)?

Two step: "Goal should be a balanced CSM that has representatives from a lot of diverse playstyles, because the point of CSM is to give CCP good advice." I think it would be helpful to understand what CCP's goals for the CSM are. I know that in part it was created to provide accountability to the playerbase after the T20 incident, but I think it would help if you described what your (and CCP's) goals for the CSM are.

CCP Xhagen: I think my goal for the CSM hasn't been fully realized but we are getting awful close. This is what I envisioned: the guys come and talk to you, both on specific features and game mechanics -- "is this fun, does this make sense?" -- and also (giving feedback) on messaging -- "when I phrase it like this, is it more clear if I phrase it like that?" -- and this being done on a casual basis, this is just part of a process a dev goes through when he's doing something. And that was the goal. I have to admit that I'm becoming a little bit of a deadweight for the CSM because the CSM is just where I want it to be. So why would I take it any further?

CCP Xhagen: So that's where I have to be careful, and not let the CSM stagnate at the place where I (originally) envisioned it in 2007. So 5 years later I'm there, but if I just let the CSM stagnate it will die out.

Two step: One of the things that has been frustrating for a lot of us is a couple of things; one is the optionality of communication with the CSM, that if a team chooses not to speak to us, they don't have to, and then we end up seeing a devblog (when it comes out) and say "what the hell is going on?" Another really difficult thing sometimes is not having the visibility into what's going on; for example, we don't have a list of the teams within CCP and what they're doing. Those two things are the most frustrating for me, and I think that the expectation from the playerbase is that we have input into the decision-making process and the reality is that we only have what people choose to give us, and often-times it's too late or not listened to. That's fine, I expect that, but people (in the community) don't know that.

CCP Xhagen: There is a certain organizational change within CCP that I'm trying to get through that would bring the CSM a little bit... nothing has been finalized yet, but I'm trying to get the CSM into the community group organizationally, and they publish devblogs and get devs to write stuff. Devs don't have to communicate about what they're doing unless they choose to. I want to change that. Changing that and plugging CSM into the part of the company that handles communications with the community would be a step towards bringing the CSM into the loop in a seamless manner. As for the list of teams...

Two step: Especially for the new people, it was very interesting to have to sit down and say, "Hey, there's this Team Superfriends, they're working on this, and Team That is working on that... wait a minute, what are all the other teams doing?" And honestly, I can't tell you, I don't know. I don't even know the names of all the teams.

Seleene: You don't NEED to know that.

Two step: I think that in order to be an effective influence... I mean, some of that depends on what the role of the CSM is. If our role is to respond when asked, then we don't need to know that stuff. But if the role is to be more proactive and say "Hey, I think you're going in the wrong direction with this Incarna stuff", then we need to know what's going on.

Greene Lee: Do you have some sort of roadmap? We don't need to know about the teams working on (infrastructure like) Carbon, but we do need to know about the teams working on stuff that directly affects the universe.

CCP Xhagen: There is a future...

Seleene: We're going to be talking to Jon Lander (CCP Unifex, the Senior Producer of EVE) about this specifically later, and we can get into that with him.

CCP Xhagen: The CSM is a volunteer group, and what happens when CCP asks for feedback and you don't deliver any?

Two step: Has that ever happened?

CCP Xhagen: No, but...

(giggles from various CSMs)

CCP Xhagen: ...but it could. And I have to operate on the premise that you are not paid employees, and I can't make you responsible in the same manner I can make John (CCP Diagoras) responsible.

CCP Xhagen: So I cannot make the CSM an integral part of some processes in CCP knowing that I cannot enforce anything if push comes to shove. And this is just a brutal and practical fact. From an organizational and business standpoint, this is just truth.

Two step: I don't deny that.

CCP Xhagen: I'm trying my best to dance around it.

Two step: I guess the thing that bothers me is that there's a perception by some people in CCP that we're trying to become a required step in some sort of development or blog-posting process, and

really what I'd like us to be is observers of these steps. If we could know -- I asked recently about getting access to the (Agile development) stories people were working on -- if we had that information, at least we could make our own reasoned... "hey, what are they doing?" But we don't want to approve things; when I talked about CSM seeing devblogs before they went out, we didn't want to approve them, we didn't want veto power...

Trebor: We wanted to be able to raise red-flags and say "Gee guys, if you say that in that way, the response will be this..."

Two step: We wanted to stop "\$1000 Jeans" (a reference to a virtual goods devblog)

Seleene: There's a huge difference between getting access to the user stories and getting a look at a devblog.

CCP Diagoras: I can't see full backlog (user stories) access being...

Seleene: And honestly, if you want to make this argument, it's best made when Jon Lander is in the room.

Two step: OK...

Seleene: Since we have only 10 minutes left, there's this thing that has come up many times, how the community interacts with the CSM in the Assembly Hall. The Assembly Hall is a pile of shit; no-one's using it, no-one's paying attention to it, and anything in there just gets lost. Jita Park seems to be where most people go to get any sort of solid information, but the concern is that if you take the AH away, JP will just turn into shit.

Two step: Is there a reason, for example, why... I mean, if you have ideas for features, there's a Features & Ideas forum that seems like the logical place to put ideas about features.

CCP Diagoras: We can handle this by just making rules about it. I just think it's clear that ideas for features aren't...

Two step: I just don't see the value; if the AH was deleted, and people posted in F&I, the theory is that CSM is supposed to be monitoring that.

CCP Diagoras: And to get the CSM involved and looking at the thread, the thread has to have contact information.

Two step: The other thing that came up during the elections that I thought was interesting was make it so players could send an EVE mail to the CSM. I understand that means development work but that would be extremely helpful. I've gotten several EVE mails recently that were sent to a mix of CSM 6 and 7 members -- they put random people they think are on CSM in the address line. So

being able to easily communicate with the CSM... I'm perfectly fine with the protocol being post to F&I, if you get a certain number of likes, send us an EVE mail. If it's easy to do that, it streamlines things quite a bit.

Seleene: As part of CSM, I can open up my email client and send an email to CSM 7 (a CCP-hosted mailing list). If players could do that too, that would be very cool.

CCP Xhagen: Are you sure?

(laughter)

Two step: We already get the mail. And I think one thing is that a lot of the mails are just to the top 2 people. There's a lot of mails to me and Mark, a lot to me and Trebor...

Seleene: They're probably picking the wrong people sometimes, I mean if I get mails and have to forward them... "this seems more like your thing", in general it would be a good idea. This is what we're signing up for, so why not?

CCP Xhagen: I will make it so.

Seleene: So this is going to happen in a week or two, right?

Two step: The last thing on our list is officers. Do we need them? Is there a point having a secretary?

CCP Xhagen: Yes.

Two step: What does the secretary do? If you're going to write the minutes, what does the secretary do?

CCP Xhagen: I've voiced the idea of the secretary publishing once a month a list of the things the CSM has been discussing amongst themselves.

Seleene: How is that different from what I've been doing on the blog?

CCP Xhagen: The secretary also has to maintain the Evelopedia page.

Seleene: Well if it was being updated, and we could say "hey everybody, click on this link" then it would be something.

Two step: (who is the current Secretary) Seems more like a task for the Vice-Secretary (Hans Jagerblitzen) to me.

(laughter and mockery)

CCP Xhagen: So you want something to do, but you don't want to do it? I see...

(more laughter)

Two step: No, seriously...

Trebor: We need to make sure this point gets prominently explained in the minutes.

Seleene: Like I said, there's many ways you can do things. Before we came to the summit, I put the information out everywhere I could. So what does the Secretary do? Talk about what we're doing?

CCP Xhagen: And accurately report it.

UAxDEATH: Guess what, Josh...

CCP Xhagen: I will remind everyone that they did want their statements to be personally attributed in the minutes.

(more laughter)

CCP Xhagen: So do what you're supposed to do on the CSM.

Seleene: So what are you asking? I don't know if you're trolling or serious now...

Two step: I'm asking...

CCP Xhagen: The answer to the greater question of "do we need officers" is "yes", because I want to be able to assign responsibility when I need something done. I as the CSM project manager. So when the CSM is in disarray, I go to Mark and say "You are the Chairman, go fix it". And if he says no, I go to the Vice-Chairman.

Two step: The interesting thing about Vice-Chairman is that according to the white paper, they are only Chairman for a week until we call a meeting and elect a new Chair. Things like that don't seem like they have a lot of value.

CCP Xhagen: Vice-Chair is a just an alternate for the Chair, if the Chair cannot make it to a meeting, he takes over.

Two step: We don't have meetings...

Trebor: (the current Vice-Chairman) The position of Vice-Chairman, like the position of Vice-President, is in the immortal words of FDR's VP, John Nance Garner, "not worth a bucket of warm piss".

CCP Xhagen: These positions are for me to assign responsibility.

Two step: That's fine...

CCP Xhagen: So I can say to people, "you go and do shit".

Two step: So I would ask that we update the White Paper with the expected responsibilities for those positions.

UAxDEATH: The responsibility is to do certain shit.

CCP Xhagen: The responsibilities have been kept vague and open-ended. Like I said, if I clearly define them, I'm restricting them as well. So if the Secretary wants to put on a play with the rest of the CSM as actors, I don't want to restrict that, it might be entertaining.

Two step: So the Vice-Secretary has to put on a play? I believe that's what I just heard. Someone tell Hans.

CCP Xhagen: So I don't want to let my lack of imagination restrict what you can and cannot do.

Two step: Well, it's not like we're not going to put on a play because there's no "Director of Playmaking" position.

CCP Xhagen: Then appoint yourself as Director of Playmaking and make a play. That's my point. If you get a good idea, I don't want the rules of the CSM to restrict what you can do.

Seleene: Honestly, as Robert (Trebor) said, the two most important positions on the CSM are Chairman and Secretary, and those two positions should be the focal point for communications with the players, organization within the CSM, planning and so on. At best, we're player liaisons, that's our job, to be the voice of the people. So whatever information we do have that we can share should be flowing through one of those two positions as much as possible.

Trebor: You (Seleene) are the official organizer as Chairman. You're in charge of running the official business of the CSM. You (Two step) are the official communicator as the Secretary, you are in charge of making sure the minutes get out, and other official communications.

Two step: But Pétur (CCP Xhagen) is saying he's going to be in charge of the minutes.

Seleene: The minutes are a twice-a-year thing. We've got a lot more stuff...

Two step: I don't disagree.

Seleene: Well Josh, it's not that hard. We've got people going on podcasts, doing interviews, writing blogs, twitter feeds... how hard is it do to a biweekly or monthly roundup? That's what I've been

trying to capture, trying to do, and it's kinda self-explanatory. I mean, do all the stuff you do when you're trying to get elected! Talk about what you're doing, what we're doing, about who's not doing anything... whatever.

Two step: That's fine, I'm just asking for clarity from CCP as to what (their) expectations are. If CCP is going to lay out any responsibilities in the white paper, they ought to be kept up to date.

Elise: CCP Xhagen is saying he just doesn't want to limit you.

Seleene: It's more like this is something we need to do internally.

CCP Xhagen: Yes.

Trebor: If you want to do something, just ask the rest of the CSM and Pétur if it's cool. When I was publishing the list of topics discussed on the internal forums (on the wiki), all I would do was make that list, do what I thought was appropriate anonymization, fire it off to Pétur for an approval, and he'd always get back with "no problem" and boom, it was on the wiki. Any initiative you want to do you are welcome to do.

Two step: Well, that's not what I'm asking, but that's fine.

Seleene: Then what are you asking?

Two step: Well the discussion on the Titanpad (CSM preparation documents) was "do we need these roles?"

Trebor: I think we do.

Two step: And are they the right roles? And the right names for the roles?

Seleene: I will say that a couple of months ago, I was of the opinion that we could probably eliminate some of them.

Two step: You were the one who wanted to eliminate Chairman...

Seleene: ...yes, I was...

Two step: ...but then you got elected Chairman, and no longer wanted to eliminate it.

Seleene: Do you honestly think that this herd of cats would operate without someone at least trying to say "we're going to have a meeting at this time?" or something like that?

Two step: Yes.

Seleene: You do, really?

Two step: Well...

CCP Xhagen: I have to disagree with you, Josh (Two step). You have to either claim responsibility or have me assign responsibility.

Two step: Well, the thing we really wanted to talk about with regard to Chairman is whether it should go to the top vote-getter.

Seleene: Which (the fact that it does) I totally disagree with.

CCP Xhagen: But again, that automatically assigns authority and responsibility.

Two step: But should it do that? Should it go to a vote?

Trebor: The CSM should elect its own chairman.

CCP Xhagen: My opinion is that the automatic election of chairman is to break potential stalemates if the CSM cannot elect a new chairman.

Trebor: Tie-breaking vote goes to the top vote-getter.

Two step: We are an even number of people, so yeah.

Elise: We got a look at it this year, we got to vote in our own chairman, and it seemed to work much better than just an arbitrary "guy who got the most votes"

CCP Xhagen: Yeah, I know, but just assigning...

Seleene: If you look at the CSM historically, the top vote-getter isn't necessarily the best chairman.

Trebor: This folds into the voting system, and a lot of other things, so I think we should discuss it in the internal forums and then get that discussion going in the public forums as soon as possible.

Alek: (via Lync) Gotta say, voting for chair will greatly improve outcomes for CCP

Two step: Something like chairman is not well understood by the public, so while there should be public buy-in (into the process) I'm not sure if the public understands what that means.

UAXDEATH: Well, this Chairman issue is way more simple than reforms to the voting system. It's just simpler to have the elected CSM appoint a Chairman.

Seleene: You (CCP Xhagen) are saying you want the CSM to regulate itself as much as possible, but at the moment CCP says the most popular guy gets it. Put that control in the CSM's hands. I think it has to be someone who's in the top 7 and comes to Iceland, but other than that we should decide who's going to be the organizer, voice, or whatever.

UAxDEATH: And as Josh said, he's scared of people scamming for votes, so the (top vote-getting) Chairman might not be the right person.

Seleene: Just because he scammed 15,000 votes doesn't mean he's the best for the job.

CCP Xhagen: If we could have a clause where if the CSM is unable to reach a decision, I or someone at CCP could step in.

Seleene: The point is well made.

Trebor: If you (CCP Xhagen) want to break ties...

CCP Xhagen: I get the point.

Trebor: Basically it'll go through rounds of elimination until we're down to two people, and if at that point we can't decide, you choose.

Seleene: You should just roll a 20-sided dice.

(laughter)

CCP Diagoras: Or you could say the top vote-getter is chairman unless a 2/3 majority of the CSM supports an alternative candidate.

Trebor: Let's move this discussion to the internal forums.

CCP Xhagen: Noted that what I said earlier (about not wanting to restrict the CSM) contradicts the issue of deciding the Chairmanship, yes. I concede to that.

Trebor: I believe we are agreed that the Chairman should be elected by the CSM, we just have not settled on the particular mechanics at this time.

CCP Xhagen: Yes.

Trebor: And with that in the minutes, I think we can break for coffee and get to our next meeting.

What is a Stakeholder?

Present: CCP Unifex, CCP Xhagen, Alekseyev Karrde (Lync), Hans Jagerblitzen (Lync)

The meeting opened with CCP Unifex (Jon Lander, Senior Producer of EVE) being introduced to the CSM noobs. UAxDEATH imitated a girl, badly.

The CSM expressed some confusion as to exactly what kind of stakeholder they were, and what kind of stakeholder they were supposed to be.

Two step: What is CCP's expectation for us (as stakeholders) in the development process?

CCP Unifex expressed that at the last summit, CCP was in the process of changing a lot of things about their development methods, in particular defining lines of responsibility and that this is an ongoing process as we look at what has gone well and what can be done better.

The Executive Board (Hilmar (CEO), CFO, CMO, CTO, VP HR, VP Engineering, VP Creative etc.) sets the overall goals for the company.

The senior producer for EVE reports to the EB and is responsible for helping to define, and then meet, performance goals set for the product. In the past, these goals have centered on subscriber numbers, but CCP Unifex considers this simplistic.

Under the Senior Producer are a number of segments focused on key parts of the EVE Product, each of which has a segment owner who reports to him. Currently for EVE, there are 5 of these segments, plus Marketing and Research & Statistics.

The senior producer and the segment owners form the product management group and make the final decisions about the product. This includes everything, such as EVE-DUST link, gameplay, web-presence, operations, etc.

More than 200 people are working on EVE right now.

Each segment can have multiple teams, and each team has a product owner, though some teams share a product owner. For example, there are 3 gameplay teams which share a single PO, CCP Soundwave.

CCP Unifex: The important people are at the bottom of an org chart, doing the real work that you see in the game. It gets less important the higher you go up.

CCP Unifex: In addition to the visible things you see (in Inferno) we are also doing a lot of refactoring as part of our project goals.

As direction and product goals flow down the chain of command, they get broken up from business and high level product goals into more detailed product and development sub-goals. At the actual team level, they get developed into release plans and sprint plans (this is standard AGILE development methodology).

CCP Unifex: So the key question for you guys is, where do you fit in?

Seleene: Right there at the very top somewhere... with an arrow pointing to the EB.

(laughter)

Seleene: You asked the question, so let's just start from the top and negotiate our way from there.

CCP Unifex proceeded to discuss what impact the CSM has and where CSM input needs to get acted upon. He pointed out that CSM input can influence people at all levels in the hierarchy.

Greene Lee asked how the front-line developers get their information? From the chain of command?

CCP Unifex: They get feedback and player information From reading the forums... from playing the game and product direction from the product management group, their product owner, the CSM and players. Let me give you a concrete example: the minute I (as senior producer) say "Balance this ship like that", that's insane, because I'm not a game designer, I'm a project manager who runs a business. Those things need to be done by experts in the team, I just point the overall direction and make sure we execute.

While product owners may have experience in (for example) game design, their job is to provide a framework for the actual teams and game designers to work with.

CCP Unifex sets the overall goals. For example, "iterate on existing stuff" and "fix the things that are broken internally". One of the goals for Inferno was "War" (which stimulates harvesting and production in a triangle). The product owners, working with their teams, translate this high-level direction into goals that would achieve more War, taking into account the current state of the games, their existing backlogs, and so on. This then gets reviewed by the segments and PM group and iterated on with the team.

The result is always much more than can be backed into a release, so the senior producer and product owners work to trim this down into an overall feature list, which is then turned into release plans by the teams.

Seleene: The question is, what is CSM's role in all of this? Right now we (unfortunately) help CCP manage damage control and pass along information, but where we traditionally haven't been

involved, and where this stakeholder thing was supposed to give us a foot in the door was more and earlier input into decision-making.

CCP Unifex stated that CSM input was most suitable for the groups responsible for gameplay and web-presence.

Seleene replied that what was missing was the solicitation (towards CSM) for input.

CCP Unifex noted there was a natural difficulty because CSM are not employees and not located at CCP.

Trebor: Some stakeholders are more equal than others.

CCP Unifex: If you guys want to be as available as employees and give us responses in the same timeframe, that would be fine, but I know you can't do that - this is really hard.

CCP Unifex: You guys want to play the game, you have responsibilities to the community, so how do we get the right amount (of feedback) from you inserted into the process without slowing everything down? What is your input? Is it a validation? A verification? Looking at a summary? You guys aren't here during the 6 weeks a year when we do (release planning). So what do you provide?

Trebor: I'd say it's a perspective.

CCP Unifex: But how do I get that without slowing everything down?

Trebor: What you need to do is figure out how to get information to us...

CCP Unifex: ...what we need to do, because this isn't you and us. If you guys want to be stakeholders, it's just "us" working at this together.

Trebor: You want us to become "us" but right now, the way things currently work, it's "you" and "I".

(laughter)

Trebor: From the perspective of the CSM, it would seem to me that the most effective way to use us is to find a way to get more information flowing to us that does not impose significant costs on you (to provide us with the information). Depending on the topic, one or another of the CSM will be interested and dig deep.

Alekseyev Karrde (via Lync): Early scoping, feedback in the middle, and verify at the end seems reasonable. Hans Jagerblitzen agrees (via Lync).

CCP Unifex: There are a couple of things in there that just worry me. First, it is impractical to think that we will be able to give you all the information. So given that, what is a good use of your time? Do we try to send you everything, or just release planning stuff?

Trebor: As with so many things, the perfect is the enemy of the good. What "we" have to do is experiment to find out what the appropriate level is. If it turns out you're firehosing us, I don't think anyone on the CSM will have a problem telling you that. And if it turns out that it is costing you too much time and effort to provide a certain (level of detail), then I don't think anyone here (at CCP) is going to have a problem saying "guys, this is a problem."

CCP Unifex: These guys have a ton of work to do. I'm not going to speculatively throw stuff at you and have them put a huge amount of effort into it. So how do we find the right balance of getting you the right information to you in a timescale that can be acted on?

CCP Unifex asked how things worked when CCP Xhagen acted as CSM's representative during release planning?

Trebor: It was a total black box for us. In both CSM 5 and 6 we got a list of what had finally been decided, but we had no way to judge whether that was a good or bad result, or whether CSM input had any real influence. It was a black box into which we blindly submitted our desires, but we had no context in which to adjust those to perhaps align them more with what other people (at CCP) wanted to do.

Two step: We have very limited knowledge right now. We don't even know what all the teams are at CCP and what they are doing. We can infer some things based on Skype conversations, but that's it.

CCP Unifex: That's obviously not great. Maybe we can meet in the middle. To help with that let me ask a question: who is the CSM accountable to?

Seleene: The players, the community... but in order to represent them properly, we need to be involved in the process at a little bit higher of a level than we have in the past.

CCP Unifex: But what are you actually accountable for?

UAXDEATH: To make sure the game doesn't get fucked up.

CCP Unifex: But what happens to you if it does?

UAXDEATH: We get brutalized.

Seleene: In a real world sense, nothing. We're volunteers, after all.

CCP Unifex: What is the thing you measure your success by?

Seleene: Oddly enough, I would use some of the same metrics you do -- how many people are logging in, what the subscriber numbers are.

Two step: I would measure it by player happiness.

CCP Unifex pointed out that metrics like the number of subscribers to EVE is not appropriate for judging the work of the teams working on FW because on an individual basis, they rarely can affect overall subscriber numbers. It's difficult to point to a particular change and say "that resulted in x additional subscribers 6 months down the road". Some actions can be correlated with subscriber number changes (PR campaigns like the DUST intro at Fanfest, PLEX offers, etc.), but most can't (at least, not positive changes!).

CCP Unifex: So what's the actionable metric for the CSM that demonstrates whether you're on the right track or not?

CCP Xhagen points out that the easiest metric is "how many people vote".

UAXDEATH notes that how much shitposting is going on in the forums might be a reasonable metric.

CCP Unifex: Saying you're accountable to the players is a pretty narrow view -- you need to be accountable to the people who work here, and you have a responsibility to be professional (not that I'm saying you aren't). Right now, people in the company ask "why should I be accountable to the CSM?", and we've never answered that question. So this is a good place to address the point.

CCP Unifex: Let me give you an example: you get a preview of a devblog, you say "don't say that, say this", some of your changes get made, the devblog goes out, and a flamewar erupts anyway. Then what happens?

Trebor: Then we were wrong, but so far that hasn't happened.

CCP Unifex: But when it does, in what way are you accountable? You're not, in any way. The people who are taking it in the neck are not the CSM (and shouldn't be, it's a CCP devblog). And when that happens, are you going to say to the players "we had a big part in this, and we got it wrong"?

Trebor: Yes. If we give some advice, and it turns out to be horrible advice, we'd step up and say "we agreed to this". When someone's getting flamed on the forums for something that isn't their fault, or quite frankly we think they're right, we get out there and defend them.

Two step: On Unified Inventory, for example, where we said "this is the right direction, there's just some things that need to be fixed".

Greene Lee: CSM is one of the best sources of information. Everyone here, in their professions in the game, have a lot of knowledge of community concerns.

Hans Jagerblitzen (via Lync) : We can make more impact in terms of player satisfaction if we are involved as early as possible in the design process, (helping to) narrow down what gets worked on.

Seleene: You spend a lot of time asking about our level of responsibility. Two things: it's difficult to help with these issues if we don't get involved a little earlier in the process. It's hard to provide more than PR help if all we're ever doing is reacting. And second, what level of accountability do you want us to have?

CCP Unifex: Great, we're making good progress. The dilemma for me is that the ultimate accountability for someone at CCP is pretty major so I want to make sure that we are getting the right set of expectations from you, the players and our developers based on everyone's accountability and how much skin they have in the game.

Seleene pointed out that when quick response was needed from CSM, it has been possible to get 6 or more people on Skype within hours. So when CCP Unifex was saying that "ping times" would be too long during (for example) release planning, the fact is that when CCP wants quick turnaround from CSM, they can get it.

CCP Unifex: There's a balance we need to find between the benefit (you bring) and disruption to a rapid process (incurred to provide you with information). So where's the right point in the process for you guys to get information up-front?

CCP Xhagen: Each visit happens before release planning, so you (CSM) are talking to the guys who are going into that process.

CCP Unifex: But that's just one point in the process and we should be making sure we get less damage control and more proactive input.

Seleene pointed out that in the past, things have often changed radically between the time CSM visits and release planning -- the summer of 2011 being a prime example.

Two step amplified: "At the December summit, we had a big discussion about wardecs, and not even two weeks later, as we were doing the minutes, we got told that it was all changing."

CCP Unifex: You are right that things change, and while the summit is a point in the process, what are the other points we need to include?

CCP Unifex noted that CCP is already thinking about things 12 and 18 months in the future, and will be soliciting CSM input in other sessions of the summit about those plans.

CCP Unifex then sketched out the typical release schedule for a year and the various points at which CSM might be able to provide input were discussed. The core issue was balancing the friction introduced into the process vs. the value derived. Two step, Seleene and Alekseyev Karrde (via Lync) made a strong case for being able to provide input before final decisions were made.

Two step: We don't want to make decisions, we want to be able to provide input that helps you make better decisions.

CCP Unifex: I think we need to give you guys the opportunity to give feedback before decision making.

Trebor: Obviously, giving us a better view into release planning and the ability to raise questions and provide perspective is a good thing, and I don't think it'll impose too many costs. But there is a second question that arises, which is about giving CSM visibility on sprints and demos, and there the question is: will it be worthwhile? What you may want to consider doing is taking just one team during the next release cycle -- a team that wants to engage in the experiment -- give us deeper access to them, and see if we can figure out ways to be helpful at low cost. If the experiment works, fine it can be expanded, and if it doesn't work, you've learned something.

CCP Unifex: That sounds good. CCP Unifex then walked CSM through the realities of sprint demos (which are recorded). These are no longer done in the cantina, but in front of smaller groups (which results in better feedback).

CCP Unifex: The reality is, if we gave you the recording and you got back to us in 24 hours, the team has already implementing the feedback they got in the meeting and done their sprint planning. You may still be able to provide some input, like "that's the most retarded thing ever", but (CSM input) may be better at a higher level (such as just during release planning).

Trebor: Even if the response is "you're on the right track" or "consider a, b or c", I think the feedback will be helpful, and I also think you will get 24-hour feedback on that.

CCP Unifex agreed to try the experiment (with a single team), and there were some discussion on the lowest-cost way to plug CSM into the loop and what could be learned from it.

CCP Unifex expressed that his business philosophy emphasizes making low-cost experiments to prove things out before committing larger amounts of resources.

Elise Randolph: It would also bridge the gap between the "you" and "I" thing. We would be judged by the same metrics as the team, although obviously the punishment wouldn't be "you're fired".

Two step: We'd be punished by lack of access. Our goal is to influence the game in a positive way.

CCP Unifex: And we don't *have* to take your feedback if it goes against things that we, genuinely believe although any feedback is good if it gives a different viewpoint.

Two step: That's the penalty for us being wrong. You won't believe us the next time.

Seleene: So far, we've been right.

Trebor: Don't say things like that!

CCP Unifex showed the CSM the internal EVE newsletter (that describes what teams are up to) and a segment of a recorded sprint demo, courtesy of CCPTube. The CSM agreed that having access to these materials would be useful.

Hans Jagerblitzen (on Lync, who could not see these items): This is so mean!

(laughter)

CCP Unifex : I feel kind of bad, but come on, you should have made it (into the top 7).

CCP Unifex described CCP's current release planning system, which has changed significantly. Now, the teams first assemble their backlogs in cooperation with their Product Owners. This is followed by a Stakeholder review. After incorporating the feedback from Stakeholders, they make changes and have another Stakeholder review.

Only after all this is Release Planning done, in which the team breaks down the user stories, works out dependencies with other teams, and so on. The final step is a presentation in the Cantina, where each team presents what they are going to be doing to the rest of the project and stakeholders.

CCP Unifex: (Looking at this process) the team meetings and presentations with ~~to~~ the Stakeholders should go to you guys so you can give us feedback (in 24 hours if you can do it). These release plan meetings happen over a couple of days, it's a busy couple of days for me and the other stakeholders.

Trebor: And for us too, it would seem.

CCP Unifex: So let's try it with one team. You get the video file, and tell us if these guys are smoking crack.

Seleene: Then give us one where you think they may be smoking crack.

Trebor: During the (Stakeholder review), even if you just want us to give feedback on one team, I think you should give us access to all the videos because there are going to be interdependencies and context that we need to understand.

CCP Unifex: For that, I think the presentations (in the Cantina) would be better, because that's where everyone gets together.

Trebor: But at that point, the decisions have been made, right?

CCP Unifex: Well, the Release Plan has been made, but the sprints haven't been committed to. Everything can still change, as we've seen.

Trebor: I was under the impression that when we were talking about testing this with one team, we were talking about what happens after Release Planning, and that for the Release Planning stuff, we would get a chance to comment on everything.

CCP Unifex: On a high level, absolutely. But there's a lot of work (during Release Planning), 20-odd teams trying to work out their interdependencies, some of which you won't be interested in.

Trebor asked for clarification about the level of input CCP Unifex wants CSM to provide. It's clear that CSM will get input before Release Planning (such as at the Summit), but does he want CSM to comment on Stakeholder reviews for all teams or just one? Following one team after release planning as they go through their Sprint reviews is fine.

CCP Unifex: I was thinking just one (Stakeholder review) for now.

Two step noted that while CSM scheduled meetings at the summit based on what they *thought* needed talking about, it was unclear if they were the right ones. CCP Xhagen replied that CSM doesn't just give feedback on the next Release Plan, but also what will happen in 12-18 months.

Trebor pointed out that while providing CSM with the initial Stakeholder reviews might be a bit of a firehose, there were 13 people available to divide up the work.

Seleene: And not everyone is going to look at every one of them.

Trebor: Even with 24 hours, we can prioritize, make summaries, and get you quick feedback. If it turns out that it's just too much work in too short a time frame, then we've learned something.

Elise Randolph: At no cost...

Seleene: You're already recording these things.

CCP Unifex: We don't generally record those meetings but we can start.

Trebor: If it's relatively easy to dump the recordings on us, then do it and let's see how it works. After all, because we are volunteers, our time is free -- to you, at least.

Hans Jagerblitzen (via Lync): It costs nothing for CCP to email us stuff, and it costs nothing for you to ignore our response if you don't have the time for it. But at least TRY it, otherwise you as a business are just throwing away free volunteer work hours.

Seleene: Your (earlier) point about accountability was well made, but what have you really got to lose?

CCP Unifex: The cost is introducing friction into a development process that is already very hard. We have to balance getting good feedback from another expert source (the CSM) with that cost. And because of the accountability issue, while we should listen to your feedback, we shouldn't have to act on it if we have a good reason not to.

Trebor: We've never asked for that. All we've asked for is the opportunity to provide some input. If it's good advice, it'll influence you, and if it's bad advice, you'll toss it in the trash can.

CCP Unifex: Sounds good. A lot of people say "why should I listen to the CSM, they're not going to lose their job over this". What they should be saying is, "I should be listening to the CSM because they're going to help me do a better job". This has never really been effectively communicated.

CCP Unifex then raised an issue he wanted to discuss with CSM further during the summit. Compared to the forums of some other games, the EVE forums can be "pretty poisonous and unwelcoming". Other forums on the other hand can be an effective platform for dialogue and constructive change. So how can we make the EVE forums more constructive instead of destructive.

Trebor pointed out that one thing CSM does (in the Skype channel) is flag interesting threads that are worth reading. Two step noted that this filters the signal, but the noise is still there.

Trebor: You're complaining that you've created a mean game, for the meanest and toughest MMO players in the world, but you don't want your forums to be mean?

CCP Unifex noted that right now the forums are in many cases not useful or effective for both devs or players and that it would be better when acting 'Out of character' to be more constructive.

As time was running short, CCP Unifex wrote down the action points for the meeting:

- 1) CCP Unifex: Logistics and socialization of getting CSM an opportunity for feedback in Release Planning.
- 2) CCP Unifex: Logistics and socialization of getting CSM an opportunity for feedback in a team's Sprint demos.

Trebor noted that it was very important to find a team that is positively disposed towards the experiment.

CCP Unifex: Your challenge is, "how do you make all the other teams want to get your feedback?"

Trebor: We don't have to do anything. We just have to do our job with the team that wants to work with us, and then *they* will tell everyone else that this worked well.

3) CSM: CSM will respond with feedback in a short period of time.

4) CCP Xhagen: Newsletter provided to CSM.

CCP Unifex: I think that out of this, both sides will get a better appreciation of what being a Stakeholder is and we can make a better game as a result.

Two step: One problem for us (has been) that because we don't know what you guys go through in this process, we don't have a good idea of what kind of feedback is useful.

The meeting ended with some discussion about what teams might be the best guinea-pig for this experiment, but the unlucky victim will be selected at a later date.

Winter 2012 expansion

Present: CCP Unifex, CCP Soundwave, CCP FlyingScotsman, Alekseyev Karrde (Lync)

CCP Unifex started the session by explaining the current structure of teams working on EVE in terms of things that will be highly visible to the user. Three teams will be responsible for delivering features for the winter 2012 expansion, one (huge) team will be working on art matters and one will be working on the (new) Player Experience. Other teams will be working on EVE as well and EVE related matters such as infrastructure, tools, website, launcher and the EVE/Dust link but they are not as 'game feature' heavy matters as the other teams. The theme for the winter expansion will continue to be 'WAR', or more specifically the stimulation of blowing stuff up and there are to be no 'Jesus features' (large new shiny features). This will allow CCP to iterate on features already in the game and lay a stronger foundation for 2013.

Going deeper into the winter schedule CCP said there would be an EVE release in June, an EVE release in August and then a big EVE release in December – a small break in the stride of 'release small and often' (close to every month) held by CCP since the beginning of Crucible.

The focus of this session will be the December release, its content being somewhat apparent from the topics selected for the summit. Going into an overview of the big things slated for the winter expansion is 'Player to player contracts' (a working title of the feature); non-PvE contracts between players, not necessarily tied down to sov and 0.0 like ideas that were discussed surrounding Dominion. This will be covered in greater details in a special session (see later in this document).

Trebor wanted to ensure that CCP understood that giving out clear and timely messages regarding any changes to existing systems is extremely important and properly communicate the plan for a feature if it is rolled out in phases based on user feedback.

CCP elaborated that team Super Friends will do the player to player contracts and will start on that in late June with the aim of delivering in December. Along the main work on player to player contracts, they will perform iterations on the war system that have already started and will continue alongside their main focus for the winter release.

When starting to talk about Team Game of Drones, who did the unified inventory, CCP Soundwave was interrupted by Two step with the question of how that had worked out. While the question was put forth with a smile, the underlying matter (now very well documented in a series of dev blogs penned by CCP Soundwave¹) was taken very seriously and the best done to resolve the situation that arose. Continuing with the discussion, Team Game of Drones also did Factional Warfare, a system that CCP believe is a good system that can be made into a great system with smaller iterations (see special session later in this document), and will continue to deliver iterations on those systems. Touching the subject of renaming POS modules, Trebor asked how easy of an implementation that had been; CCP replied with that it has been very easy compared to what had been expected. And this change is a good example of what changes can come in a rather unexpected manner as the team wasn't looking at POSes specifically.

There was very little balancing done for Inferno, mainly due to manpower issue (devs having babies) but an effort will be put into balancing for Winter (see special session later in this document). Elise asked what ship type would receive the attention this time around and without going into great detail at this point, the smaller ships will get the attention for Winter 2012 – moving towards the overall goal discussed in this dev blog. Two step asked where any other special classes, like the Black Ops would receive some love as well. The answer is that the smaller ships would be done first and if there is time available they might be looked at.

¹ ["Unified Inventory Changes"](#), ["This week in the unified inventory"](#), ["Unified Inventory: changes coming your way this Friday!"](#) and ["Next Unified Inventory Update"](#)

Moving onwards to the third team, Team Five 0, which will be focusing on little things (improving the life of the newer and average players) along with the [Crimewatch system](#). The backend of Crimewatch has been rewritten and deployed and now the frontend is next up (see special session later in this document). It must be kept in mind that this is such a fundamental system that it might be delayed (i.e. not released during Winter 2012) if its state is not acceptable. Also iterations to the effects bar and the HUD will be on their agenda – the aim being of making it more versatile and useful in order to decrease the dependency on the overview.

UAxDEATH brought up the topic of making the life of the Fleet Commander easier (for example the settings for the overview) and while CCP has no specific plans in that regards the needs of the FC will be kept in mind when it comes to iterating on the various UI components. Trebor reminded CCP that it should keep strongly in mind that people have developed work flow within the current UI and breaking those will result in negative feelings – allowing people the option of having several ways to accomplish or display the same thing with the UI should be kept in mind at all time.

Seleene commented, at this time in the discussion, that he was still waiting for the ‘money-shot’, what about [Technetium](#), [POSes](#), sovereignty? CCP Soundwave’s reply was that these topics were not on the schedule for the Winter 2012 release, but they would be covered in more detail in the next session about EVE Future, i.e. the release/s beyond Winter 2012.

This session didn’t really conclude but more of morphed into the next session after a very short coffee break.

EVE Future

Present: CCP Unifex, CCP Soundwave, CCP FlyingScotsman, Alekseyev Karrde (Lync)

CCP FlyingScotsman started off by discussing CCP’s idea about smoothing out the new player experience, as increasing the retention of new players by even a few percent would be a very good thing for EVE. Furthermore, when people start to hear about EVE through DUST 514, it will be important to be able to receive those who are interested in EVE and ‘reel them in’ (so to speak). Another idea CCP has is to scrap the tutorial as it is in its current form – the reason being that having a linear tutorial for a game that is anything but linear gives the wrong impression about EVE.

UAxDEATH commented that there is a reason why most big alliances have newbie programs, as the tutorial might be good to get new players familiar with the UI and the basic functions of the game, but anything beyond that is best performed by training corps/programs.

CCP stated that EVE is [not an easy game](#) and it will never be an easy game so it makes sense to help players with training programs in some manner, to make their life easier. This will be covered in more detail in a special session.

Other things on the future map are avatar based things – but due to the slow burn that development is on little will appear in the foreseeable future. This will also be covered in a special session.

Still more is ship customizations, as in color and things, not attributes. While some things have been explored this is by no means a fleshed out idea, nor is it in any manner certain that this will ever appear; for example the question of how much customizability should be allowed has not been answered. There is also the question of what type of customization should be allowed – corp logos on ships, alliance logos on ships, painting your ship in faction colors. But some prototyping work has been done to explore the feasibility of these matters (during a live demo to the CSM, it was proved that the ‘time to penis’ is around 30 seconds). Then of course it is the question of how things perform, e.g. having 200 different color schemes having had to be loaded up in a fight might affect performance in an unacceptable manner.

Trebor urged CCP to keep in mind the ‘bang for buck’ and not commit limited resources to something that players view as being a low priority.

Elise added that if the choice was between fixing POSes or making customizations the POSes should be picked (in terms of resources).

Two step brought up the topic of ‘clientside recording’ – meaning to have the ability to record the client simulation and then play it back at a later date, possibly view the battle from any angle and at any speed. That would allow users to tell better stories with cooler videos.

CCP’s response was that at some time in the past something like that was hacked together but it turned out to be very flakey and it was not worth working further on that at that time.

Two step responded to that by stating that EVE is beautiful, updating the graphics on ships, guns, launcher and effects should have some added utility beyond just being in the game and CCP should strongly consider enabling players, with tools like this, to tell stories from EVE.

Continuing on other future matters, ring mining. The basic idea is that it would be a group PvE activity that allows players to gather moon materials – in the spirit of talking about the future, without it being decided or set in stone, CCP Soundwave included the word “replacing”, i.e. the idea of moving moon-goo entirely to the ring mining venue. The argument for this statement is that moons are basically ATMs, you plant down a structure and receive money, an awful gameplay mechanic.

Seleene commented that he agreed to the assessment that it is an awful gameplay mechanic but pointed out that moons and their resources is a great conflict driver and perhaps it would be better to 'upset' the balance by adding alternative sources of moon-goo rather than removing the current source entirely. He then asked, "How would you go about doing this?"

CCP Soundwave responded that the initial plan was replacing the current moon mining function with ring mining, but it was decided to place POSes higher on the priority list than ring mining and thus that plan is currently on hold. There will however be a change done regarding moon-goo in Winter 2012, but it hasn't been decided exactly how that change will be done. There is also the matter of how to go about doing this change gracefully regarding the community.

Two step asked why the composition of the tech II components is simply not changed to remove the dependencies of specific moon materials. It would be quick and easy to do and could be done several times to keep balance on moon material value until ring mining is done.

Seleene and UAxDEATH both stated that this would not change anything in the end, at least it would not be a conflict driver, if anything it would perhaps just increase the workload on diplomats to organize deals between coalitions.

Two step pointed out that some of the moon minerals were more regionalized than others and currently the one in the highest demand was mostly present in the north. Changing the requirements of tech II components would make 0.0 entities move around more and create fights.

UAxDEATH said that this was not a correct assessment; resources are not as big of a reason for fighting as personal vendetta (or hate).

Elise pointed out that when alchemy first came out it did wonders for the then-problem of R64s (but created the current problem). It not only did it bring about a certain balance in the pricing of those resources but it also encouraged smaller entities to go and fight over moons that provided the goo that is possible to alchemagic into R64s.

Seleene said that while that solution was good, it was almost that he wished the change had never gone through due to the effects it had (the Technetium situation).

Two step added that every ship uses Tech and as such it is of course the prime candidate to control, plus the aforementioned localization of it makes it much easier.

Elise said that moons were a huge conflict driver for one month of the year, the eleven other months it is not.

CCP Unifex asked, to simply explore the option, how it would be received to simply completely randomly reseed the moon resources?

While the question might represent an extreme solution, Two step and Elise responded that it would be 'cool' but not the best solution in terms of the community – Two step added that an added pain to that would be the pain of having to scan all the moons again. He added that as a solution it would only be 'kicking the can down the road', it wouldn't solve anything but might buy CCP some time until ring mining is ready.

Greene Lee brought up an idea that has been floating around as well for some time, where the resources present in the moons could be depleted and would then spawn again in another random moon, thus adding a certain dynamic element into the resource distribution. This would mean that at some time an alliance might hit the jackpot, become a target (because of the resources) and then the fight would move somewhere else once that resource had been depleted.

CCP Soundwave responded to the dynamic resources discussion as a whole, by stating that he didn't like that approach (which CCP has looked closely into) for three reasons, of which two are entirely practical; it is contradictory to provide functionality to people to build up their space and then add a pressure on them to move their 'homes' frequently – for the average member having to ship around their stuff every two months because of moons is not something to desire, the second reason is that it might not be best solution to introduce an overly complicated system to address the matter at hand when a really easy solution with alchemy could be introduced (in a relatively short timeframe), and finally the method of providing tangible things as conflict drivers – having conflict drivers rely more on the social aspect of EVE rather than resources (something tangible) is what makes EVE such a great game.

Two step mentioned that CCP should be focusing on the 'Farms and fields' aspect of EVE, giving individual members the opportunity to prosper.

CCP Soundwave that ring mining would be a step towards that.

Trebor, Two step and Seleene iterated on their stance that while short term solutions to the Tech situation were understandable, drastic actions were needed. Whether it would be dynamic allocations (or depletion) of moon resources, rebalancing the moon-goo requirements for tech two components or ring mining, something needed to be done.

CCP Unifex wanted to explore the topic of conflict drivers a little bit further and asked, if moon minerals are taken off the table, what is it that drives conflicts in EVE?

Seleene responded by saying that these days the major players in each alliance all hang out in the same jabber channels and conversations after fights are more akin to chat after a friendly match (even though titans and super caps were destroyed) rather than 'hatred' – everyone is so filthy rich that losses really don't matter. The 'romance' of old times, where hate and animosity were driving factors are largely gone. The sense of loss has turned from 'damn, now I have to go and mine to afford all this stuff again' to 'man, now I have to go to the market and spend money.'

Two step clarified this by saying that there would be conflict drivers if it meant something to lose, in order to get mad at someone they have to do something to hurt you. Even if alliances lose their space, all their stuff is sitting in invulnerable stations. He took an example from Wormhole space, where if attackers destroy you and all your things and brag about how much they are going to get from selling it, that hurts and makes people angry.

Seleene added to this that personal animosity is the best conflict driver in EVE, not resources or space. Currently things are like a bunch of fat people fighting over how gets to eat first at the 'all you can eat' buffet, no one will starve, it is just the question of who is first in the line.

CCP Soundwave then commented that it sounded like if everyone lived in complete misery in EVE, it would be a better game?

Seleene and UAXDEATH agreed to that. It was however added, and agreed by all of the session's participants that seeking security is a very human thing to do and that behavior is reflected clearly in EVE. It could be said that people are perhaps 'too' comfortable at present and even though resources (such a moon materials) are tempting, they are not tempting enough to ignite a war.

Turning towards other future matters, CCP Soundwave stated that they were currently looking at medical clones, as the cost of dying for highly skilled pilots is very high and is getting in the way of PvPing – flying a 500k ISK Rifter and paying 10 to 20 million ISK for a clone is not very encouraging for PvP activity. Furthermore, the skill-loss mechanism is also something that needs to be looked at as punishing forgetful people for participating in PvP is counter-intuitive. While nothing has been decided the aim is not to reduce the risk of PvPing, but to move the mechanism of spending the ISK to somewhere else – such as investing the ISK in customizable clones that then give you some benefits (special mining clone, PvP clone, etc.).

In general no one of the CSM voiced concerns with this plan, as penalizing players for not remembering to buy a new clone is the wrong way to go about this.

Two step pointed out that wormhole dwellers would perhaps voice concerns regarding that plan due to the inability to switch clones in wormhole space. He also added that perhaps a 'longevity' perk could be added to clones, meaning that the longer a person is using a clone it would get unique bonuses.

Seleene agreed with the idea of making clones simpler and cheaper at its core.

Trebor Daehdoow was also in support of simple and cheaper clones, while he emphasized a 'simpler is better' approach to the change.

Due to Iceland's weather being very hot that day (above freezing), ice cream was offered to people present at the session.

Kelduum pointed out that the concepts of 'Medical clones' and 'Jump clones' are very hard to understand for new players, so a different naming strategy for those features or more emphasis in the tutorial regarding them is desperately needed.

Also in the plans (and keep in mind, plans can change) is a POS revamp. And while that topic was not discussed in great detail during this session, there was one held later during the summit.

Discussion then turned to Arenas, which were envisioned as a tool to promote some sort of organized PvP without ruining the game.

Two step and Seleene said that if the loss mechanic of such an arena was similar to real fights, then that could be a valuable addition – a place to get your instant action fix.

CCP went on and said that the term 'arenas' can be very big and needs to be defined properly, but one way of thinking about it could be a player controlled version of the Alliance Tournament that CCP currently hosts.

UAXDEATH voiced the concern that such a feature would draw away pilots from fleet operations, as they tend to involve a lot of waiting.

Seleene did not agree with that assumption provided that sufficient conflict drivers existed in 0.0 and that the arenas would be limited in a manner that it would more encourage e-peen matches rather than goal orientated matters.

Elise did however agree with UAXDEATH that currently EVE players suffer through a lot of 'boring shit' just to get a fight – attacking stations, grinding through POSes etc. was not necessarily done with the object of claiming space but to get a fight. To be able to get a fight would somehow make the fighting experience cheaper and not as sought after. Regarding that, Two step pointed out that the option for getting quick and easy PvP is to log onto Singularity, something that is not very commonly done.

Seleene stated that perhaps the reason for that is the effort of patching up a test server client.

CCP Soundwave said that it could bring in more people to PvP as the barrier of entry is a bit high, also the possibility of betting could be introduced into the arenas idea, which could create interesting social dynamics and other groups of players that are not participating in fleet warfare currently thus potentially increase the number of troops available.

Kelduum commented that in terms of training and educating new player about EVE's combat it would be immensely beneficial to have this sort of a feature.

It is important to note that CCP is very aware that this needs to be explored in detail before any further steps are taken on this path.

The final topic for this session was then the revamp of PvE, missions in particular and possibly group PvE. A myriad of ideas came up, group missions with various things to enforce the group element, the aforementioned ring mining and more.

Trebor encouraged CCP to introduce players to group content as soon as possible, as EVE is so much more fun with other people – and people playing in corporations stay for a significantly longer time as customers than those who don't.

The State of Incarna

Present: CCP Unifex, CCP Bayesian, CCP FlyingScotsman, Alekseyev Karrde (Lync), Hans Jagerblitzen (Lync)

CCP Unifex started off by saying CCP recognized the problems that happened with the Incarna release but they did not want to throw away the work done towards avatar gameplay. Instead, they would move forward with more of a focus on what the actual gameplay of avatars might be as opposed walking around in Captains Quarters, by yourself, trying on clothes. Thus an Incarna prototyping team was tasked with exploring how and why the Incarna experience could fit into EVE's emergent and interactive gameplay.

[[“Sorry”, declares CCP Manifest, “it’s hot-drop NDA o’clock on this prototype!”]]

Amongst various and thoughtful expressions of feedback, Greene Lee offered some thoughts on unique Incarna gameplay reward structures that you can't get currently from existing game systems.

Trebor emphasized that Incarna gameplay needs to be distinct enough that it's not compared to conventional avatar MMOs, and that the impact of this distinct gameplay is valuable to players in ways that are social/strategic not just monetary.

The mechanics, immersion considerations, and method of competition were also discussed.

In general, the CSM was pleased with the progress on the prototype, and agreed with CCP's approach to developing Incarna content as long as CCP doesn't ignore “Flying in Space”.

Two step: What are we giving up to get this?

CCP Unifex said that he wasn't sure what it would take but that tools were being developed in parallel to Flying in Space projects that would enable them to move forward.

Two step reminded him that the community had lost faith in CCP's vision of Walking in Stations and would need to be won over.

Seleene said that many questions about the Incarna we have now remain, including why some items in the NEX store have such high price points. He clarified that the prototype was a Good Thing as long as it didn't detract from FiS development.

Alekseyev Karrde (via Lync): Would like to see station establishments with war rooms and poker tables first as a stepping stone. Players need to have confidence in CCP's ability to deliver WiS content before such an ambitious feature is launched. Otherwise buy-in will not happen.

And with that the CSM concluded that this prototype was a pleasant surprise and thanked CCP Bayesian as he had to leave at this point.

CSM Chairman Seleene declared "Let there be light," and the blinds opened to bring the room back to normal lighting.

CCP Unifex put up a power point presentation and started off the next phase of discussion that a lot of feedback he had during player events was that people did enjoy being able to dress and customize their characters.

Often more clothing options were requested. So, without putting in much effort, they would like to test the waters for what the demand is like. He revealed that there were almost 200 clothing items fully designed, coded, and installed just not "turned on" and he would like to release some at different price points. He also raised the possibility of players getting smaller amounts of Aurum without having to cash in a PLEX. The price points were currently 150/300/500Aurum.

The CSM questioned CCP's plan to remove existing items and questioned why they remained at the current prices.

CCP Unifex responded that CCP didn't want players to feel ripped off by devaluing something they already bought.

CCP Unifex brought up that a staggering number of players have not spent the free Aurum given out over the years. CCP hopes to be able to provide these new options and track both free and non-free Aurum spent on them to gauge player level of interest and willingness to spend. Trebor suggested a metric of converted PLEX.

CCP Unifex said there would be many metrics and subgroups of players that will be tracked, including the reaction of those that bought the "monocle". Unifex mostly wanted to try it and see what happens.

Trebor counseled that CCP can ill-afford a “second failure” in NEX store releases and pricing, suggesting a 100/200/300 price spread since it’s cheaper and scales simply.

Both Seleene and Trebor pointed out that impulse buying will be a valuable source of income here.

CCP Unifex and his team had looked around at other micro transaction games and the prevailing pattern is companies make the most from their highest priced items and the second-to-lowest priced items.

Two step reminded everyone that of the NEX purchases that were made, a huge amount were the infamously high priced monocle.

Trebor asked what proportion of items would be rolled out. Answer: about 15%.

Two step suggests offering a wider spread of items and price points for the test.

CCP Unifex showed some of the items which will be released.

Trebor suggested the value of this test was testing the price sensitivity and elasticity of the market.

Seleene asked if CCP would be able to offer a discount for matching sets or offer more “packages” of clothing. He also suggested CCP offer “lines” which could be purchased.

CCP Unifex said they do not have the resources to put to that, maybe if the test was successful that would change. The test would go live June 19th (more in a blog here).

Seleene strongly emphasized there needed to be a video component to a dev blog to explaining that CCP devoted no new resources to the additional releases, and do it with his face on camera to help build the trust and confidence of the player base in CCP moving forward with NEX.

Two step suggested giving people more free Aurum to avoid the perception CCP is doing this out of greed, which Trebor seconded so that people try out buying clothes and might then spend RL money to do so. UAxDEATH mentioned that doing so would invalidate the test, while Seleene reminded everyone that most of the free Aurum given out has not been spent yet.

The CSM, particularly Elise Randolph and Seleene, emphasized that the main reason players raged over the initial release was the diversion of resources.

Live Events

Present: CCP Goliath, Alekseyev Karrde (Lync), Hans Jagerblitzen (Lync)

CCP Goliath introduced himself and talked briefly about the Live Events team.

CCP Goliath began by explaining the three main types of live events that happen on TQ: “CCP Core” events (ex. dev-caravan style events), “RP Lore” events (ex. Sansha live incursions), and player-made events (ex. Hulkageddon).

Seleene and Elise mentioned that the EVE community really enjoyed the last CCP Caravan events, with the rest of the CSM in agreement. CCP Goliath responded saying that CCP Devs who took part in the event also enjoyed them. Continuing on, CCP Goliath was curious how the CSM felt about CCP Core events in particular and asked the CSM for their input on the frequency of the CCP Core events, what the scope of said events should be, and finally whether the events should be restricted to certain areas.

Trebor was the first to chime in suggesting that the CCP Core events would be welcomed “as often as [CCP would] like”.

CCP Goliath mirrored his sentiment that CCP employees really enjoy the live events, but added he was worried that too many events could be viewed as an intrusion into the sandbox, so he suggested three to four live events a year.

CCP Goliath went on to explain that a live event is composed of several mini events on the same arc. With the CCP Caravan event, for instance, there were four separate instances of the event. CCP Goliath was also very concerned with where the events should take place, avoiding both secluding individuals and giving perceived favoritism toward some groups.

Two step queried whether several small events or fewer large events were more practical, and CCP Goliath responded that, while the workload was comparable either way, that smaller events would probably be easier in the short run.

Two step then went on to suggest that the CCP Core events could be as small as five to ten Devs camping a gate in lowsec. Two step’s main concern was that with the larger CCP Caravan event that it was so publicized that large numbers of organized parties showed up and possibly limited others from participating.

CCP Xhagen interjected with a concern that lots of small events would adversely affect the sanctity of the sandbox.

Seleene responded to the sandbox concern and argued that CCP Core events should be more common and very RP oriented. Seleene recalled a memory of a Serpents live event in the early years of EVE when CCP event staff “stole a Gallente Federation Titan”. UAXDEATH agreed and went on to suggest that the CCP RP events could be incorporated into the sandbox. Trebor agreed that the CCP Events should be something unique and RP-oriented, not something mundane that normal

players can do. Seleene expanded on his idea citing the rich backlog of EVE RP lore, allowing the Devs to have near-limitless RP type events.

CCP Goliath was happy with the response of the CSM and presented an idea that the Live Events team came up with, which is that there would be hidden event triggers and, if met, would cause a certain event to take place – or not take place. The players would then choose the outcome of the event and it would be written into EVE lore.

Hans, Seleene, and Elise were very approving of this idea. Hans chimed in that players would love to rewrite the EVE lore based on player success or player failure.

Two step expressed concerns in the rules of engagement for the CCP Events, arguing that players shouldn't be ganked while doing mundane tasks. Two step continued with the concerns and said that the RP aspect of the live events wasn't necessary, just simply CCP employees camping a gate without an RP element would be sufficient.

Seleene disagreed and argued that the best part of the CCP Events is the immersion aspect.

Trebor half-jokingly suggested that the CCP Event staff should be able to tackle players and ransom them until they posted on the forums to get the word out for the event. Trebor didn't care so much about the distinction between Devs playing as themselves or Devs playing as RP characters so long as the Devs and the community had fun in the event.

CCP Goliath reminisced on the last CCP Caravan event and admitted he wanted to escalate it, but the limiting factor was the lack of manpower.

UAxDEATH attempted to solve the problem and suggested that EVE FCs could simply FC the CCP Event staff, a notion that CCP Goliath was very much against because it would unfairly raise questions of favoritism which, in turn, would cheapen the events. On the subject of manpower, CCP Goliath mentioned that he was looking into spawning some unused NPCs with no loot tables and no bounties to avoid an unnecessary ISK injection from the event – something learned from the slight mishap on the Dev Caravan.

Two step stated that no rewards were needed apart for the fancy Dev kill/loss mail, to which everyone was in agreement.

Continuing on the idea of Devs being Devs or Devs RPin, Seleene added that the RP route allows the Devs an extra layer of anonymity which, he argued, would protect the Devs from players that felt they were unfairly harassed.

Trebor countered that if the correct rules of engagement were in place, similar to the ones used for the Caravan event, that the harassment claims would be a non-issue.

Taking the discussion a bit further, Seleene asked CCP Goliath how much support he was getting since the Live Events have historically had a spotty past (Seleene cited the Aurora program), and CCP Goliath was cautiously optimistic from the overwhelmingly positive reaction – both from the community and the CCP staff -- from the Dev Caravan event in December.

The final topic of the day was player run events, namely how to support player run events without disrupting the sandbox or showing favoritism. Trebor made the distinction between supporting an event and encouraging an event, with the latter being perfectly fine. Elise noted that splash ads were a perfect way to bring attention to a player event. CCP Goliath admitted that the hardest part of giving support (e.g. Twitter mentions, Facebook links, et cetera) is identifying the event as being good enough, or legitimate enough.

Two step was fine with giving support to anyone who asked for it, so long as there was no in-game material benefit for the event. Two step then brought up the issue of potentially scamming players under the guise of a CCP-touted player event, which would go against the idea of not aiding a player.

Trebor, quite poignantly, pointed out that this is EVE and as such CCP will get scammed somewhere along the line. He gave advice applicable to all EVE players: use good judgment and accept imperfection.

Seleene suggested consulting the CSM on any edge-case events, given that the CSM is supposed to have a good understanding of the community.

On the topic of how to support player events, Greene Lee suggested CCP could give out statues or medals as prizes for the player events, even small inter-alliance type events. Greene Lee discussed a “freighter convoy” event that his alliance ran with another alliance for fun, and admitted that it would have been well received to have some sort of distinct, though non-valuable, prize. The purpose would be, he added, to promote similar player events.

Trebor expanded on the thought, suggesting that any sort of distinction for event-creators would be positive.

Elise made the case that the distinction, whatever it may be, should not be an in-game item - to avoid giving an external value.

CCP Goliath spitballed on the idea and threw out the idea of having a forum ID for event creators. Trebor approved and added that possibly some unused NeX clothing item could be a reward. There were no immediate rejections of the idea from either CCP Goliath or the rest of the CSM.

Summarizing the overarching thought of the meeting, Two step reiterated he believed more events were the best outcome for the Live Events team. Two step mentioned that the community is

incredibly supportive of the live events, but they feel that sometimes the events become neglected, such as the arc of Arek'Jaalan.

CCP Goliath responded that the live events aren't forgotten but, since they are done in the Devs spare time, real work takes precedent.

Talking about Arek'Jaalan, CCP Goliath discussed how he immersed himself into the lore surrounding Arek'Jaalan and wormholes after the Fanfest roundtable and his fascination with the story. CCP Goliath then shared with the CSM his perfect scenario for Live Events: HBO-style story arcs that take place over the course of a few months, with several events affecting the overall arc and leading up to the story. Players would be able to directly affect the story through their own actions.

Elise agreed that player involvement would greatly enrich the depth of the lore to EVE players.

CCP Goliath admitted that this would be the perfect solution but, unfortunately, the work involved may prove to be too daunting. However CCP Goliath recalled that several arc-type events had occurred previously, where players directly affected the outcome of the event by either killing a crucial player or neglecting to rescue another.

CCP Xhagen noted that time was running out and asked for any concluding remarks.

UAxDEATH summarized that there may not be a "best" solution, but simply trial and error would be the best way to go about it.

Thursday, May 31st

Industry and mining

Present: CCP Greyscale, CCP Arrow, CCP Unifex, CCP Soundwave, Alekseyev Karrde (Lync), Hans Jagerblitzen (Lync)

CCP Arrow showed a document that outlined changes planned in the near term related to industry. CCP decided that industry should be goal based making it more fun and quicker to do. There should be graphical feedback while it operates.

CCP Arrow is aiming to reduce the number of clicks and again improve the graphical aspects. Improvements include seeing minerals status displayed immediately and the ability to see multiple jobs at the same time. Industry will also include a new “batch” system to allow large scale manufacturing to be more easily manageable.

CCP Arrow and the CSM discussed an example of the change where you would build a carrier using the new “job order” process and all the sub modules would be automatically rolled into a single operation. Another example given was a player could start a job building 100 of an item with only enough minerals to build 10 and then feed the job with more minerals as the job progressed as required so long as the minerals are fed into the process before they would be required.

The CSM expressed strong support for these improvements and Trebor offered that PI should be made to work the same way.

CCP Arrow said this was the vision and goal and there will be a much needed improvement in visual and functional operations of industry. CCP Arrow feels this will increase the number of players involved in industry and asked if the CSM thought that would be a good thing.

Seleene said “Yes, if they don't build it I can't fly it”

CCP Arrow indicated that they would be very careful to make sure that the players highly involved with the current industry system aren't disrupted by the new UI and functionality.

Two step stated “the difference between the proposed industrial change and inventory was that inventory let you organize things differently but wasn't anything new but the new industrial system is letting you do new stuff and the players will be much better with “you've made my life better and changed things” as compared to “you've just changed things”.

Two step said “less clicks is a godsend from heaven for players!”

Trebor said that this would be good as the players that wanted to put in the extra effort can gain some efficiency and gain advantage.

CCP Greyscale offered that less time spent manufacturing gave more time for players to do other activities.

Seleene said back in the day you had a needless complicated system that was needlessly and overly bad but the new idea would be simple and indicated how good the new system would be if it was as simple as dragging what you need and it just goes...

CCP Arrow said they hoped they could make industry easier to manage and cooler to look at.

CCP showed some samples of possible work flow UIs that allowed simple graphical control of the manufacturing process where the process is visual and can be sequenced in a logical graphical manner. He mentioned that similar systems are used in industrial process control systems in real life.

Two step suggested that a graphical system which is similar to PI, which is good for setting up a multistage process would be a big win.

Trebor pointed out that this is a different problem as the steps to build a capital ship are already known. He said that what you needed in the simple case was a good view into the materials requirement pipeline (for example, in 36 hours you will be blocked because you are out of some material) and suggested that then there could be prioritization applied if there are multiple jobs. Trebor also suggested that something along the lines of the PI UI would work well for the new industrial system.

Trebor noted that instead of just letting the computer figure it out, a player could work on the lower levels of a multi-tier job (building a Titan for example) to optimize those to increase efficiency and interleave tasks (such as building and researching)

Trebor and CCP Soundwave discussed the idea of how multiple manufacturing jobs could be optimized.

Two step pointed out how current T2 manufacturing was broken in terms of the need to manually interact with each step of the job and it would be great if he could just “dump in” a bunch of materials and BPCs and just “chew through them” automatically.

Trebor then added that as long as the top-level jobs could be prioritized the system could handle most things automatically, but someone who wanted to work a little more could schedule lower-level jobs in a more optimum way (say, interleaving production and research) -- this would be a “think sink” where a player willing to put in extra time and effort could get an edge.

The CSM discussed various graphical indications of completion of jobs with some comical possibilities including fireworks and animated factory workers and slaves.

CCP Arrow suggested that the graphical display could encourage players to make even more complicated items.

Trebor suggested investigating genomic circle charts. They are usually used to describe relationships between species. He made several other suggestions to make the display graphically appealing.

CCP Xhagen asked if the industry UI needed improvement at all.

Elise said yes definitely.

Two step said even if you just reduced clicks without changing major stuff it would be a big win.

CCP Xhagen asked, that with the exception of the overview, is there another component of the UI that needed to be redone – i.e. is the Industry UI at the top of the list?

Two step said the excluding the overview, the Industry UI would be his number one.

Seleene said “yes since this also involved the queuing system which makes it its own mini-expansion in its own right. Hell, throw in a new little mining frigate and you got something there man! It would be amazing!”

Trebor offered that this would be something that could be used on other places in EVE like PI which would be a great long term thing. – it could be used for anything that involved construction.”

CCP Arrow then said he would go ahead and mock something up.

Seleene said if CCP gave EVE a real queuing system that will make a lot of people happy.

Two step offered that it would be the “biggest industry expansion in EVE” and Seleene agreed. “It would be such a huge deal and kill so many birds with one stone, and then all you need to do is making mining more fun”.

CCP Soundwave asked what other things would make industry better.

Two step offered that making Factional Warfare have faster production lines would be a possibility, “things like that that make industry more of a decision rather than what convenient station can I find near Jita with open build spots, those are really good things”. “There is also stupid stuff like you guys should just quadruple the number of build spots in 0.0, there is no downside to doing that and that seems like a quick database update thing and go,”

CCP Soundwave replied that the way that stations were implemented meant that wasn't a single simple database change to make that happen, unfortunately.

Two Step mentioned that he'd heard that people can't even build all the ammo used in 0.0 in 0.0, even if you wanted to, not mention the ships and modules and that seems stupid.

CCP Greyscale responded that it was a different topic whether you could or could not manufacture everything in 0.0.

Seleene said this was an industry discussion.

CCP Greyscale said we've never really talked about how industry really works and maybe there should be decisions you can make to make it more interesting and fun without breaking it.

UAXDEATH discussed that logistics of moving your base from one place to another for example to stage for a war.

CCP Greyscale said he was more wondering how you could add decisions for the more serious industrialist to make more profits.

Two step suggested it should cost less to build farther from Jita by adjusting NPC build costs. The cost should be more important in the decision as to where you build in NPC production slots as NPC slots are dirt cheap and don't really affect your decision of where to produce your stuff.

CCP Greyscale mentioned things like station rents. But he wanted to more focus the discussion a bit on how can a dedicated industrialist have an edge over the 'next guy' who just takes a pile of minerals and makes ships every now and then.

Two step suggested skills could be part of the solution as it only takes a month to max out the related skills and it would be nice if there was a way to use skills to find rare things and do blueprint research with them.

Trebor says if you add a "build me a Titan" button, the real way to optimize will plan ahead and break down the tasks to make more time efficiency to get an extra edge. He noted that at one point, he wrote his own software to do this kind of optimization when he was running an Orca production line where he had written software to really optimize his profits...

CCP Greyscale asked if we went back to renting slots by time and not by job would that make it better?

Two step pointed out that if the queue is in place we effectively are booking the slots for time and not just a job.

CCP Greyscale said that maybe going back to booking a slot for a fixed time would be increased motivation to use the entire time.

Trebor said that the simple building would take place in public facilities, and the professional industrialists will move their activities to POSes to gain an edge.

Seleene also restated that the more experienced player will evolve to activities in POSes as the player progresses. "Anything you put in there that rewards you for sticking with the game and learning how to do this stuff is a reward in and of itself, there are things I can do a new player just can't do because of the time I've put in the game, it goes back to the idea that a new player two weeks in the game should be able to do anything. That's a nice rainbow land idea for some things but should not apply to this, you have to train, you have to learn and you have to use a little bit of your own intelligence outside as well, that is outside the game mechanics".

Two step mentioned "barriers of entry", he mentioned he had been building T3 hulls with an alt and when they first came out it had a high skill level required that kept the market limited and that having segments of the market you can be in and that take a lot of work to specialize in was a good thing. He cited an example of the decryptor interfaces that were rare when they first came out but now they are cheap. He mentioned T2 BPOs and how some players see them as an advantage. Adding high level goals for industry is a good thing.

Seleene said that he felt that it seems odd that Titans use the same materials to build as frigates. He feels that there should be other materials used in the highest levels of items you build to increase the sense of accomplishment.

Trebor said that this pretty much happens in the real world to which Seleene responded "but this is the future!"

Trebor said there should be little differentiators you can add at this stage but since this is "Unexpected Consequences Online" no one can predict if these things will be needed, loved or hated. CCP should plan to make their system modular and flexible enough that they can make changes all along the chain but not enable all that or put the things in until you've had the experience with how the people accept the new system.

Seleene said that CCP has buried, and should bury, players with those new systems and new resources to find and mine. Requiring "unicorn manure" (suggested by CCP Xhagen as a new resource) to build the best thing (whether it is a module or a ship) would make it more of a goal and challenge, having to find that exotic and rare item or material. He made the point that there are old and new sniper rifles in the real world and the younger ones are more exotic and better, made from different materials with different techniques – it is exciting to expand and complicate matters in this manner.

Two step felt Titans are a bad example because they are an item with a real barrier to entry because of the cost and the infrastructure. He feels it would be nice if other things have similar barriers.

CCP Xhagen asked if the meeting should discuss mining.

Two step asked if this was where the CSM trolls the player base and says that no one actually mines.

Seleene said mining is where you literally should be able to search for “unicorn dust” and “space whale oil” to build magical widgets.

Some CSM members jokingly said something about mining still being boring and it isn't supposed to be fun.

CCP Soundwave showed some statistics about mining since the drone regions changed and Hulkageddon. Mining in high sec is slightly up, low sec is way up and null sec is way, way up based on volume of ore.

Two step suggested that it would be cool if the character sheet showed you the volume you've mined in your lifetime.

CCP Arrow stated that the task to mine could stay the same but the visual elements could change to make the tasks more fun. For example when selecting an asteroid you could scan it to see more details about what was in it in terms of different types of ores in a single asteroid. The asteroid may even be displayed in a 3D manner showing the ore distribution.

Seleene asked if this would mean there were composite rocks with different ores and CCP Soundwave said that they would really want that.

CCP Soundwave indicated that ship of different sizes could be used but larger ships might be faster or better.

Seleene asked for a proper capital mining vessel for ring mining.

CCP Soundwave also mentioned League of Legends, where there was a mechanic that allowed you to hide in bushes and that maybe you could use the asteroid interference to shield you from being scanned and maybe even being hidden from local.

Seleene pointed out that real asteroid belts have very low density (completely different from the famous Star Wars scene where the Millennium Falcon hid in the asteroid belt) while Trebor pointed out Ice Rings are more dense.

CCP Soundwave said they would be going with the Star Wars more dense field.

Two step asked if there would be rings in all security spaces and CCP Soundwave said they haven't decided but he'd prefer low sec and null sec only

Hans added "Put the best rings in low sec :) It needs a boost."

Trebor added that you need to take damage if you are moving too fast and that his favorite Sci-Fi scene was from Wrath of Khan when the two starships appear out of the gas clouds and all hell breaks loose. If ring mining could provide that kind of experience, it would be great.

CCP Xhagen asked when we could expect ring mining. CCP Soundwave said after the POS work because it would most likely use the same team - best case scenario would be winter expansion 2013.

Seleene made the comment that there seemed to be some CCP resources not being used due to how the current production pipeline is being used.

CCP Soundwave indicated that these belts are going to long enough to fly in for hours. He also suggested the POSs may be used to scan the belts to indicate where the best ores might be.

Starbase rework

Present: CCP Greyscale, CCP Masterplan, CCP Ytterbium, CCP Soundwave, CCP Explorer, CCP Unifex, Alekseyev Karrde (Lync), Hans Jagerblitzen (Lync)

Editor's note: CCP calls player owned starbases (POSes) "starbases" internally, both terms are used during this session.

Foreword

The current state of the starbase redesign is "in concepting"

- ***It has not had its initial direction pinned down***
- ***It's not had any kind of formal design assessment***
- ***It's not had any kind of formal technical assessment***
- ***It's not had any kind of formal art assessment***
- ***It's not had any kind of formal QA assessment***
- ***Nothing has been signed off by anybody at any stage of the decision-making process, beyond the initial instruction to begin concept work***

This session was used as an opportunity to pitch some very early concepts to the CSM and see how they reacted to them, to guide our own internal concepting work. Everything that is discussed in the following meeting minutes **will** change between now and whenever the feature finally reaches TQ., and anything implying concrete decisions should not be read as such.

These meeting minutes are being provided in full in the interests of transparency, but they should very definitely not be taken as any kind of commitment or firm statement of intent from CCP.

We now return you to your scheduled broadcast.

CCP Greyscale started out by laying out their goals for a starbase rework (remember, dear reader, goals are one thing and the realities coming out can be something completely different):

- 1) A sense of ownership. New POSes should be "space housing", with players feeling that, "a starbase is their starbase, not a generic starbase." This includes some form of customization
- 2) Scalability. They need to scale from individual to alliance sized.
- 3) Get rid of the force field bubble, partly for technical reasons.
- 4) A single structure. This doesn't preclude some sort of modular system, but they want a single actual object in space, partly for technical reasons, partly for usability.
- 5) They want a path to retire the current starbase system. This may not happen in the first release, but eventually a new starbase system should completely replace the current starbase system. This means that everything that current starbases can do either needs to be replicated in the new system or removed from the game.
- 6) (added later on by CCP Masterplan) The current starbase system code is not the best, full of lots of edge cases, and the new one is a chance to greatly simplify things, similar to what CCP is currently doing with Crimewatch.

There will be overlap between the time the new system is released and when old-style POSes are removed. The CSM emphasized that this is a good thing, to allow players time to transition to the new system and for bugs to be worked out. Trebor asked if the plan was to introduce all functionality at once or to spread it over several expansions. CCP Greyscale wasn't sure yet, but he expected that it would be spread out. CCP would likely have separate teams working on core new starbase functionality and a separate effort to add functionality to that core. Once the core functionality is ready, it might be released with features to follow at a later date.

Two step asked about docking at the new starbases, CCP Greyscale said, "We will get to that, but yes." CCP asked what the CSM thought of the goals they laid out, and the CSM all said the goals sounded solid.

UAXDEATH asked if CCP had some sort of timeline for release, because players are very interested in a POS rework. The team that will be doing the work will be working on the new Crimewatch system for the winter release, so new starbases would be a 2013 project.

CCP Greyscale then moved onto a list of stuff they want to do in a new starbase system:

1) Modular. CCP's initial thoughts are that modules would be cubical and fit into a simple grid. Some modules might be much larger than others, such as the docking module. CCP is thinking about some sort of gameplay with the arrangement of the modules, such as having power generation modules that generate heat that needs to be dissipated. Players might then be able to reduce cooling costs by better arranging their modules.

CCP Greyscale said about the layout, "We want to have it yours, we want players to say, 'I want to make it look like the ISS', or 'I want to make it look like a spider', or whatever." Two step suggested many players might make penis shapes instead.

Regardless of shape, to encourage this, the cooling cost reduction would probably not be extreme, to allow players to trade looks for functionality.

UAXDEATH asked about if POSes would be restricted to one per moon, and CCP Greyscale said that they wanted to allow them to be anchored just about anywhere. He would have an exclusion zone around gates and stations, but would allow them anywhere else.

Two step asked if there would be a one starbase per grid limit, and CCP said no. They want to allow people to build little "cities" of starbases. Greyscale said, "I want to make a major industrial outpost in nullsec a little constellation of small structures and ships flying between them. This makes CCP Ytterbium unhappy because they would be untidy."

Two step asked about appearance customization, including faction modules to let players really customize their starbases.

CCP hasn't decided how to do this yet, but they are thinking about having, "basic modules and then we have a lot of shit you can put on them, like accessories, like solar panels and satellite dishes and heat radiators." CCP feels that it is important to make design unique enough that a player could look at a screenshot and say, "that is mine!"

UAXDEATH asked about faction POSes and modules, and CCP Greyscale said they would probably be there as well.

Seleene noted that this sounds exactly like a game he used to play as a kid on his Commodore 64.

UAxDEATH and Greene Lee asked about players connecting starbases to each other, and CCP Greyscale said they were thinking about allowing players to transmit power and CPU between starbases.

Kelduum asked about ownership, and if it would be transferrable between individuals, corps and alliances, and CCP said that they would probably allow something like that.

2) Defenses. CCP is looking into defensive modules that would have firing arcs, so they wouldn't shoot through the structure itself.

3) Force fields (or lack thereof). CCP wants to have docking modules, but they don't want them to be cheap, and they may want to limit the number of ships that can be docked. CCP has been exploring adding mooring modules that would protect a ship that was able to physically get near the module with a small force field around just the ship. This system might replace ship maintenance arrays.

Two step pointed out that this system might be nice for docking as well, so that people can get some indication of how many people are active in a starbase, especially in w-space where there is no local chat.

UAxDEATH asked about moon mining. CCP isn't sure what they want to do with that, they may require a new starbase to be at a moon to mine it, or they might move to a different source of moon minerals entirely.

Two step asked about if there would be a way to add a POS to the overview, via a beacon or something. CCP wasn't sure if this would be present. Two step then asked about if the new starbases would be able to be opened to the public. CCP said yes.

Seleene said, "I want to cloak my secret pirate starbase." Greyscale said that might be a possibility, then shocked the entire room by mentioning offhand, "I really, really, really want to let you put a jump drive on them." The whole room erupted into smiles. He then continued, "Not just right click cyno jump, but you put a beacon down and it takes something like 48 hours before you jump." He wanted to do this to allow small gangs to have a roaming base.

Seleene declared that, "This is a hero move! This is amazing!"

Greyscale then mentioned that this was just an idea, and the CSM shouldn't get **too** excited about it.

Trebor called it, "the world's slowest hotdrop."

CCP Soundwave suggested that people might fill one with guns and use it as an offensive weapon as well. CCP Greyscale mentioned that he would love to have a death ray that required a ton of power plants as a possible module option.

Trebor mentioned that not having a force field would be a big change to the way fleets often operate, and Greyscale mentioned that he would be looking into that.

Elise asked about mooring supercaps, and CCP said that that would be allowed, and people could set it so that only the owner or a director of the corp that owned the starbase would be able to un-moor the ship. CCP Greyscale said that he was thinking that people would have to get to 0 meters from the mooring module in order to moor a ship, which would mean that there would be a natural limit of however many ships could fit at the mooring point, and that people would have to carefully consider their starbase layout to take this into account.

UAXDEATH asked about if personal POSes would still allow directors to un-moor ships, and Greyscale said probably not, but that corp POSes would, because corps need to be able to take down a tower.

CCP Greyscale turned the discussion to reinforcement timers. His proposal is that starbases would have a smaller core fuel tank which could be locked down for 24 hours. If you had a large starbase that was using a lot of fuel, the core tank would only last for 24-48 hours. A smaller starbase might last a week or a month, with the attacker needing to come back every day to shoot the starbase. This would be the downside to having a large starbase, as you would be more vulnerable to attack.

Elise asked about moored ships when a starbase is destroyed, and Greyscale said that they would all un-moor and be able to be stolen.

Two step asked about being able to individually target guns, and Greyscale said probably.

Trebor suggested that the damage required to lock down a starbase should be tied to the fuel consumption, so that a small starbase would require less damage but spread out over a long time. CCP Greyscale suggested that this could be done by allowing people to attach shield modules to a starbase which would increase shield HP.

Two step expressed some concern with a multiple week reinforcement timer, especially in wormhole space where the fight is often over by the time people start shooting POSes. Requiring players to stay for several weeks to finish the starbases off would be unpleasant. He suggested that the defender should have to perform some action to refuel the reinforcement tank.

CCP Greyscale explained that he was mostly thinking about nullsec with this mechanic, to make it difficult to destroy someone's personal starbase.

Two step mentioned that another wormhole concern with the current POS system is that large towers in lower class wormholes are extremely difficult to remove, and that the new system might be a good chance to fix this.

CCP Ytterbium said that he would rather have sleepers fight back against starbases in wormhole space.

Two step worried about this being free ISK to those that could defend their POSes, but Seleene said that, "I am pretty sure the evil Frenchman (Ytterbium) has accounted for this in his plans."

CCP Greyscale suggested that perhaps the larger power cores might require freighters to move around, which would prevent them from getting into lower class wormholes.

UAxDEATH asked about the cargo space required for the new starbases in general, and CCP Greyscale said that he would like to be able to fit two or three basic small starbases in a hauler.

Two step asked about the possibility of the new starbase system replacing outposts. Doing so would fix some of the problems with the outpost system now, including not enough build/research slots in nullsec and the vulnerability of people's stuff.

Seleene thought there was still room to have outposts in the new system, though they would probably need some improvements.

Two step pointed out that docking in the new starbase system enables people to do things like spin ships, fit ships from saved fittings and refit T3 subsystems, as well as even use features like the Captain's Quarters.

Seleene asked what happens if someone is in their Captain's Quarters and it is blown up. Two step responded, "it sounds like some awesome graphical effects to me."

Two step asked if people would have personal storage space even without a docking module, and CCP Greyscale said, "We would like to code that in ASAP even for the current system." CCP Greyscale said they were considering introducing a new item hangar that would have about 1,000 m3 storage per person. There was some discussion about if this would be item storage or ship storage, Two step said that if he had to choose one, he would choose ship storage.

CCP Greyscale said that this was driven by conversations he had at Fanfest where wormhole corps told him they were not recruiting because of theft worries.

Trebor said that in his wormhole corp, they needed a fairly large amount of space for items, for PI and mining mostly.

Two step pointed out that if people had personal ship storage, they could always fill a hauler with their expensive modules and store it there for security.

CCP Greyscale asked more about what was specifically blocking player recruitment for wormhole corps and Two step explained the various security measures that wormhole corps use.

There was some discussion about what the removal of POS force fields would change in things like nullsec fleet fights. Elise pointed out that losing the ability to have a safe(ish) place to park a fleet for 20 minutes or so would be a big change from the current system.

CCP Greyscale suggested that they might look into making an anchorable POS type shield.

Two step pointed out that this would be a big change for all sorts of fights, and might be just a tad controversial. There was some discussion about what exactly might prevent people from mooring at a POS, such as warp scramblers.

The session ended with the CSM urging CCP to "ship it" as soon as possible.

[EVE/Dust link](#)

Present: CCP Jian, CCP Nullarbor, CCP LeKjart, CCP Omen, CCP Unifex, Alekseyev Karrde (Lync), Hans Jagerblitzen (Lync)

The CSM was joined by CCP Jian via video conference from Shanghai and CCP Nullarbor, CCP LeKjart, CCP Omen in Iceland.

Editor's note: obviously this is all subject to change, and still in the discussion stages with the CSM even though these minutes are somewhat dated.

Seleene: Wow, it looks just like Iceland, pretty cool

Two step: Except it is dark out

CCP Xhagen: OK, Begin!

Quick round of intros for the CSMs. CCP Jian wanted to know if everyone had gotten a DUST beta key, which they had, though some of the CSM lack PS3s to play DUST with.

CCP Xhagen: OK, CSM, do you have any questions for Jian? Or maybe Jian, if you want to start? OK, how is DUST?

CCP Jian: I thought we covered that in the last meeting (editor's note: CSM 6 met with the DUST team before Fan Fest)

Seleene: OK, so it this literally a Q&A session where we ask you stuff, or do you have something to talk to us about first? That is what we kind of figured.

CCP Jian: Well, we are on track for everything we previously talked about. We are doing a big update for E3 that will come later in June. So all the news and stuff people hear about at E3 that will be in an update for closed beta. Then we have another update coming later in 2012. Then we have a big update, when we move everything onto TQ. The first release will be Factional Warfare only, not including the 0.0 stuff. Once that is released, there will be a test client connected to Sisi to test 0.0 stuff. That will culminate in a 2013 release to the game that will include 0.0, and more player controlled things.

UAXDEATH: OK, so when can we run for DUST CSM?

(Laughter)

CCP Jian: We haven't sorted that part out yet.

Hans: (on Lync): I'm curious about the state of the Mordu's Private Trials (the closed beta) - feels a bit rough compared to the video footage and demos we've seen.

CCP Jian: So yeah, the beta is way behind where we actually are at. You will see with the E3 update the leaps and bounds we have made. This release that you are playing is fairly old, it is essentially the Fanfest build, which is a couple of months old at this point.

Because of how console development works they are not able to update as often, though Sony has given them a lot of flexibility, the release process is still slower than the PC. CCP said that the E3 release focused on framerate and polish. The E3 update should be live at the end of June, 2 or so weeks after E3.

Two step: So is 2 weeks the cycle time for these releases? It seems like you guys are struggling with Sony a little and the approval process? Is that something that is going to be a problem?

CCP Jian: No, no. It is not the approval process. If we have to rush something, Sony has turned stuff around inside of a week. That is not the issue. When we are trying to push out a new update, we do a lot of testing and we want Sony to do a lot of their testing because it helps harden the product.

The CSM then got an update for what CCP is working on for the next major DUST 514 update.

They are working on the highsec matches, including the matchmaking system. They are also working on the Factional Warfare aspects of DUST. They will be integrated with the new FW changes that were made in Inferno. DUST players will be able to join a faction, and see a FW dashboard similar to the one in EVE. The DUST battles will contribute to the overall FW system control. The FW matches will have orbital bombardment (OB), and CCP is looking at if OB should be in highsec matches. The OB visual effects are being worked on, as well as making the DUST districts visible in space in EVE. This would include reflecting the conflict state of those districts (showing explosions if there is fighting going on, etc.) CCP also noted that this will include more points around a planet that will be warp targets, without bookmarking them.

Two step: What about corporations? Right now in the beta you can't join one, is that stuff just not in the beta yet?

CCP LeKjart: It is not in the beta, and the whole corporations owning districts thing will be part of the nullsec update.

The CSM asked about joining player corps in the late 2012 release. CCP said that wasn't currently on the schedule. They don't want to stick something in that would break EVE, and are worried that EVE corps with role management and voting would be too much for DUST players.

Two step: I just worry that if you are going public with DUST, it seems like not having the ability to join corporations or clans or whatever people are used to in FPS's seems like it would be a big problem.

Kelduum: Even if it was really basic, it would be enough.

CCP is looking at if they could have simple DUST corps, with chat channels. They understand the importance of corps, and are looking at a concept called "simple corps", with greatly streamlined management. Those might be part of a betarelease, or they might just have NPC/FW corps for people to join. At the latest, players would be able to join player alliances or corps in 2013. CCP is also looking at including persistent squads, so people can play matches with an ad-hoc group.

Two step: I just worry because the lesson you guys have learned from EVE is that players that socialize in groups stick around, it seems like you want to apply that same lesson to DUST.

Kelduum has had people contact him about DUST University already.

CCP Jian: Yeah, clans are forming already. I had a random MAG clan leader come and visit us in Shanghai a couple of weeks ago. That was kind of a pleasant surprise.

(Laughter)

CCP asked CSM for feedback on DUST corporations, and what the CSM's preferred vision for them would be. The options presented were:

- 1) Unified corps, where DUST and EVE corps are the same thing, including allowing DUST players to be CEOs of EVE corps.
- 2) A special DUST division of a regular EVE corporation, where the DUST players would have some autonomy from the parent corporation.
- 3) Entirely separate DUST and EVE corporations but allowing contracts/alignment between them or allow DUST corps to join EVE alliances.

The CSM and CCP discussed people's desire to easily manage DUST and EVE players in the future, especially moving ISK/AUR between the two if/when that is allowed. CCP has had people ask them about multiboxing DUST and EVE.

Kelduum was in favor of allowing both DUST corps and allowing DUST players into EVE corps, with much limited roles and whatnot. The entire CSM said that having some sort of corporation at launch of DUST was critical, even if it wasn't the eventual ideal structure.

Alekseyev: Don't punish DUST corps with the EVE corp UI.

CCP Jian: Yes, that is part of why we are talking about this.

CCP Jian also pointed out that most FPS's don't have great clan support, and that DUST will be launching with as good or better support than other FPS's.

Two step asked if CCP was still planning on making DUST participation optional for FW, or if it would be more required.

CCP explained that DUST would (for now) only have combat on Temperate planets, so systems with more temperate planets would have more DUST involvement, and the systems with no temperate planets would have no DUST influence.

Two step: So will it be required? If I want to take over a system and I am in Factional Warfare and it has 8 temperate planets there, will I have to have DUST people?

CCP: There won't be a line of code in that saying that, but I think in practice you would have to.

Two step: I think this is great.

CCP likes this system because it means that the planetary landscape would matter.

Elise: I think that is pretty neat. So you can attack systems with a lot of temperate planets if you want DUST to be involved.

CCP mentioned that in 0.0, the plan is for DUST actions to be additive to sov bonuses and not detrimental.

Two step: So you are saying you don't need planetary control to take sov?

CCP Jian: Yeah, that is right. Sov is sov, planetary control is planetary control, but if you have both then we are looking at bonuses on that.

CCP is still not decided about how the 0.0 mechanics will work, and they hope to learn from the FW rollout. They expect to have the 0.0 mechanics "softer" than the FW ones, because they understand that players are worried about 500,000 DUST players changing the sov map overnight. They don't expect to have the same mechanics from FW used for 0.0 sov, but they do hope to learn valuable lessons from DUST's involvement in FW that they can apply to the 0.0 system.

Elise: Yeah, if it is additive, I would want to hire DUSTies to live in my capital system.

CCP replied that it would be good for them as well, because they would be getting their own industrial resources

Two step: I guess I am less concerned about the whole people taking over overnight. If I am a 0.0 entity and this matters, then I should be willing to pay top dollar to the DUST mercenary corps and hire the very best to defend my space. I don't let random bad people in my alliance in EVE if I want to hold my space, why should I have random bad DUST people in my alliance to help me hold my space?

CCP Jian: Yeah, Two step, this is what we talked about at Fanfest. You are representing the extreme end of the integration, which philosophically we understand and would like to do, but we are looking at baby steps, which is why we have these two notions, sov and planetary control. You have the SCC (surface command center) which is the flag you plant in the ground and is the first bit of infrastructure you have to build in DUST, which gets resources for DUST people. You have the OCC (orbital command center) that is in space that is controlled by EVE people. If those two things are controlled by the same people and the planet and sov then there is a whole bunch of additive things we can do on top of it, but then taking that extra step of saying that to defend my sovereignty, to defend my space this should be directly influenced, that is just the one step that is too aggressive for us to take as a default position, but if it turns out that this Factional Warfare stuff plays out amazingly and people want us to do more than that is a conversation we will have with you guys and a step we can look at taking.

The discussion turned back to FW and the rollout plans for DUST.

CCP Xhagen: Anything else the CSM wants to add? Trebor, you haven't said anything, which is unusual.

Trebor said that this is an area where other CSMs have more expertise than him, and his issues have all been raised. Seleene said he is in "wait and see mode", while people start learning more about DUST.

The discussion then turned to when the economies of the two games would be linked.

Two step expressed some concern about the DUST prices being very cheap to EVE players.

CCP said they are also concerned about this, and they will have levers to control some of the money flow, including taxing transfers, changing item prices or changing ISK rewards in DUST. The issue of making guns cost as much as a frigate was brought up, and Seleene brought up the relative prices of guns, shoes and his ships.

Two step pointed out that guns were small, and it costs more money to make things little. With the recent expansion of the DUST beta, CCP is now starting to look at the relative burn rate of guns versus a ship in EVE, and can start to balance that out more.

The CSM was concerned about anyone's ability to predict what will happen once DUST is live on TQ, because nobody has ever done anything like this before.

Two step: You have the risk of setting up EVE players as gods in DUST because they have this giant pile of money. Or if I am a serious DUST player, I could start an EVE account and run level 4 missions or whatever because I can make ISK faster than I can make it in DUST.

Seleene asked how DUST ties into Planetary Interaction.

CCP Jian said that they were looking at having PI pins within DUST districts pay taxes to the owners of the district.

Two step asked about if the SCC would be able to tax PI transfers like a POCO can.

CCP is still looking into how DUST would impact PI, and isn't willing to commit to anything for the initial release, but is thinking about how to make the systems interact, including bonuses to PI production if DUST players build certain structures in their districts.

Seleene pointed out that when PI first came out, CCP's intent was that it would be the way that DUST interacted with EVE, and now it seems like they aren't linked at all.

CCP said that PI didn't have things like territoriality, and the CSM pointed out that PI had no PVP or real gameplay in it at all.

CCP's plan is to first work out the DUST district system, and then figure out how to tie it into things like PI.

Two step pointed out that just allowing DUST corps to tax PI would result in a lot of interaction, as EVE players would make deals with DUST corps for lower tax rates.

CCP Jian asked for the entire CSM to state their opinions on DUST corporations. Two step voted for unified corps eventually, but would be OK with either of the other options in the interim. Before hearing the rest of the views, the discussion got sidetracked to talk of how ownership of districts in nullsec would work. After the summit, the CSM was asked on the CSM forums, and Trebor, Kelduum, Alekseyev, Two step, Issler, Dovinian were in favor of DUST only corps to start with and Hans wanted DUST players to be able to join EVE corps.

At the end of the meeting, the CSM invited the DUST devs to join them on Skype and to ask for feedback on the CSM forums.

EVE UI

Present: CCP Arrow, CCP Sharq, CCP Unifex, CCP Punkturis, CCP Explorer, CCP Optimal, CCP Soundwave, CCP Tuxford, CCP Frellicus, Alekseyev Karrde (Lync)

CCP Arrow began by asking the CSM if they'd like to see a video presentation showcasing the direction of his current work. There are four main ideas posted on the screen:

A new notification UI

A new station services UI

A ship viewer, including a bubble pop-up

"Fitting Fantasies"

CCP Arrow emphasized that none of these items are ones that have been committed to yet, but that are simply early ideas. He then proceeded to begin the video, showing an amalgamation of work compiled over a couple years. The video appears to be the same one shown at Fanfest.

CCP Arrow then began discussing a new notification UI. He explained that there are many kinds of notifications that appear in the game, and consolidate them into a single interface. CCP Arrow emphasized that there were two key groups of notifications that would be kept separate: combat notifications, and all other notifications. The UI would be a menu interface that could be folded into the Neocom, and allow you to turn on and off items like the wallet blink for various types of transaction. Other forms of pop up notifications would be included in this menu as well, as

opposed to just appearing in the middle of your screen. The user could sort these menu items by date, or location where they happened, and control the various ways these notifications behave in the game.

CCP Arrow noted that these would also include new types of notifications for Faction Warfare, for items that the players receive currently but that they usually get in a delayed form. He added that it was actually work on these Faction Warfare notifications that inspired him to extend this new interface into the rest of the game's notifications as well. CCP Arrow warned that there was no official date set on the new interface, but that this was important to implement soon as the more types of notifications that get built into the client, the messier it gets and there needs to be an efficient system to manage them all. Since some things matter to some players, and not to others, CCP Arrow emphasized that there needs to be a way for players to have the freedom to choose how this all worked.

Elise asked if some of notifications that were currently in the form of mails could be transitioned over to the new interface, and CCP Arrow confirmed that the goal was to bring those types of notifications into the new UI, which would require less clicking and have faster access to the notification content. Two step asked if this would allow players to completely ignore notifications, and CCP Arrow confirmed this as well.

Next up was the station services UI, CCP Arrow explained that one of the things he'd been hearing was that the ship hangar was pretty important to players, and that they had essentially hid it by inserting it into the new unified inventory tabs. There needed to be a better way to display ships in station. Since the station services tab was essentially a list of things available in the station, CCP Arrow explained that it made sense to integrate the ship hangar into that instead. The limitation of course is the amount of real estate on the window, so in order to create more room the station logo and station service items would be reduced substantially in size, condensing them into small, easy to understand icons. This frees up the Guests, Agents, and Offices tabs to be transformed into moveable windows, so that they could be displayed all at once, or one at a time, depending on user preference. As for the ship hangar, it would contain a list of ships as well as a more visual indicator as to when new ships were added, such as a blink.

CCP Arrow: "Another thing would be that you could get at a glance, by selecting one of them in the list, some information that you currently need to go into the fitting window to get, and even some of them that you have to go outside of the client to get. It could be something simple, or it could be something complex, or maybe it is something that the players set up because they just want to know different things, depending on their playstyle. And the thing that we are excited about that we want to implement here that not only would you drag the ship out of the hangar to basically activate it, but you could select a fitting that you've saved out from a quick menu here, which is the bubble popup that CCP Sharq will be showing you later. Where basically you could just drag the fit over, which in one action activate that ship, with the fitting. And tying into that, we would like to

have it just save everything that you have on the ship. So basically you have a ship, that you put certain rigs on, and you filled the cargohold with ammo, drones, and everything, and you save that – than that is what you get when you load this again."

Elise and Seleene both noted that this was pretty awesome.

Two step: "I mean just having rigs fit when you save a fit, all that stuff is win, this is even more incredible."

Two step then asked CCP Arrow if the station name would still be clearly visible in the station service panel, and CCP Arrow confirmed that it would. CCP Arrow then proceeded to explain that you would be creating a list of all the ships in your inventory, and be able to assign fits to ships, without having to actually activate each ship. The active ship should remain at the top of the list, but fittings could be assigned to ships in the list without actually activating them, and that by the fit over you could activate the ship with the fitting in one motion. CCP Arrow explained that the player would hover the cursor over a ship and get buttons that would enable you to select a fit. Clicking the button would display the fitting information, and dragging the fitting over would activate the ship. Two step asked how you would tell if the ship was active, and Elise pointed out that the non-active ships were greyed out. CCP Arrow noted that there could probably be a more prominent way of showing which was active. Two step suggested that it would be better if it was highlighted and a bit larger in size.

Lastly, CCP Arrow explained that mousing over a ship name, even if not active, would display an undock button, which when clicked would fit the inactive ship and undock with it, in a single motion.

CCP Arrow added that these were all ideas that came from the feedback that the hangar was an important part of the station experience pointed out that even the 3D model was only accessible by right-clicking "show info", and would now be visible as part of the pop up window when a ship was selected. Trebor asked about whether a compact view would be included, and CCP Arrow explained that the ship list could be seen as either icons or a more compact list instead. Greene Lee added that it would be nice to have a way of sorting ships when you had them in bulk fitted and ready to go, so you could quickly find a unique ship in a large stack. Two step noted that it would be great to have a filter system included, and CCP Arrow agreed this would be a good thing to include. Two step praised CCP Arrow for the use of filters in all of the recent UI upgrades. Trebor stated that any list included in the game should have a filter box associated with it.

CCP Sharq then began to demonstrate the bubble pop up, explaining that this was a form of UI control that he'd like to integrate into the client for various purposes, and that it originated from the need to provide faster access to information about those attacking you, building off the recently added effects bar. One example would be for providing additional information about attributes in

the fitting window, you could click on DPS and find out exactly what DPS means, and what modules and/or skills modify that attribute, and then access the usual "show info", "find in marketplace" etc.

CCP Tuxford then stepped forward to demonstrate some new concepts for the fitting window, explaining that under the current system, the client is simply notified of which attribute is which value, since the system that models your various skills, modules, rigs and how they affect your ships exists on the server. This turns out to be unnecessary - for example, if you are sitting in your ship in station and switch to a different ship, there's no third party that needs to access this information, and therefore there's no reason to run it through the server. The mission, which CCP Tuxford calls "Clientside Dogma" is to move this system to the client, enabling things like being able to test modules in your fitting window that you didn't even own. Additionally, ship fittings could be modified and saved without having to sit inside them. The team is currently testing this new code out, working on eliminating the bugs in attribute reporting and bringing it to a level of polish that it can be released.

CCP Sharq "If we go ahead with this, the first steps would be to correct [the attribute reporting errors], and also allow players to simulate – basically, disjoint the fitting window from the HUD and from the actual fit, so that you could be docked in a station and activate various guns to see the DPS change. You could see, for example, what happens when you turn on your hardeners, and what happens to your defenses. So basically, [EFT](#). The first steps towards that."

CCP Sharq added that the real fantasy here is to move *all* fitting capabilities to the client, even hypothetical fittings for ships you couldn't even fly yet.

Seleene took a moment to explain that what is really needed is a method of mass-fitting ships, for folks that do logistics or who contract deliveries - a way to take a stack of ships, assign a fit, and prepare them at the same time using a bucket of items taken from a corp or personal hangar. Trebor added that batch fitting didn't really need to be associated with fantasy EFT-fitting window, and that it would be useful to players much sooner if possible. Trebor also pointed out that for the fantasy fitting window, a feature such as an undo-redo slider, would enable players to look for a fit out of several they tinkered with that peaked for the attributes they were attempting to optimize. Two step added that if the direction was really to replace EFT, there needed to be a way of simulating gang links as well.

CCP Sharq emphasized that the fantasy fitting window was still just that, an idea being toyed with that stemmed out of the other projects the team had been working on. Two step replied that this functionality really needed to be built into the game, and that players shouldn't have to rely on third party tools to access this information.

CCP Arrow said that this concluded that this was the end of the ideas portion of the session, and asked the CSM what else they'd like to talk about. Two step brought up the Unified Inventory,

stating that while most players thought it was better than before, the main issue was still performance. For example, a hangar with 150 cans each with 700 items in them, might end up taking as long as 30 seconds to load. Assuming that the list of issues slated to be addressed that weekend were delivered as promised, the remaining issue was simply bringing everything up to a usable speed. Seleene asked what other elements CCP planned to iterate upon, CCP Soundwave explained that they wanted to look at the hangars located on ships, as well as monitor the changes affecting POS use to see how they turned out.

Two step asked if it would be possible to add a check-box to hide items players didn't want to see in the list, and CCP Soundwave mentioned that they were looking into a "favorites" mechanism to sort out what you want to see. Two step also shared that the other feedback he wanted to see was a way to pin a much more frameless version of the window into the UI, for cargoholds and such. CCP Arrow explained that they were also looking at changing the reported market value so that you only saw it on items you hovered over, rather than it being reported for every single item. Two step stated that he wanted to just be able to push a button to see the item value, that most of the time he didn't care about the information. CCP Soundwave countered that this was really nice when you were doing PvE, because you see your income as you accumulated loot, and Kelduum added that it was really handy for people that were thinking about stealing corp hangars.

Two step emphasized again that the feedback he'd received was that the new inventory was working fine from a station perspective, but once you were in space there needed to be a more stripped down and pinnable form of the window. Trebor suggested that there simply be a button that hides all the extra information and could bring it all back just as quickly. Greene Lee explained that he'd like to see presets built into the system, where you could hide the information that you didn't want to see, and create different windows with settings to show particular sets of inventory information. Trebor summarized that the Unified Inventory was working fine 90% of the time, but it's for the 10% of players that do particular activities in the game, that it broke down completely.

Two step then asked why it took so long for the inventory to load at a POS, CCP Arrow explained that it was because of the way the POS modules were being queried individually and that this was being addressed in a patch they were working on. CCP Arrow explained that he understood everyone's frustration with the performance, and the entire concept behind the unified inventory was to speed up some of these player activities, and that the resulting lag was a disappointment they were working fast to address.

Seleene asked why, on a carrier, he can shift click to open an individual hangar. but can't shift click to open the entire corp hangar. CCP Arrow explained that currently in the system, the corp hangar isn't considered an item itself, and would have to be converted into one before it would function this way. Seleene emphasized that it needed to become an actual item so that the players wouldn't have to open up multiple windows to access the various sub-hangars.

Seleene also noted that the "unrent office" button needed to be moved far away from where the "corp hangar" button usually resides. CCP Soundwave suggested that maybe it needed to be completely moved into corp management instead.

Two step took a moment to compliment Soundwave on the communication surrounding the Unified Inventory in the wake of all the problems the players were having with it. Seleene agreed, saying that although mistakes were made, it was great to see such immediate response and that CCP's effort in addressing the issues was a dramatic improvement over what the CSM saw around this time last year.

CCP Arrow: "And we learned a lot. We haven't had such a huge revamp of the UI since I started here, and [we're finding that] use cases are so much more than we anticipated, and trying things out on SiSi just doesn't give us a enough time to address it. We'll definitely do things differently next time."

Two step added that for things like POS's, even with the reduced anchor times, players aren't likely to go simulate working POS setups on SiSi. CCP Soundwave explained that they weren't always able to obtain such specific use cases by relying on SiSi, and that once a feature hits Tranquility it becomes instantly clear where the problems lie. Seleene asked if CCP thought the inventory actually turned out better as a result of the problems and the second examination of system.

CCP Soundwave: "I think we still would be iterating on it, like we're looking at Faction Warfare stuff still. And the fact that we're doing it on a much faster time scale than we did before, that's basically the problem solving that we haven't approached the same way in the past. [The unified inventory] is a feature that people aren't liking and we're just going to throw everything at it until they like it, instead of just leaving it like Faction Warfare. So for all the bad about this, I'm fairly happy about how we handled what went wrong, and looking back I think that it's that most of this stuff needed to go wrong."

CCP Soundwave further explained that he was more concerned with how the Faction Warfare stuff was turning out during the preparation for Inferno, and that he never expected that the Unified Inventory system would turn out to be the feature with the most criticism. CCP Soundwave also admitted that closer attention needed to be paid to the SiSi forums leading up to releases, and that he learned that lesson from this experience. Two step added that all of this feedback had been expressed to CCP through the CSM Skype chat, but Seleene acknowledged that the CSM could also make sure that the internal forum posts happened even earlier in the process next time around.

Forwarding a comment from Alekseyev, Seleene asked if it would be possible to obtain a graphical representation of the scan cone when using the directional scanner in the solar system map view. Two step added that even in the normal in-space view, it was difficult to tell whether certain celestial objects were within the scanning cone or not depending on your settings. CCP Soundwave

acknowledged that this was a massive barrier of entry into the game, learning to scan, and Kelduum confirmed that this was a several hour class that was taught to new players.

CCP Frellicus elaborated a bit on the cone view as something that CCP wants to do, but the technical matter of 'your current view is the scan cone' is presenting a problem – this is not as a 'low hanging fruit' as it appears at the first glance.

Greene Lee brought up the issue of conversations during fleets, and noted that it was frustrating to have conversation invitations always pop up and interfere with whatever he was doing. Two step noted that it would be nice if there was simply a place where these invitation notifications could be grouped and sorted. After Kelduum noted that he's watched people die after an entire fleet convoed them at once, Trebor jokingly suggested that there be a 10,000,000 ISK CSPA charge for a conversation invite if the recipient was in their pod in space.

Seleene then asked the room if there was anybody that actually used the F11 minimap information. Two step explained that he used it for seeing the cone of the directional scanner, CCP Soundwave added that he used it for short range travel directions.

Alekseyev: "It's shitty for the cone of D-scan. It's a 2D piece of crap."

CCP Arrow said that maybe this could be transformed into a widget of some kind, rather than a menu bar, and asked the CSM if it was the content they were more concerned with than the format. UAxDEATH replied that yes, it would be great if there were a way to customize which of these mini-displays were visible at any given time.

Going back to the idea of CSPA charges, CCP Soundwave leaned back and jokingly asked CCP Unifex if they could just eliminate CSPA charges completely. CCP Soundwave explained that while they worked for preventing ISK spamming, really all they end up doing is preventing newbies from doing anything. Kelduum excitedly agreed. CCP Unifex suggested that they just default the charge to zero, but allow players to reinstate it if they so choose.

CCP Soundwave: "This is one of the things where a small part of the population does things badly, and we end up just punishing everyone. It's just a silly, dumb, system."

CCP Soundwave then said he was really interested in what types of intelligence tools the CSM might be interested in, and how they might be packaged into some really interesting UI. Two step mentioned that a remote overview for scouting might be useful, so that someone could broadcast everything they see to their FC in another system. Elise mentioned that he'd like to share a player-created mock-up of a similar type of broadcast report, and passed his tablet over to CCP Soundwave.

Elise: "It's not perfect, but something similar to that. So I can see exactly who's in my fleet, who's getting shot at, and how many ships I have of each type, and someone could send this to me remotely, or I could just see this because I'm the fleet boss.....a kind of super-watchlist."

Elise explained that he didn't want to have to ask scouts this information, he wanted to just see this information, because even the time taken to communicate this intelligence often made it obsolete by the time it reaches the FC. CCP Arrow mentioned that they always wanted to observe an FC in practice. UAXDEATH said that a lot of the hassle is the movement of the items on the overview when they're sorted by distance. Two step suggested that some of the more experienced FC's write up reports about exactly what they do when commanding a fleet, but CCP Soundwave replied that he'd much rather SEE what they're doing as they do it. CCP Arrow mentioned that they had a program called Moray that would create a timeline, with multiple observation points, and would track not only client displays but also records keystrokes, and would enable them to recreate player activity and glean information about what might be needed. Trebor joked that it would be much easier to just install a direct port to their brain using a socket in the back of their head.

Two step noted that it might be nice to have a better way of indicating whether a ship was in optimal range of your weapons. CCP Sharq mentioned that maybe this could be incorporated into the effects bar, and be customized to show which ships were within a certain range and were of a certain ship type, available in some form of a pop-up bubble. Two step added that being able to see whether there were drones attacking you would also be incredibly useful to have on the effects bar. CCP Sharq agreed, explaining that E-war is really on the first step of including information on the effects bar, that there was other functionality he would like to add on as well. For example: incoming damage, incoming repairs, requests for assistance, etc. Two step cautioned that to avoid over-complication, it might be best to only have the effects bar show things that a pilot needs to stay alive, rather than things he needs to see to keep other people alive. Elise added that it's a shame that pilots have to focus on a broadcast history so much for doing logistics, instead of just observing the cool part of the game. UAXDEATH agreed that pilots were too afraid to miss a broadcast which would mean losing an entire ship.

Two step asked if drones were still slated to be turned into a module in terms of the UI, and CCP Arrow loaded up a picture of the work in progress. Drones would be turned into a small orb-like button similar to the other modules, and be able to be "loaded" with whichever drones were about to be deployed, much like ammunition. This orb would have a glowing color to it, and that the location of the glow and the speed of its flash would visually demonstrate the current behavior of the drones, such as idling, travelling, or attacking a target. This location and flash speed indication would prevent colorblind people from being unable to operate the drone button properly.

CCP Arrow added that one of the design barriers to implementing this was that they didn't want to interfere with a pilot's ability to micromanage drones, and said that iteration was required on the existing drone window that that functionality was only being added, not removed in the process.

CCP Arrow also noted that they had been watching video footage of planes that were in the process of crashing, and gaining inspiration from actual cockpit indicators that assisted pilots during an emergency and seeing how they transitioned into a state where essentially all they were doing was telling you that you were about to die.

Kelduum revisited the idea of an indicator for optimal range and tracking, emphasizing that this was an extremely difficult process to explain to newer players. CCP Arrow asked CCP Soundwave about whether they could have a sort of overlay on the screen that could contain these indicators, and Two step added that he had heard players asking about velocity vectors on overviews as well. CCP Soundwave said that he wondered whether there might be a more simple "hit or miss" system, where you could have someone targeted, than hover your mouse over a gun and see either a green for a hit or something along those lines. Two step agreed, noting that he had heard players on Reddit sharing ideas for color-coded indicators about whether weapons were effective.

Trebor: "There are essentially two questions here. Can I hit this guy with my guns, who should I be shooting because I can't hit this guy."

Elise warned that he didn't like the client telling players who to shoot in a battle, but Trebor replied that this just creates an enormous amount of memorization about the conditions of success based on ship type, skill level, etc. He explained that this was the disagreement that he had last year with Meissa Anunthiel, and that while it was fine that for the experienced power-users that could look at a column of numbers and know how to use them, for the average user it was simply information overload. Trebor added that no real-world UI system presented information this way anymore, and that over complication was unnecessary. Seleene agreed, explaining that the holographic HUD in a modern F-22 required no math from the pilot. Elise pointed out that while he understood the need for a simplified indicator, he wanted to retain an advantage as an experienced players – citing an example of two targets being yellow for moderate damage but that he could use the numerical indicators to know that one could be hit for more damage than the other.

Trebor suggested that this red-yellow-green gradient would actually help Elise make those kinds of critical math decisions, but eliminating the excess data and allowing him to zero in on the information he really needed to look at closely. Elise agreed, concluding the session by emphasizing again that whatever simplified indicators were created, they keep from crossing the line to the point where they make decisions for players through explicit instruction.

Null sec

Present: CCP Soundwave, CCP Unifex, CCP Ytterbium, Alekseyev Karrde (Lync), Hans Jagerblitzen (Lync)

CCP Ytterbium kicked things off by saying he didn't have much to talk about aside from a list of questions, since his team was squarely focused on the Factional Warfare feature for the coming months.

Seleene jokingly asked if that meant things would be stagnant for the next two years.

Two step got into things by asking about DUST, specifically whether the DUST link in 0.0 would impact sov or not.

NOTE: Another NDA area, but existed of a quick back and forth about the timeline for DUST/ EVE sov integration with Soundwave and Ytterbium making the points that "you guys (EVE players) will still be shooting" and that DUST will not flip systems on their own.

Seleene mentioned CCP Unifex brought up the perennial destructible outpost idea, along with massively increasing their build cost and being able to build more than one per system so 0.0 players were not forced to take 3 systems to get "basic functionality". Seleene expects a massive reset and "purge" if that were to happen.

Seleene: "Is this even in the realm of possibility in the next 6-8 months?"

Two step also mentions the idea of doubling the factory slots.

Soundwave says CCP might be able to squeeze some things in but they have a development schedule already worked out.

UAxDEATH brings up the point that destructible outposts have been talked nearly every CSM summit, including the last one.

Soundwave poses the rhetorical question of now that CCP finally sat down to do another oft-talked about feature in Factional Warfare, would the CSM really like them to stop progress there and do something else?

Seleene points out that everything in EVE that players build players can destroy except for this one thing and it's resulting in veritable "ghost towns."

Ytterbium raised the concern about what happens to players stuff when an outpost is destroyed as a possible objection.

UAxDEATH states that players should have a chance at losing everything if they mess up.

Seleene points out that if CCP decided to do the feature, that aspect of it could be "literally game designed around."

Two step raised the concern that making outposts destroyable in isolation would greatly increase the risk of null sec without the accompanying increase in rewards one might expect from a full iteration of sovereignty.

Seleene clarified that's not what he was talking about, but that null players don't want to wait a year and a half to get some dev attention.

CCP reiterated they wanted to prioritize keeping their focus so iterations could happen properly.

Ytterbium wanted to hear some reasons why null sec was viewed as so dead.

Greene Lee piped up that 0.0 players, some of the oldest players in the game, are suffering from a lack of motivation to take action; trading super capitals is not fun or needed, if an alliance loses space it can just wait and take it back later. He raised the issue of remote reps on super carriers as one factor making supercap combat "not fun. You have 50 super carriers, and you can do nothing."

Elise Randolph: "You bring titans and you volley through them. It doesn't matter how many reps you have if you have titans."

Greene Lee: "You need how many titans?"

Seleene/Elise: "16, 16-17 to go through an Aeon. Not a lot."

Greene Lee moved on to lack of motivation to defend individual systems as "you don't need to undock to defend your system, really." He views POS iteration more potentially more useful in addressing this point than iterating on the larger sov mechanic.

Two step raised the issue that the massive amount of money in the game has taken a lot of the meaning out of losses, with players less inclined to defend assets or get mad and take revenge for losing them.

Two step: "It used to be the case in null sec that you'd have a giant battle, it would hurt, and it would mean you're mad at the other guys and want to take revenge. Now it's like 'meh I lost my battle cruiser and who cares?' The money stuff needs to get looked at. If that means lowering income across the board..."

After this, Soundwave said the T-word and this led into a discussion about Technetium.

Two step was quick to point out that Tech isn't actually creating any ISK and went on to state that half a trillion ISK comes into the economy every day, and for every 2 trillion coming in only 1 trillion is going out. He believes the many faucets this is coming from should be cut back across the board.

Soundwave: "I can, with virtual certainty, say that this December we're going to do something about cap and supercap presence in anomalies. That is the biggest faucet we have right now."

Seleene thought that was cool.

Two step reiterated the other faucets should be considered.

The table wanted to get back to talking about null sec, with Elise chiming in that every summer there's "doom and gloom" about stagnation and an unbeatable power bloc, then winter happens when people come back to their computers and content gets created. Elise reiterated he thinks sov should get the same level of attention and time that Factional Warfare has gotten so it's done correctly, but that's not a pressing matter: "If the tradeoff is we have to wait a little bit, that's fine by me." He went on to say it would be a good idea to take a look at conflict drivers though, specifically make more medium sized ones between tech and PI.

Alchemy was raised as a way to improve the value of more moons into that territory, providing 1600+ targets for smaller groups to fight over rather than a couple dozen for large coalitions.

Elise also reiterated that ultimately there needs to be a reason to hold space i.e. upgrades which could tweak the value but not something where every "max upgrade" system is exactly the same.

The CSM also pointed out that supers aren't running anomalies anymore, though regular caps are.

Soundwave clarified his earlier statement that the top ISK earners are all carrier pilots running anomalies.

Two step pointed out that carriers running anomalies make great targets, and perhaps the solution is not to bar them from entering those sites but to add more scrambling NPCs to expose them for longer periods of time.

Alekseyev Karrde (via Lync): "SCRAM EM"

Soundwave said the change would not be a warp gate but more like what you see with WH sites, where bringing a cap spawns additional ships like logistics, scramblers, etc.

Two step: "All you need is those scrambling rats and then the risk is increased by players which is better than risk increased by...other stuff."

Two step followed up by saying even players running anomalies with carriers don't have the right risk/reward balance when compared to highsec, particularly incursions.

Soundwave sheepishly mentioned CCP broke incursions and showed the CSM a graph depicting the drop off in incursions activity. There were many "Ohhh snaps" around the table. Ripard Teg's

analysis of incursion activity pre/post patch was mentioned by the CSM. The massive drop off of Vanguard sites was praised since they were relatively risk-free ISK.

Two step compared Incursion sites to WH sites and how quickly players de-risked both types of content. "That one with the frigates...you'd have to work to die in that."

Soundwave pointed out that people do die in incursions at rates higher than some other kinds of PvE content. He felt the main driver of incursions was social in nature, and the group PvE that the incursion sites provided was a good thing. The loss of it made him "a little bit sad" so fixes to de-nerf incursions would come out in June. Soundwave also wants to take a look at the LP store to make them more of an ISK sink, possibly giving people a way to cut around tags in offers by spending more ISK.

UAxDEATH would like to know how any of that related to null sec, followed by other CSMs asking to get back on topic. UAxDEATH raised the issue of deep 0.0 NPC stations acting as safe havens for retreating/attacking/stalling in 0.0 warfare.

Two step followed up on that by saying the problem is NPC 0.0 is too intermixed with sov 0.0 and that some world-shaping might be in order.

Soundwave offers up the idea of NPC 0.0 being a buffer between sov and lowsec.

Syndicate was hailed as an example of how NPC 0.0 should be; bordering lowsec/empire and sov 0.0 but without the ability to launch a major attack/defense against player controlled space. Venal was raised as exactly what NPC 0.0 shouldn't be, or more specifically where it shouldn't be.

Greene Lee brought up players caging NPC 0.0 space during the Delve wars as an example of sov players taking the fight to other "sov" entities staging in NPC stations. He continued that intermixed-with-sov-space NPC 0.0 regions like Curse and Stain are places where small but really high skilled alliances can develop i.e. Darkside.

Two step clarified that there was nothing wrong with NPC 0.0 as a place to live, run missions, fight etc. but the problem lay in that sov space was too accessible from these NPC regions, which Seleene explained create a convenient, unassailable fallback position for players that would otherwise be forced to defend their space or lose a lot of ISK.

UAxDEATH brought the discussion back to tech, asking that despite the current focus on FW could there be some kind of tweak.

Seleene took from the earlier discussion that there could be a fix coming for tech before December. He then turned to Soundwave and asked him to go beyond the "long term iteration" type answers

and asked him what we could expect to see next year. “Factional Warfare is a major gameplay mechanic. Sov 0.0 is also a major gameplay mechanic. When do you foresee that getting touched?”

Soundwave jokingly said that “The schedule is CCP Unifex’s fault.” He laid out the development plan of highsec/war decs, lowsec/Factional Warfare, and 0.0/POS. He thought it would be “straightforward” to tie a 0.0 theme to the POS revamp.

Seleene: “To me, POS are something everyone uses.”

Soundwave: “That’s true...” He brought up that three years ago they did Dominion which is considered failed, and 0.0 has been dragging along ever since with “no light at the end of the tunnel.”

Two step asked about doing something relatively simple like taking a look at the balance between existing upgrades.

Soundwave summarized that tech will get looked in December, perhaps some super cap changes as well (remote repping was mentioned).

UAXDEATH asks about the capital scrambler idea pitched a while ago but it did not get traction.

Seleene asked Soundwave how hard the destructible outpost idea would be on a scale of 1-10.

Soundwave countered that probably the most difficult problem would come in creating the art assets.

Elise mentioned the removal of drone alloys as something else which has spiked the prices of supercaps. Elise also asked if the roles of titans and supers would get looked at, to which Soundwave indicated they may.

Corporation management

Present: CCP Soundwave, CCP karkur, CCP Punkturis, CCP Unifex, CCP Explorer, Alekseyev Karrde (Lync), Hans Jagerblitzen (Lync)

After some brief joking about the regrettable state of the current corporate management mechanics, UAXDEATH opened the session's discussion by explaining that there is a critical need for a mechanism to expel members from a corp while they're in space. While he understood that this may be a power only held by the CEO, and not directors, UAXDEATH emphasized that the leader of

a corporation should have the ability to drop a member, anytime, anywhere, with no cool-downs or other delays.

CCP Xhagen reminded everyone that this was used as a grieving tool in the past, if there was a fight between warring corps and one member is expelled, his enemies would be CONCORD-ed instantly because the expelled member was no longer a valid target.

CCP Soundwave agreed that there needed to be some way for the CEO to “queue up” the kicking of a corp member, so that the next time he docked or logged off he would be out of the corp.

UAxDEATH strongly objected to the notion of having to “queue up” a member kick, as the CEO shouldn't be restricted in any such way when it comes to corp safety.

Two step suggested that the CEO be able to begin a warning timer, that would allow up to 15 minutes for the member to log off, and if they didn't log off they would be forced offline so that the corp removal goes through.

After Trebor reaffirmed the grieving potential of an instant kick feature, CCP Soundwave concluded that there needed to be a mechanic put in place that would allow CEO's to remove a problem member “in a reasonable amount of time.”

Trebor suggested a mechanism where you could initiate a removal, and the player would receive a warning so that the next time they logged off, hit downtime, or docked, they would be kicked.

UAxDEATH and Kelduum Revaan didn't understand the need for an actual warning to the recipient, but the group consensus was that this was a step in the right direction.

CCP Explorer warned that consideration should be taken for those involved in aggression with the member about to be kicked, because they would be the victims of concord enforcement if they weren't aware of the member's imminent removal.

Two step pointed out that a similar warning existed, referencing incursion runners that receive a notification if using logistics on a member who became flagged for aggression.

CCP Soundwave started scribbling on his notepad furiously, saying “maybe we can use this” in reference to the warning mechanic.

Two step also suggested that members be able to be kicked anytime, as long as they're not under aggression.

CCP Soundwave agreed that this would work as a solution as well.

After protesting the idea on the grounds that a problem member could easily stayed aggressed indefinitely, UAxDEATH stated once again that a CEO's power in such matters should be absolute.

UAxDEATH: "In a real life, if your ass doesn't look like it's funny, you'll get kicked out of the corporation, in the middle of a second. And nobody gonna give you a warning."

Trebor: "Yeah, but in real life, when you get fired and you start packing up your stuff, the other employees don't pull up with their Uzi's and start hosing you down. OK, well maybe in Russia they do."

Kelduum: "I was about to say, it depends on the corporation."

Everyone in the room laughed.

Seleene moved the conversation along by stating that he would love to see all these features and abilities accessible to him, without having to log into the client to do so.

Two step reaffirmed that the [CREST](#) tools CCP has developed are really awesome and that its time to start putting them in the hands of players.

CCP Explorer mentioned EVE Gate as a potential place to house these controls, but UAxDEATH was concerned with the fact that the corporate UI was already pretty poor, and that third party tools would allow players to come up with something better.

Two step explained that from what he has seen, the folks working on the CREST project are mostly preoccupied getting Dust 514 integration ready, and that this may be the reason we haven't seen any beta versions of the new CREST system for EVE Online itself.

CCP Unifex responded by saying that a dev blog was in the works regarding this matter.

UAxDEATH also expressed interest in a feature where you could create a custom role, but Kelduum explained that this was mostly already possible through the use of titles, which could be customized to contain any number of corp roles.

Two step asked if anyone actually used the "Headquarters or Based at" settings, and Kelduum said that EVE University uses these extensively.

Seleene was also surprised to hear that someone actually used these.

Kelduum then proceeded to give everyone a brief tutorial on how they worked and could be used to group players by access to a particular station.

CCP Xhagen explained that the value in the current system was that it was incredibly powerful, and Kelduum defended the practical use of all the various features and controls.

The problem, as Seleene pointed out, is that these are not intuitive in any way.

Two step added that the current system only allows for three locations to be assigned user access, and would love to see a more robust mechanic where players could be grouped, and then given access to a set of locations based on that group.

Kelduum elaborated on the issue regarding current roles – for example when Communications Officer began it was simply the ability to post or delete alliance mails. Now the role controls bulletins, MOTD's in channels, and even has power over corp bookmarks.

Two step: “Clearly corp bookmarks were hung off of communications officer because someone was like, 'I need a role to hang this off of', not because it had anything to do with communications.”

As CCP Soundwave continued to take notes, UAxDEATH asked if there was a way to more accurately show how many members were online with a given role inside of an alliance, even if it was a simpler set of information than was available at the corporate level.

CCP Soundwave: “In general, we just want real alliances. They're not a real entity (like corporations are) right now.”

Two step remarked that it would be nice if “show info” on an alliance showed the total number of players in that alliance.

UAxDEATH further explained that right now the alliance member listing is bugged and that if the alliance is 100 players or less, the listing is readable in the UI. As soon as the alliance goes over 100 members, the window ceases to show details about the additional members.

The conversation then turned to industrial operations, Two step mentioned that players in the forums had been asking for more restrictions on who can complete build jobs.

Kelduum clarified that currently, the necessary role is build manager, which also enables cancellation of other corp member's jobs. It would be wonderful to have a mechanic instead for isolating these functions so that corp members can install and pick up their own jobs without having access to everyone's jobs.

UAxDEATH expanded on this by asking if it was possible to separate POS management from the skill needed to actually operate the manufacturing or research equipment, it shouldn't be necessary to operate the tower itself in order to access the housed facilities.

After a brief pause for CCP Soundwave to finish recording more notes, Two step asked about the possibility of having customized corporate logos, much like the customizable alliance logos we currently have. Two step explained that there wouldn't be a need for CCP to moderate corp logos if there was a flag button that could mark a logo as inappropriate.

Two step: "I understand this is some overhead for you guys, but if there was some form of community vetting, to get the penises out.... and not have to use the funny logo designer"

CCP Soundwave: "I'd rather have a few penises and a good system, than a bad system."

Greene Lee took a moment to bring up the issue of sov transfer in 0.0 space, and stated that there was a need for a method to transfer sov between alliances. Currently the holding alliance has to drop sov and then the receiving alliance has to claim it – basically the mechanic is based around hostile takeovers, not transfer of sov.

Kelduum and UAxDEATH jointly confronted CCP Soundwave on the time line for corporate management updates.

CCP Soundwave explained that they have some room to take care of "little things" as part of the winter expansion, and hoped that some of these issues would be addressed at that time.

Two step mentioned the ethnic relations skill book, pointing out its silliness.

CCP Soundwave agreed that it was unnecessary and impeded social interaction, and explained that it would likely disappear since they were cleaning things up in preparation of Dust 514 members entering the system.

Two step moved on and asked about monetary distributions, asking if it would be possible to get more access to the CREST system so players can construct their own ways of paying their corporate members, since there is no efficient way to do this in-game.

UAxDEATH complained that the wallet system in general was too simple and didn't contain enough ways to track how various subgroups in your corporation are spending their money.

Two step: "Let people who know what they're doing, have this link-up and make it really easy to transfer money. I guess the thing that bothers me is that you have these tasks that basically have to be done by a director/leadership, and imposing all this load on them just makes them want to quit. And these are the guys you need."

Kelduum shared that he was approached by an individual who wanted to give 25,000,000 ISK to everyone newly enrolled in EVE University. The problem was that there were so many new members he literally couldn't do it in any reasonable amount of time.

Two step concluded that although this was one of the riskiest changes, it was one of the most badly needed, and would get more players excited about working with the new CREST interface.

Kelduum added that adding roles to a member was similarly tedious and had to be done by hand.

Two step then made an appeal to CCP to continue working on the in-game browser. He explained that players were creating “some pretty crazy apps” with it, and that additional work on the browser to add more features would pay off by allowing players to create their own tools.

Two step: “It lets you guys be a little bit lax on the UI, because players would be able to come up with their own UI.”

Kelduum moved on to talk about recruitment, but the group decided it would be best covered by the New Player Experience session scheduled for later that day.

Two step wrapped up the session by reiterating that these corporate management issues are burning out the people that are creating the in-game content.

Seleene mentioned again that these things should be able to be done without even logging into the game.

CCP Unifex explained that in the short term, players would likely see smaller fixes to ease the pain of some of these tasks, as supposed to a complete overhaul. CREST access, however, could come sooner than an overhaul of the in-game corporate interface.

War decs and Crimewatch

Present: CCP Masterplan, CCP Greyscale, CCP Unifex, CCP Explorer, CCP Punkturis, CCP Tallest, CCP Tuxford, Alekseyev Karrde (Lync), Hans Jagerblitzen (Lync)

CCP Greyscale begins by asking what the CSM would like to talk about regarding crimewatch, and verifies that everyone in the room has seen [the Fanfest presentations](#). Alekseyev Karrde, (via his giant face on the screen), asks how neutral reps are going to be addressed with the new Crimewatch rules.

CCP Greyscale explains that there is a self-defense clause, if someone shoots you, you are legally able to shoot them back. However, people assisting that person would be safe.

CCP Greyscale: “Otherwise, it becomes a complete nightmare. If you've got someone hunting you down, and they have logistics, it sucks to be you. Hopefully that's a reasonable compromise.”

Two step responds by saying that he thinks Aleks is asking about how this intersects with wardecs.

CCP Greyscale illustrates with an example: He and CCP Masterplan are at war. Seleene is his best buddy, and is flying logistics for CCP Greyscale. If CCP Masterplan comes along and starts fighting CCP Greyscale, then Seleene cannot get involved since he is not part of the war. Seleene would get a "suspect" flag for repping CCP Greyscale.

Aleks then asks about how this works with jump countdowns, docking, etc.

CCP Greyscale explains that neutral assistance would inherit the same countdown as the aggressor they are repping. Thus, the logistics can only jump or dock at the same time as those they assist. If the recipient ceases firing, the logistics pilot's countdown begins winding down as well.

Aleks is relieved, and re-emphasizes that this is the change most players want to see with regards to remote reps.

CCP Masterplan continues the conversation by showing a diagram describing the aggression timer. He explains that most of the time players are in the "idle" state. As soon as they start shooting, or are actively repping someone who is, you end up in a "weapon [active]" state (cannot dock or jump). The minute you or the person you are repairing ceases fire, you begin your countdown and are part of the "weapon [timer]" state. CCP Greyscale reiterates that the timer you have is only inherited from your aggressed recipient, and begins to count down the minutes you cease repping someone.

Satisfied that the crimewatch / logistics issues seem to be in good situation, Aleks asks if the conversation can shift to the stuff that is actually broken regarding wardecs, primarily the "mercenary marketplace".

Trebor Daehdoow interrupts and requests that before everyone moves on, he would like to know if CCP Greyscale can package up the diagram shown during the meeting and send it to the CSM for further review. CCP Greyscale declines, as they are his design documents in an unfinished state and he doesn't feel comfortable releasing them. However, CCP Greyscale agrees to pull up the internal wiki and see if it is in a state he's willing to release to the CSM.

Elise Randolph has one final crimewatch question – regarding storing ships in carriers/Orcas. Does the timer carry over to the Orca if a criminal swaps ships?

CCP Greyscale responds that no, not at this time, there is no inheritance of the timer for ships being swapped.

CCP Masterplan asks if the fix is to block ships from being swapped under aggression, Aleks responds by saying he'd rather see the timer be applied to the Orca.

CCP Masterplan expressed concern about this being exploitable in high sec.

Alekseyev Karrde: "Only if the exploit would be that the Orca would get Concorded, which actually sounds pretty good"

CCP Greyscale adamantly explains that the timer should not be inherited by the Orca because of the potential for abuse, and innocent ships dying for doing things they thought were within the rules.

Two step: "Innocent people don't fly Orcas, man." (Room laughs)

CCP Greyscale moves on to explain his work on sentry guns. Sentry guns will now shoot anyone with a criminal flag, suspect or otherwise. Sentry guns will also start with smaller amounts of damage, and ramp up with time. Ideal tuning will be to where triage carriers will die at around 4 1/2 minutes. This way, if you want to use triage carriers in lowsec on gates you can, but you must commit to the cycle for a length of time before starting your reps, if you want to deactivate triage before the sentry guns kill you and jump out. CCP Greyscale also points out that another goal is to make it so that the first couple of hits won't kill an interceptor immediately, enabling a quick tackle, and then a warp out.

Aleks remarks that this would be great for enabling more frigate use in lowsec piracy.

Aleks asks when all of these changes will be released, and when there will be dev blogs released for this information.

CCP Masterplan explains that this is where everything is at in the design process, that they're looking forward to working more on this as the Inferno stuff dies down.

CCP Soundwave: "It is looking like a December release."

Aleks and CCP Greyscale briefly discuss community response to these changes, Greyscale acknowledges that the changes to "suspect" flagging would upset some players, particularly can-flippers.

Aleks pointed out that the one real concern is that removing can-flipping means removing the one way for a legitimate 1 vs. 1 to occur in high sec.

CCP Greyscale proposes instead that there be a flag fleet-to-fleet option that would allow free fighting to occur.

Aleks supported this possibility.

CCP Greyscale explains that it would enable two fleets to enter a temporary state of wardec, that would function exactly like a concord-sanctioned wardec from a mechanical standpoint, it would simply last for 15 minutes or whatever the agreed-upon time would be.

Two step jokes that there should be a "dueling glove" item (purchasable by Aurum) that you could drop in a can and if looted it would prompt such a flagging.

Moving onto wardec, CCP Punkturis takes a moment to explain the work she is finishing on the wardec interface, moving the ally / surrender / mutual war options into a single control, so it is easier to access and use.

CCP Soundwave then begins a review of wardec features that didn't make it into Inferno, but are being worked throughout 2012:

- CCP is working on making ally contracts of fixed length, that this was the main feedback they were hearing from mercenaries.
- CCP is working on making sure that you can clearly see which ally has contributed the most work to the war, so you can evaluate the quality of your assistance.

Aleks mentions that it would be nice for war report information to be linkable like a kill report, so that in conversations or in corp info boxes you can include a record of past successes. "I want to be able to wave my epeen around, I don't want someone to have to reach in to get it."

CCP Soundwave then lists more items in the backlog:

- Being able to see individual battles in the war report, so you can track an engagement.
- Being able to see a timeline in the war report, to track progress.
- Placing more headers on graphs so the information is clearer.
- Being able to filter wars by the most active war, so players can voyeuristically watch war progress around the universe.
- Placing a cap on wardec costs, somewhere around 500 million. CCP Soundwave explains that the goal is to make decaying large groups easier for smaller groups.
- Enabling a "forced peace" after an enemy has surrendered, so you can buy your way into safety and that surrender becomes an attractive option to use.

- Enabling owning / destruction of high sec POCO's (Aleks emphasizes this would be a great conflict driver in high sec space. Since players would have to use wardecs to take them out safely, it would foster use of the war dec system.)

Two step expresses concern that allowing high sec customs offices to be fought over might lead to large alliances dominating control of high sec space.

Elise Randolph disagrees, and along with CCP Soundwave points out that this is an incredible amount of coverage, that its unlikely large alliances will have the resources to micromanage both high sec and null sec properties. Especially since high sec POCO maintenance will revolve around Osprey repairs, not carrier repairs.

CCP Soundwave hopes that large industrial corps will take over expanses of POCOs, instead of 0.0 entities.

Two step also reiterates that high sec POCO tax rates must always be higher than everywhere else, so that the advantage to production isn't taken away from low sec.

Wrapping up the review of the backlog, CCP Soundwave explains that these are the ideas being toyed with and are gathering feedback on.

Two step begins explaining that the major issue with the current wardec system is that there is little incentive for any corporation to declare war when you are essentially inviting everybody in EVE to fight you for free.

Hans Jagerblitzen states that a limit on the numbers of allies promotes careful decision making and makes the selection competitive.

Kelduum Revaan suggests that a limit on the numbers of corporations one can ally with would work as well.

Aleks explains that large alliances have no incentive to use the system when it hands every player in the game a free wardec against them as a headliner target. Small corps have no incentive to declare war because they lack the numbers to compete with everybody piling on an ally request. Mercenaries have no incentive to declare war because they are unlikely to complete a specific contract if they are interfered with by an unlimited number of allied responses.

Aleks continued and said that there is a current novelty of corps piling on unlimited ally requests, but that overall he hears a lot of folks saying that they don't plan on continuing to use the new war dec system because of the excessive risks involved. He expressed frustration with the fact that Inferno was supposed to encourage the use of the war dec system, not do the opposite.

Two step adds that griefer corps now no longer have to even pay for wardecs, they can essentially just wait and accept ally contracts for free and circumvent war costs entirely.

CCP Soundwave agrees that this needs to be limited in some fashion, but doesn't specify exactly how.

Aleks reminds CCP Soundwave that there needs to be a fixed length to ally contracts, so that the defender isn't locked into their original selection. If an ally underperforms, they can be replaced by someone more effective.

Elise Randolph suggests that the system not be limited to a single allied relationship, because groups that wanted to take multiple allied contracts could end up burying themselves in too many targets if not careful, and liked that element of risk.

Aleks recommends that there be a limited number of ally slots, like 2 or 3 at the most.

Two step suggests that perhaps the first ally is free, but that further allies could be added at an additional cost.

Seleene agrees with Aleks, and explains that a limited number of slots makes those decisions critical.

Aleks emphasizes again: "If you have a CONCORD fee, no offense, but that's bullshit. What you'll have is people that pay the CONCORD fee if it's cheaper to get in on a war."

Kelduum explains a story that occurred recently: A traditionally low sec corp wardecs EVE University, and as an experiment E-Uni allows anyone to ally with them for free. By the end of the war, they had 15 free allies. And not a single one of them actually contributed anything to the war.

Two step adds that whether or not free allies are shown to be of little value, they still discourage the low sec group from wanting to complete their objective anyways, not knowing whether or not those groups will actually fight in the war.

Aleks continues by emphasizing again that this added-risk element to the war dec system makes using it to achieve objectives impossible. Since the wardec system is designed for limited-use engagements, (like taking down a POS or similar objective), unlimited allies pushes all war dec conflicts to absurd levels. War decs should be about a group, decaying another group, and maybe some of their friends – not against everyone in EVE.

Seleene explains that mercenary activity these days is limited to Orphanage or Pandemic Legion-scale operations, small scale "mercenary" groups like this system is designed to support no longer really exist and that it would be great to see this form of gameplay grow again, but that it can't until some of these competitive opportunities are created.

CCP Soundwave asks about the need to limit the number of ally requests one group can accept.

Aleks explains that this might work but is the weaker of the two options. A limit on the number of allies one can have is a much more effective solution. Otherwise, you simply restrict the game play opportunities for groups that can effectively manage larger number of allied contracts at once.

CCP Soundwave agrees that CCP can put some sort of limit on allies.

Aleks asks to move on to other issues that haven't been discussed yet, like the corp hopping fix. While the current fix is an improvement on the old system, players can still hop into another corp and continue their business with little inconvenience. Exploiters can also use multiple simultaneous wardec to be able to duck out of a corp for whatever reason, then rejoin a second corp to continue a wardec, evading the 7 day waiting period to get back in the fight. Aleks suggests that a great improvement would be to not allow a player quitting a corp at war to join any player corp for 7 days, not just the corp they left. This would discourage players from dropping a corp to evade a wardec unless absolutely necessary.

CCP Soundwave suggested instead that they were looking at adding a monetary fee, like one or two million that a member would pay to the aggressor for leaving. Soundwave said they definitely want to look more into corp-hopping, but that for now the ally issue needed more immediate focus in terms of refinement.

Aleks then explains that another issue is that the current war dec costs are counting inactive members that have unsubscribed – and that this needs to be fixed to only count actively subscribed numbers.

CCP Tallest agrees this needed to be addressed and would be addressed soon.

Aleks points out that people are abusing the buddy system to pad corp sizes, and that this replaces one dec shield with another. Speaking more about dec shields, Aleks explains that when corps that leave an alliance they keep the war dec, those wars count against the attacker's next war dec cost. Alliances can fill themselves with tiny corps that can all leave during a wardec, greatly ballooning the costs to continue a wardec.

CCP Soundwave agrees that this is unintended and that these wars on the individual corp wars should not count against the next bill to continue a wardec, and agrees to fix the problem.

Lastly Aleks asks about allies in the mutual war system.

CCP Soundwave says that this is being taken care of, and that allies will be removed from the mutual war. Aleks explains that in the future this might be a neat idea, but under the current

system anyone can be locked into a mutual war forever, and this discourages anyone from wanting to risk allying with someone even if they are being paid for their work.

Hans Jagerblitzen asks about transparency in war declarations – right now there is no way to identify which director initiates a war.

CCP Tallest remarks that it would be good to put that into the records as well.

Kelduum adds that is similarly frustrating to never know who accepted a member application, either. It would be helpful to have a record of this information as well for accountability's sake.

Aleks agrees this would be very helpful to have.

CCP Tallest explains that his intention is for whenever a war is declared, then those receiving the war declaration would see which individual declared war on them, as well as a short explanation as to why, or the terms of the wardec.

Aleks announces he has three final things he's like to cover if there is time. The first is a request for the ability for merc's to be able to advertise their services, not just an accessible list of corps in need of support.

CCP Soundwave explains that when player to player contracts are put in place for winter expansion, this functionality should be integrated into that system.

Aleks reminds the developers that the negotiation interface is clunky and limited at the moment, and that it's much easier to just wait until another party is online to open a chat channel, and that this UI could use some polish. Aleks asks CCP to continue to consult the CSM going forward regarding the changes to the contract system, keeping us updated on the progress and not being afraid to ask questions.

CCP Tallest reminds Aleks that there will be a session the following day to brainstorm ideas for the player to player contracts.

Aleks then makes another suggestion, that contracts with allies be able to be set up through the billing system with wallets, so defenders can extend ongoing relationships and automate the payment process.

CCP Tallest agrees this would be good to put in as well.

Aleks concludes his questions by re-emphasizing that the critical changes – for example the allies system adjustments, need to happen as soon as possible and that clear communication needs to be given to the players that these problems were both understood, and that work was being done to fix them.

Kelduum then asks if the current war dec costs were finalized, or if there was changes planned in the near future.

CCP Soundwave says that he wants to see how many wars are declared first before deciding anything.

Aleks suggests that closing up the inactive membership and other dec shields will lower war dec costs and make them more attractive in general, and that they may not be in a bad place at the moment with this in mind.

Kelduum asks if there is any plan to link base war dec costs to mineral prices or any similar market index to adjust with inflation.

CCP Soundwave explains that there is no current plans to do so but that it brings up an interesting point.

Kelduum reminds CCP Soundwave that 50 million was a large fee several years ago, but that today it's not much at all.

Aleks points out that even a yearly adjustment for inflation helps to prevent another overhaul of the system if it scales naturally.

Soundwave agrees this is a fair idea.

Kelduum then expresses concern about the fact that surrendering grants immunity from a wardec of the same for a period of time, but there's no such period if a war expires by the bill not being paid. Therefore a war can lapse and then be immediately be re-declared. The general consensus amongst those in the room is that this is not a major concern, and isn't likely to be addressed in the immediate future.

Aleks asks one last question as the session is concluding, and would like to know about when logistics would be included on kill reports.

CCP Punkturis explains that this is a question for the Crimewatch team, not so much the UI team. Crimewatch (the system) ultimately decides how Logistics integrate into a kill report.

Player experience – launcher

Present: CCP Atropos, CCP Alice, CCP Unifex, CCP Explorer, CCP Illurkall, CCP Arrow, Alekseyev Karrde (Lync)

CCP presented the latest work being done on the Launcher and requested CSM feedback. Upcoming changes include:

- Moving logon into the launcher, as a prelude to single sign-on where credentials from other providers can be used for verification. Eventually, forms of authentication such as a Facebook account can be supported for EVE Online accounts.

Trebor Daehdoow: How is this going to affect multiboxing?

CCP Alice: It will make it easier; you'll be able to launch multiple clients from a single Launcher instance.

CCP Atropos: When this goes live, the logon mechanics will change. You won't be able to have multiple preferences, but neither will lightweight clones of the EVE application need to be employed. [This is paraphrased and combined with a couple of Trebor questions] We have always officially unofficially supported multiboxing, and we want to make it easier, but this will happen at some future date.

- Game client settings will move into the launcher. Settings will be broken down into per-installation, per-account, and per-character. Initially, just the per-installation ones will move into the launcher.

Splash screen will go away, replaced with a progress bar for the client loading process.

- EULA agreement will happen in the Launcher, so you don't have to do it for each multiboxing instance.

Greene Lee: Will the EULA be localized into Russian with the new Launcher?

CCP Alice: That is being kept in mind, but legal-speak is tricky as everyone knows.

Two step: Are you going to do anything to make it easier to launch SiSi?

CCP Atropos: You can run this with the /server argument and it will patch for SiSi. You can make the process easier but you're always going to be downloading something.

Two step: Right now I have two installations but it would be nice if I could have just one and I could (launch TQ or SiSi without always patching back and forth). Or there was a button that would create a SiSi installation for me (and the Launcher would just patch/launch the one I want to use).

UAxDEATH: More people will use SiSi if you make it easier.

Greene Lee: In my experience, it would help.

CCP is working with TransGaming to get a Mac version of the new Launcher, but it will be released after the summer to provide time for extra hardening work.

Trebor: As long as the functionality is there and we can run multiple clients without having to have physical copies (as is the case now using the CloneMaker on Macs) then (the delay) will not be a big deal.

CCP Atropos: There are some issues with the current Mac launcher, things like what you have to do to point it at SiSi, and then it notices the change and reverts it back. It needs to be better, you shouldn't have to mess with a CloneMaker tool, etc.

Trebor: I don't think anyone on the Mac side is going to be concerned about having to wait an extra month (to ensure things are working right). Especially if you don't tell them they are waiting an extra month.

(general giggles)

UAxDEATH: Would I be able to authenticate my 30 accounts with the Launcher, then launch accounts without having to always retype passwords?

CCP Atropos: If the security concerns can be addressed, I don't see why not. But you may not want to start 30 accounts at once.

Two step: Since you have an embedded Chrome browser, it would be cool if you could use the built-in password store (or other password managers).

CCP Unifex: It would be cool, but there are security concerns.

CCP Xhagen: The EVE client used to store the password in plaintext back in 2003...

Seleene: That only lasted a few weeks, and when it got fixed, people complained that "now I have to enter my password".

CCP Atropos: One aspect of stuff like this is that it bears on the question of are we finally going to officially embrace multiboxing?

CCP Unifex: I think we can put things in that make it easy to do without officially supporting it.

Two step: But doesn't the average EVE player have 1.6 accounts?

CCP Explorer: The issue is how do we define what the minimum spec is for 2 clients or 3 clients?

CCP Unifex: We will (only) define a minimum spec for a single client and then give you the tools to run multiple clients more easily.

Elise Randolph: Importing and exporting settings is important. I should be able to export the settings from a client (or account) and import them into another one or send them to a buddy.

CCP Atropos: There was some work done to explore storing them server-side.

Two step: You don't want that; if I have a laptop and a desktop, I probably will use different settings.

CCP Atropos: Our first step is moving the generic installation-wide settings into the Launcher. Where we go from there is up in the air.

CCP Explorer: We do want to move settings to the server at some point.

Trebor: There are some people who are going to want different settings on different machines (as Two step pointed out). But having the server able to hold settings for me (so I can push stuff to the server and then pull it onto another machine) would be useful.

Two step: One thing you seem to have lost -- I liked not having to type my username each time.

CCP Atropos stated that there are lot of things like that that CCP wants to address. The change to using the embedded browser in the Launcher imposes some limitations (autocomplete is not available) but there may be ways to use cookies and javascript to do this kind of thing. He added that a reason for this meeting was to get this kind of feedback.

Two step stated that minimizing disruption to people's muscle memory habits would be appreciated.

Elise pointed out that a nice improvement would be providing a list of usernames that could be selected from.

There was a short discussion of possible shortcuts that might make common functions like logging into multiple accounts easier.

Two step noted one minor annoyance -- when the Launcher is patching, the patch notes aren't "right there" so they can be read (in the Launcher) while EVE is being patched.

Kelduum pointed out that you shouldn't be able to hit the Launch button until patching is completed.

The CSM, in general, expressed support for the Launcher.

CCP Atropos noted that there had not been much feedback when the Launcher was on SiSi but some negative feedback from players when it went live. He had been expecting more CSM feedback.

Two step noted that he thought CSM had been asked for feature feedback as opposed to "is this annoying?" feedback. He further commented that as long as the Launcher made it easy to log in, easy to get patch notes when patching, and easy to access SiSi, he would be "100% happy" with it. However, he cautioned that any features that are moved into the Launcher should be as easy to perform, or easier, than they currently are -- no extra clicks.

Two step then pointed out some minor inconsistencies in the launcher, such as the difference between the Launcher news-feed and the one on the character selection page.

Trebor suggested that the Launcher make it easier to pick which account to launch by (for example) caching the icons of the characters in an account and displaying them. Furthermore, you could do the actual character selection in the Launcher and skip a page.

CCP Explorer: There has been discussion of doing something like that. It is a little more complicated than it appears, so this a longer-term thing, but we have thought about it. We may also be able to do something like let people buy more slots in an account.

A discussion ensued about possible ways to handle master accounts, outside authentication, accounts and character slots, and how these things might interact.

CCP Xhagen: So the basic feedback from the CSM is "don't add steps".

Two step: And if you can reduce steps, that would be better, and make it more likely to get a good reception.

CCP Atropos asked about CSM opinions regarding client updates. CSM asked when they were going to get folded into the Launcher. CCP Atropos sarcastically asked if he could keep his extra click (to start the game) if he folded client updates into the Launcher. He further stated that they would get folded into the Launcher at some point.

Two step, Trebor and Kelduum reiterated the importance of making SiSi access as easy as possible.

CCP Atropos: I will add SiSi accessibility to my list of things. That's my next 6 months sorted...

Trebor: We'll be back in 6 months to help you with the next 6 months.

CCP Atropos: If I post on the forums, will you give me feedback?

Seleene: Only if you screw things up.

In response to a CSM question, CCP Atropos noted that because the Launcher has an integrated browser, it will be possible to make the initial install a much better experience than the current "silly progress bar".

CCP Alice closed out the meeting by noting that this would be a good place to give new players some pointers.

Seleene: When you first log in to Spreadsheets Online, you may feel a little overwhelmed.



Friday, June 1st

Factional warfare discussion

Present: CCP Soundwave, CCP Ytterbium, CCP Arrow, CCP Unifex, Alekseyev Karrde (Lync), Hans Jagerblitzen (Lync)

CCP Soundwave: "Factional Warfare. This is, for me, probably the feature I am the happiest about. I think we really hit the nail on the head. We're going to make some more changes come December, we'll keep iterating on it, even though it's in a pretty good state. I'm fairly certain that by December we can have it in a place where we won't have to go back and do major things to it for a long, long time."

Hans fiddled with his audio stream, which he wasn't able to get to work, and so had to just type his responses instead. Two step mentions that Hans has prepared notes for the session, which are then placed on the screen for everyone in the room to see.

Seleene: "There's a ton of stuff here."

Two step: "Hans is not known for his brevity."

First on Hans' list is the infamous Complex (plex) spawning bug. Hans explained that this needs to be addressed immediately, by June if at all possible.

CCP Ytterbium explained that the developers thought that this was fixed, and were surprised to hear that the fix wasn't yet working properly. It would be helpful for them to have as detailed instructions as possible to aid in recreating the bug.

Hans agreed to send in writing the steps necessary to trigger the bug.

CCP Ytterbium emphasizes that this is important to fix right away, to end the continued abuse of the system.

Looking down Hans's list, CCP Ytterbium explained that the next item has already been addressed as well, the visibility bug on the plex timers. A fix should have been deployed on Tranquility a few days prior to the summit.

The third item on Hans' notes was LP payouts for plexing only occurring within proximity of the timer. Hans explained that all players inside the plex contributing to its seizure should be eligible for pay, not just those that camp the button. Players use a variety of tactics inside the plex and should be rewarded regardless of their physical position and role in the fight. Hans suggested making a payout

requirement be that you are in fleet with a pilot who is in proximity of the button, to prevent stealing of LP from those that enter the plex or decloak at the last minute.

CCP Soundwave expressed concern that this is just going to lead to fleets putting an interceptor on the button and waiting on the warp-in, and wants to leave the mechanic as it is for the time being and see how things play out.

Continuing to review Hans' list of items to be addressed, CCP Ytterbium began talking about the status of the NPC rebalance. Hans noted that a short term fix is to remove all E-war from the NPC's, until the larger overhaul can be completed.

CCP Ytterbium explained that this is a somewhat complicated affair, as the NPC's used for FW dungeons are the same NPC's used for conventional empire missions, and thus can't be altered without disrupting missions everywhere in the game. The solution CCP is going to try to work on is changing the actual spawning pattern of the NPC's in FW dungeons, to avoid the spawning of the particular NPC's that use E-war.

Noticing that the next section is Hans discussing changes to the plex tiers, CCP Soundwave asked Hans: "What do you think about the dungeon restrictions in general? Tell me what you think about the dungeon restrictions in general, and then I want to run something by you afterwards."

There was an awkward pause where Hans tries to figure out what else Soundwave is asking for, since his notes on the subject are already on the screen. Hans repeated the first item in the notes, which is that minor plexes are dominated by destroyer fleets, and that there isn't a place for simple frigate combat. Hans explained that he would like to see tiered dungeons that foster fleets of the various sizes of faction ships – thus a minor plex might allow frigates and navy frigates, but not destroyers or pirate / tech II frigates. Outposts could remain as is, though more spawning of unrestricted majors would be welcome, to bring back more battleship fleets into Factional Warfare.

CCP Soundwave went on to explain that there are two ways that the dungeon system can go. The first is to segment it along the lines Hans is talking about, iterating on separate dungeon sizes for various fleets. The other is to eliminate FW dungeon ship restrictions completely, essentially making all dungeons the same as the current unrestricted dungeons. Hans responded immediately that he doesn't like the idea, and that part of the appeal is that there is a role to be played by every ship size.

Elise Randolph also disagreed with this approach, explaining that when cruising around low sec, a lot of the small frigate PvP can be found because of the FW system, and that removing these restrictions means you're going to see FW dungeons run by 100mn Tengus and not much else.

CCP Ytterbium then said that one iteration he'd like to work on is renaming the various complexes, making it more clear which ships can go inside by their titles. Going back to ship restrictions, CCP

Soundwave added that one of the lessons he's learned from working on Incursions is that players hate to constantly play the re-ship game, once they're in a ship they want to be able to do content without being told which specific content to run.

Two step pointed out that having to re-ship for various size dungeons becomes an interesting defender advantage, since the attacker has further to travel in order to get ready for a change in complex size. Despite that explanation he'd prefer to eliminate restrictions completely.

Soundwave concluded that renaming the complexes and adding more unrestricted sites would be something CCP could easily do. Typing on Lync, Hans once more reminded CCP Ytterbium and CCP Soundwave that it would be great to have a class that only allowed tech 1 and navy frigates, no pirate ships or destroyers.

CCP Ytterbium explained that this is bit tricky and would take more time from the programmers, since the current checks on the gate can differentiate between tech 1 and tech 2, but not between various types of tech 1 ship.

CCP Soundwave again cautioned that this might be segmenting the FW dungeon tiers too much, but CCP Ytterbium responded by explaining that a streamlined system doesn't have to involve more than the current 3 tiers of plexes. CCP Ytterbium suggested that this could mean a small, medium, and larger dungeon size, where small was simply frigate combat, mediums were cruiser sized and down, and the larges were battleships and below.

Elise noted that it would be really cool for there to be a special venue for tech 1 frigate combat, especially after all the work that's being put into the rebalancing effort.

The next item on Hans' notes was concerns regarding the hierarchy of the LP payouts. Hans explained that mission running is still the top-paying activity in terms of LP/hr earned, whereas the ultimate goal is to make fighting over warzone control, and participating in PvP, be the incentivized activity.

CCP Ytterbium agreed that missions could use a bit of a nerf in payout, or alternatively be increased in difficulty by ramping up the quality of the NPC's being fought against.

Hans elaborated on the LP payout issue, explaining that the whole system needs attention right now. The Amarr, for example, earn plenty of LP but it's essentially worthless. The Minmatar, on the other hand, when faced with zero pay for defensive plexing, rush back to missioning as the default method of earning LP, undermining the goal of encouraging more PvP and less PvE.

CCP Ytterbium went on to explain that one of the other issues that has arisen is that the missions currently spawn in their old locations, which may or may not be enemy space. They would like to

change this so that missions would be concentrated in hostile systems and not be farmable in one's own territory.

Hans agreed, missions should always spawn in the remaining enemy systems.

CCP Soundwave then took a moment to pose a philosophical question – “If someone joins FW, and just wants to run missions, is that actually a bad thing? Do we have to force people to PvP?”

Hans Jagerblitzen: “For Factional Warfare, yes. PvP is the point. We're not Incursions, we're a PvP venue. But again, mission running these days is stealth bombers chased by Inty's”

Two step asked if there is a need to have FW missions at all?

CCP Soundwave said that he believes they are a valid profession, and that Factional Warfare caters to both playstyles at the moment, without mandating either. “I mean, we have some stuff like blitzing. Blitzing missions I don't like. That's definitely something we can take care of. But I really just want people to live in low sec, and I don't really care what they do. I remember from 0.0, when alliances were kind of fail-cascading, people would say 'yeah, its cause we only have 50 people on ops, everyone else is mining or running complexes' and I kind of get that feeling from a lot of Factional Warfare players nowadays. Where now one faction is losing space, and 'it's because of the PvE-ers'. But if someone wants to join Factional Warfare, and just run missions 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, I have no issue with that, I'm not going to tell people how to play the game. In general, the more people I see in low sec, regardless of what they do, is healthy. I don't want to ruin missions for Factional Warfare. But blitzing, let's take a look at that for sure.”

Continuing with Hans' notes, the discussion moved on to the system rewards themselves.

CCP Soundwave explained that the next step is to add bonuses so that industry can be done faster in upgraded Factional Warfare systems.

Elise Randolph: “Low sec production hubs would be super-cool.”

Two step pointed out that if taxes were boosted on trade in high sec, then you could make more noticeable rewards in the upgraded low sec systems, and make industry have a distinct advantage operating outside high sec.

CCP Soundwave said that they are looking at doubling the amount of slots available in stations, as well as adding a 5% increase to industry speed per level, as a base line package of improvements. There is room to look at other additions as well, but those two would be the place to start.

Hans enthusiastically agreed, faster industry is what is needed, not just additional slots.

CCP Ytterbium then proceeded to comment on Hans' own suggestions regarding system upgrades, the first of which was to move the station lockout consequence to an upgrade feature, instead of a static consequence to system ownership. This would enable the underdog factions to gain a foothold in the system they are trying to conquer, by plexing a system enough to bleed the I-hub and enabling docking rights for the duration of the siege.

Hans explained that it would embolden groups like the Amarr that currently feel "stuck" to make plans and execute system takeovers with greater tactical flexibility.

CCP Ytterbium offered up the idea of attaching the lockout to a level 3 or level 4 upgrade level, agreeing that "this would be a fair compromise."

Wrapping up the discussion of system upgrades, Hans' notes pointed out that cyno jammers are one of the most popular "missing" upgrades that didn't make it into Inferno, and that the developers should continue with the design process on this idea, regardless of the challenges posed by 0.0 groups that would threaten to intervene.

Elise Randolph immediately said that this would be a "terrible, terrible, terrible idea."

CCP Ytterbium explained that this feature was postponed because the Fanfest feedback was that this was too underdeveloped as a concept, and that too many neutral parties were concerned about this interfering with other forms of low sec gameplay.

Elise warned that if a Factional Warfare group were ever to interfere with his supply chain, he would send people into Factional Warfare for a month just to ruin everything for them, as a warning not to meddle in the future. He also warned that this is what every large entity would do as well.

Two step said that the effect could be temporary, like for 10 minutes once every hour or something along those lines.

Hans agreed that this exactly what he means, the cyno jammer doesn't have to be a permanently deployed feature.

CCP Soundwave proceeded to explain the backstory of the cyno jammer, and his concept for its control by an elected militia leadership. This leader would have a set of roles, and influence everyone's day-to-day activity in some way. "It would bring in some of the drama from the CSM elections, combined with some of the social interactions you see in 0.0, where you give a shit about who's in charge. The idea here is that we would shoehorn the militia in, as a political faction, where you would have to maintain diplomatic relations with the Factional Warfare people. Part of this would be that the Caldari leader, whoever he was at that time, would be able to barter with the 0.0 alliances about access. So basically, this would be about interaction between lowsec and zero sec, and like you said, about having either good relations and having the jammer turned off whenever it

was requested, or whether the group decided to just come in and steamroll everyone to take what they wanted.”

Elise: “But I think it would be annoying for Factional Warfare, if the 0.0 guys could just come in and take their infrastructure. 0.0 guys are just far more organized. No disrespect to the Factional Warfare guys, I do like them, but they do tend to have more hodge-podge fleets and have a different concept of what's expensive, and what's not. I can take a 100 billion ISK fleet, and at the drop of a hat just throw it around.”

CCP Ytterbium: “Something I really don't like in Factional Warfare, is just the capital hot drop. To me it has nothing to do with what Factional Warfare is supposed to do.”

Elise: “Well I don't know, triages are pretty cool small gang PvP thing.”

Two step: “It works really well in wormhole space, where it matters and it's a commitment. But I think the issue in Factional Warfare space is that no one wants to triage, when you know PL might be in the area.”

CCP Soundwave clarified that the cyno jammer is more a theoretical concept than anything else at this point.

Seleene asked Hans how much capitals are even used in Factional Warfare anyways, Hans responded that everyone's hesitation in using capitals is the inevitable supercap hot drop.

Two step clarified that what the militias want to have is the ability to deploy a cyno jammer when they know they're going to have a capital fight, giving them a brief window to engage each other without outside interference.

Elise agreed that this would actually be a really cool idea.

Hans: “Bingo.”

Trebor Daehdoow suggested that it could even function as a ship module, and be destroyable.

CCP Ytterbium wrapped up the cyno jammer discussion by agreeing that this would be fine, if it worked for only a small period of time.

CCP Soundwave thought the idea was interesting, and said it would have to have an LP cost attached, of course.

CCP Soundwave and CCP Ytterbium then stepped aside to allow CCP Arrow to demo the latest in the UI developments for the Factional Warfare expansion. While CCP Arrow was pulling up the relevant slides, Hans mentioned that it would be really cool if the system contested percentage was

available as an API pull. Third party developers are waiting and ready to produce apps that allow players to monitor the warzone if they had the relevant data.

Elise used the transition time to ask CCP if there had been a big spike in low sec activity, CCP Ytterbium confirmed that the number of kills has gone way up but that his concern wasn't with simply hyping players up for the expansion, it was sustaining the activity level in the long run.

With his slides now ready, CCP Arrow began by describing the various elements he'd like to alter about the new Factional Warfare interface. Some of the feedback he had received was that players would like to see their personal LP earnings listed as part of the Factional Warfare interface, instead of being tucked away in the journal. CCP Arrow would like to build this information into the warzone control interface. Another change mentioned is altering the capture status column in the warzone control tab to show a progress bar, with mouse over percentages, as supposed to the numerical placeholder in the interface right now.

Looking at the warzone control interface, Hans reminded the developers that he would love to hear their thoughts on the morale/motivational issues facing the "losing" faction. Hans points out that the warzone levels have barely moved in a week.

Two step: "Later, Hans, we're covering UI at the moment."

CCP Arrow then displayed a new tab for the Factional Warfare interface, the statistics page, where a multicolor line graph is shown that records the number of kills each faction had achieved in the past week. Drop down menus suggested that a variety of graphs could be produced with this interface, based on statistics from around the warzone. Additional information that can be found and displayed on this tab includes pilot enrollment, victory points earned, and number of systems captured. CCP Arrow then clicked over to the next tab and revealed a leaderboard mockup, containing pilot names, ranking, corporation name, and factional identity.

Hans said that one UI feature he'd like to see is the listing of your LP rewards in one easily accessible location, to avoid the constant stream of EVEmail notifications.

CCP Arrow agreed that the proper place for this information is in the Factional Warfare interface itself, not hidden away in some location elsewhere. "We'll definitely make room for that."

Elise then mentioned that for the leaderboard, it would be important to have one listing for kills, and another listing for top LP earners.

CCP Arrow wrapped up his UI demonstration by showing a sample of the Factional Warfare notifications, small boxes that would pop up according to your settings, and show you when a system was captured, or contested, etc.

Two step mentioned that these would be a great place to place the LP reward information, instead of cluttering up player's mailboxes.

CCP Arrow: "If you want. There would be a variety of Factional Warfare notifications, and you can set it up so you can choose which ones you get, and how you are notified."

Hans agreed it would be awesome to have more choice over the notifications.

Elise and Kelduum both mentioned how beautiful the new Factional Warfare interface is, complimenting the team on a job well done.

Seleene joked: "Just think – since you're testing sovereignty on Factional Warfare first, I can only imagine how good this will look when you apply it to 0.0"

With a big grin on his face, Two step replied: "Factional Warfare DOES make a great testbed, yes absolutely. "

Seleene: "Well, that'll end up in the minutes now."

CCP Soundwave: "STOP SAYING IT." (Room laughs)

CCP Ytterbium then asked to go back and revisit Hans' question about the morale issues facing the losing faction.

CCP Soundwave pointed out that the feature has only been live for a week, so it might be a bit early to be concerned about this.

Hans asked what CCP's thought are regarding why a player would enlist in the losing faction.

Two step suggested that lore wise, it might make sense for the losing faction to want to give their soldiers extra rewards for fighting given the desperate nature of their situation, in the form of extra LP for player kills. This would entice the pro PvP-ers to join the underdog faction. The Amarr, for example, would earn more LP while behind, providing incentive to push ahead and win back warzone control so they can cash out this abundance of saved LP.

CCP Soundwave: "EVE is a game where you win, or lose." He continued with that the Amarr militia are getting a lot of PvP, currently killing as much as or more than the Minmatar faction, and pulled up the latest graphs demonstrating this. According to the data, there isn't any evidence that one side is steamrolling the other in terms of activity or kill success.

Elise and Two step discussed that new players may be attracted to the winning side, where they can learn PvP in a large group, but that the pros will be drawn to the underdog where they can have more targets to kill.

Hans emphasized again that kill opportunities aside, there is zero economic advantage to playing for the losing side.

CCP Ytterbium restated that the intended incentive to join the losing side is to get more kills, not to make more ISK.

Two step: “The problem is that you cut out the income source for the losing side. It now costs me four times as much to buy my datacores, so now I can’t afford ships to fight in.”

CCP Soundwave: “But we’ve made it much easier to earn LP now, through dungeons and kills and the like.”

Two step: “Yes, but is it four times as easy to earn LP?”

Hans Jagerblitzen: “The problem is that people are attracted now by LP-for-kills, but horribly disappointed when you can’t afford anything. Exactly, Two step.”

CCP Soundwave: “We want to wait and see what happens with this for the time being.”

Two step revisited Hans’ earlier point that if the winning faction ends up spending most of its time defending space, they aren’t earning any LP and thus are forced to go run missions.

CCP Ytterbium explained that this is by design, LP wasn’t paid for defensive plexing because they don’t want to encourage farming of LP’s in your own space, where you could sit and just let the attackers come at you while you profit.

CCP Ytterbium: “If you find yourself winning too much, this is the consequence for it.”

Two step suggested that perhaps the defender could earn extra LP for killing enemies while defending a complex, in lieu of being paid to run the plex itself.

Hans noted that without any reward for defensive plexing, it quickly becomes an exhausting grind.

CCP Soundwave: “Yeah, let’s look at defensive bonus LP stuff. That might be an actual solution.” He then concluded that this covers all the items he wants to discuss for the session.

CCP Ytterbium explained that the NPC’s are the current project being worked on, that he’s already begun some of the balancing work. Ytterbium clarified that his current work only applies to the dungeon NPC’s, which are in more immediate need of balancing effort. Missions would be revisited as well, but they represent a whole different set of challenges to rework them. CCP Ytterbium then posed a question for Hans – explaining that he’d heard from a few individuals that Amarr space is harder to defend, being in a small area whereas Minmatar space has a single pipe that can be easily blockaded.

Hans replied that he hadn't studied this issue in great detail, and mentioned that the more pressing issue with regards to the map lay in the Gallente/Caldari warzone, where the number of systems to fight over is making achieving high levels of warzone control a considerable challenge.

CCP Soundwave: "Yeah, I mean, that's alright. You're not supposed to have everything upgraded all the time."

Two step: "Is this something you guys are actually thinking about changing?"(referring to the map of the warzone)

CCP Ytterbium: "I don't know. That's why I'm asking. Do you feel that there are issues with the general geography of the map?"

Two step: "I mean it makes sense that if you're going to have this battlefield, with a static structure, that you examine it to make sure it's a balanced structure to start out with."

Elise countered that nowhere else in the EVE universe is geography balanced, it's not like 0.0 has an equal number of entrances and exits to each region.

CCP Ytterbium interjected that Factional Warfare is not like null sec, however, and standards shouldn't be the same.

Hans wrapped up discussion of the map by stating that he doesn't consider it a major issue, that there hasn't been enough feedback recently to place it as a priority over the other items discussed so far.

CCP Soundwave mentioned that he would like to look at the small isolated pockets however, the systems that are disconnected from the rest of Factional Warfare territory in some fashion.

Hans agreed that this would be worth looking into, especially since system flips are more likely to occur in adjacent systems, as supposed to deep behind enemy lines.

Editor's addendum: An 'in a dreamy land' idea was floated by CCP Soundwave in another session that CCP would like to include here. The broad scope idea is to include non-aligned players in Factional Warfare as a 'third' faction. A little bit narrower, it would potentially include all of low sec (as opposed to just a few systems now) in Factional Warfare but allow the 'third' faction (pilots not related to Factional Warfare at all) to come and remove the claim on a solarsystem, thus making it like most low sec systems are currently. That would allow pirates to carve out their empires, space that could then be claimed in the name of either faction if Factional Warfare participants wanted. CSM's response was that this needed to be discussed further, but CCP Soundwave wanted to bring this idea out in the open to have a discussion about it. It was not discussed further at the summit.

Art session

Present: Participants: CCP BasementBen, CCP Huskarl, CCP Mannbjörn, CCP Unifex, Hans Jagerblitzen (Lync), Alekseyev Karrde (Lync)

CCP BasementBen opened the meeting with a powerpoint presentation.

Current projects Art is working on include:

- * Effects (Explosions!)
- * V3 (updating existing ships)
- * Ship Redesigns (improving existing ships)
- * New Toys (new stuff to support new game features)
- * New Costumes
- * Tech work (pipelines, tools)

A new visual effects artist has just been hired; he will be working with the existing technical artist. This should increase the output of new and improved effects.

Elise Randolph complimented the team on the new bombers and bomb effects.



CSM was shown a demo of new explosion effects. The CSM liked.

Art is putting more effort into making it easier to iterate on effects than they have in the past.

CSM was next shown a preview of the Minmatar V3 ship redesigns. These have already hit TQ.

Two step expressed player concerns that Amarr ships have gotten duller.

CCP Huskarl noted that this is temporary, and they will brighten up once nebula bounce-light is implemented. He also noted that the "glassy gold" Amarr colors were a result of incorrect shaders and were not intended. Finally, he stated that "we are not done with Amarr" and intend to iterate on their appearance.

Elise stated that he liked the new Amarr appearance, especially the Guardian, which in the past "looked like Iron Man".

Hans Jagerblitzen complimented the art team on the new Prophecy model.

CSM then got a look at Ship redesign works-in-progress, including the Tempest, Punisher, Purifier, Crucifier, Drake, Heron, Incursus (the lance is shorter!),

One thing Art is playing with is having some of the ships change their configuration when (for example) they go into and out of warp. This is not possible with the current system but they are keeping it in mind when doing ship redesigns. Similarly, some of the new redesigns have visible drone and cargo bay hatches and airlocks.

Trebor Daehdoow (discussing the new Incursus): If you actually showed the drones being deployed, it'd look like the ship is taking a dump.

Art introduced the New Toys section with a picture of the classic Thunderbird II die-cast metal toy.

Trebor: I had that toy!

New goodies included the Salvage Drone (shown at Fanfest), the Ore Frigate and early concept work on new Destroyers.

CSM was also shown work being done on new Incarna costumes; this involves using existing (unreleased) assets and creating variants of them (color, fabric patterns, etc.)

CCP Huskarl: We have a bunch of assets that have never been released, (so this does not require much manpower).

The CSM liked the results, but Seleene complained about the lack of hats.

CSM: Can the new systems (such as V3) make it easy for players to color their own ships?

Art: It would be possible to do this, but a decision has to be made about how much freedom is appropriate, and then mechanisms have to be added to the game to support whatever decision is made.

CCP Huskarl: I would prefer to limit the possible variations, just as when you buy a car you choose from several pre-defined paint schemes.

Seleene/Two step: Are you leaning towards a few CCP-defined schemes, or providing players with several limited palettes (main color, highlight, etc.) to choose from.

CCP Huskarl: More towards the latter.

CCP Mannbjörn: I tend towards the former, because it's not just the color that you have to worry about, but the material (and how it interacts with the lighting). There are just too many knobs that would have to fiddle with.

Two step: I would expose the knobs and let interested players tweak them and then sell their color schemes.

In response to a question from Two step, CCP Mannbjörn noted that updating T3 ships to V3 models will be easier than updating the T1 and T2 ships.

Seleene: Is this (coloring ships) still envisioned as a microtransaction thing?

CCP Unifex: We haven't made those decisions, but my feeling is that if (Art) spends a lot of time making a custom scheme, that would be an Aurum thing. But other paint schemes might be rare drops, or available in an LP store. I think there needs to be a blend, and just doing one will piss off one or more of the stakeholders. The same goes for clothing; there may be a rare "Field Marshall" jacket only available as a drop.

Two step approved of this approach. Getting back to ship skins, he commented that while he understands CCP's concerns about the look of the game ("no pink ships"), EVE is a sandbox game and it would be nice to be able to be a professional ship skin designer.

CCP Huskarl appreciated this point of view, but noted there would have to be limits. There was a short discussion of possible ways to achieve the goal.

Seleene raised the issue of corporate/alliance skins and color schemes.

Two step suggested it would be nice for industrialists to be able to produce custom ships with variations in both attributes and color schemes, so that the ships could be branded.

CCP Unifex: Nice dream.

Seleene: Talk to Stoffer (CCP Soundwave) and see how far you get.

Changing topics Greene Lee expressed concerns about differences between the visual and logical models of objects like stations, which causes bumping issues.

CCP Xhagen provided an example of supercaps being unable to approach modules in POS's for similar reasons.

CCP BasementBen: This is a consequence of the fact that collision objects in the game are all made of balls, and the number of balls in some irregular objects were reduced for performance reasons -- "you end up with fewer but bigger balls".

Two step suggested keeping this issue in mind when doing the design work for the new POS's.

CCP Xhagen suggested wrapping things up as time was running out.

Kelduum Revaan made a passionate plea for corp logos on ships (nose art), saying he would pay "ISK, Aurum or real cash" for them.

CCP Huskarl stated that corp logos is something they want to do, but alliance logos is a more difficult issue. This is because corp logos are created by putting together existing art assets, whereas alliance logos are customized and some of them don't look good.

There was some discussion of the issues surrounding this.

CCP BasementBen wrapped up the discussion by saying that CSM should pitch game design on this, and at the end of the day, if it is a desired feature they can make it happen technically.

Two step asked why this was a game design issue. CCP Mannbjörn replied that there were performance issues to consider (for example, during massive fights). He would prefer to proceed cautiously.

Two step then put in a plug for the Battle Recorder concept, pointing out that most people have to fight zoomed out, so they don't see Art's great graphics, but a Battle Recorder would let them revisit the fight and see it the way it should be seen.

CCP BasementBen did not address this directly but pointed out that some of the work they are doing involves things like cinematic cameras and picture-in-picture, which would address some of these issues.

Two step noted that even being able to play EVE but at the same time FRAPS the battle without the UI would be a useful improvement.

CCP Mannbjörn replied that stuff like that is on their long-term roadmap but there is a lot of work that needs to be done first before it can be implemented. However, they keep this issue in mind

when making improvements -- the new missile system, for example, has some hooks in it that will be useful later on.

Trebor suggested that if a Battle Recorder was implemented, it should dump out the data in a form that 3rd-party tools could use. While the EVE client would be required to replay the battle visually, 3rd-party tools could be built to analyze what pilots were doing and help them improve their techniques.

CCP BasementBen closed the meeting by asking the CSM to post followup questions on the forums.

Ship balance and iteration

Present: CCP Ytterbium, CCP Greyscale, CCP Soundwave, CCP Tallest, CCP Unifex, Alekseyev Karrde (Lync), Hans Jagerblitzen (Lync)

Additional CSM Present: Hans Jagerblitzen

CCP Ytterbium delved right into the Ship Balance topic by asking the CSM their collective opinion on the first set of changes: the “Combat Frigate” changes.

Elise was the first to chime in giving high praise for the revamped Punisher and Merlin.

CCP Xhagen asked to elaborate on the praise and Elise responded with the sentiment that T2 Frigates are no longer better than their T1 counterparts. Elise went on to explain that with proper ship bonuses it was clearer what the intended role for the Frigates were. Additionally, there were now many cases where T1 Frigates provided more value than T2 Frigates; a very stark contrast to the pre-balance Frigates that were oftentimes totally useless.

Seleene voiced his approval of the notion and the rest of the CSM nodded in agreement.

Two step voiced concerns on the lack of a mining Frigate, but before the ship balance discussion continued further CCP Xhagen wanted to ensure that the CSM was satisfied with the current balance of the Frigates.

Elise echoed his sentiments that the new Frigates were “amazing” and Kelduum gave an endorsement from EVE University emphatically claiming “the Uni loves them. It’s great because the Rifter isn’t the best one, they’re ALL the best one”

CCP Ytterbium laid out [his future plans for ship balance](#), a very pragmatic approach: finish the rest of the Frigates during the summer, then move on to destroyers. After the first set of destroyers is

balanced, add a new set of destroyers. Fleshing out the idea, CCP Ytterbium shared his idea for the new Amarr and Gallente destroyers as being drone boats, while Caldari and Minmatar would be missile platforms.

CCP Ytterbium then spoke to the concerns of Two step regarding a lack of a newbie-friendly mining Frigate. He explained that a new ORE mining Frigate would replace the role of the racial mining Frigates. On the topic of mining, CCP Ytterbium added that he has plans to balance the ORE Mining Barges and Exhumers as well. He explained the problem with the current system in that people gravitate toward the Covetor and Hulk and completely skip over the other ships. To rectify this problem CCP Ytterbium laid out a plan for the Barges:

Covetor/Hulk mine the fastest, but will have the lowest cargohold.

The Retriever will have an advantage of having Battleship-type HP, giving it an advantage of survivability, but will mine slower than the Covetor.

The smallest class, Procurer, will still mine the slowest, but it will have a large ore bay, the size of a jetcan for example, so it can be more independent.

This way there will be a tradeoff to each class, instead of simply going for the biggest and the best and leaving the rest largely unused. Additionally, CCP Ytterbium was concerned that the Hulks mining yield would still be too dominant, so he explained that he wants to reduce the gap between the Hulk and all the others.

Two step asked if it was a nerf to the Hulk class, and CCP Ytterbium was quick to say that the Hulk would not be nerfed, but instead the others would be boosted. The conversation segued to the new role of the ORE mining Frigate where CCP Ytterbium presented his concept of the ORE mining Frigate as a small, fast platform with a very large ore bay for mining. Seleene and Kelduum agreed that the mining Frigate with a large ore bay would be a welcome addition.

The conversation then diverged slightly onto the mechanics of this new “ore bay” and CCP Greyscale shed some light onto the question by explaining that if an item is fit for an ore bay then when it is introduced into the cargohold it will immediately sort itself into the ore bay.

Two step and Seleene were both quite excited by the notion.

Two step asked for clarification on if the new ORE Frigate would replace the racial mining Frigates, and CCP Ytterbium confirmed that.

Kelduum then took the question a step further and asked if the mining Cruisers would be replaced.

CCP Soundwave explained that current Frigates would be balanced into “Combat Frigates” and Cruisers would shift to “Combat Cruisers”. It followed that mining Cruisers would see their role replaced by the rebalanced mining Barges.

Before moving on CCP Ytterbium asked if there were any concerns, and Two step did raise one: the HP of Barges. With Destroyers being buffed, Two step was worried that it would make Barges more vulnerable to small ships. Two step said that Tornados suiciding Barges was acceptable, but buffed Destroyers doing the same would be bad.

CCP Soundwave and CCP Ytterbium both agreed that an HP buff for Barges was well within reason.

CCP Soundwave: “I like suicide ganking, but I don’t like the risk-reward where it is now. You should be able to kill anyone anywhere, but not that cheap.”

Conversation shifted slightly to skills which sparked CCP Ytterbium into elaborating on the new rebalanced Barge class. Mining Barge I would allow you to fly any of the Barges (of course with better benefits at level V), and Exhumers I would allow you to fly any Exhumer.

Moving to rookie ship balancing, CCP Ytterbium explained his vision for having rookie ships being very versatile. He explained that the rookie ship would ideally have a large number of small bonuses, but it would be less specialized in all of them. This not only makes the rookie ships less useless, but it would help new players find out what they want to do and allow them to specialize early on. Kelduum explained that, while the EVE tutorial does supply a Frigate early on, new players are prone to losing them so a useful rookie ship would be a welcomed addition.

The next order of business was ship lines. CCP Ytterbium recalled that the ships would be rebalanced away from “tiers” and into “ship lines”. The initial concept of ship lines was: attack, combat, bombardment, and support.

Bombardment, CCP Ytterbium explained, was “Quite lame. Not necessarily a role but instead a means to a role”. As a ship line, Bombardment is out.

CCP Ytterbium went on to share his ideas for the Frigate rebalance. Part of the balancing involves giving all Frigates more slots – somewhere around ten, with slightly fewer for support ships. He gave an example of the Navitas and Bantam; the Navitas would be the attack drone boat and the Bantam would be transformed into fast, possibly blaster, attack ship. Additionally, each race would have their own missile ships for each of the lines (for example the Tristan for Gallente and Inquisitor for Amarr).

Two step liked the idea since in the current incarnation Amarr ships randomly get missiles at the HAC level.

CCP Soundwave agreed and recalled his experience with EVE training Amarr and after he skilled for an Arbitrator, he soon realized that the drone skills he trained were wasted.

CCP Ytterbium added that each race has enough Frigates to allow for a drone, missile, and standard gun platform for every race.

Two step expressed concerns that this type of system would take away from each races specialization, however CCP Ytterbium explained that the races would always be better at their racial specialization. Soundwave added that he didn't think this would be a significant issue because, for instance, Caldari would be the best missile ships but Amarr would still have an option.

CCP Ytterbium summarized his stance on Frigate rebalance with the simple notion that T1 ships should more generalized than T2 , so T2 isn't universally better in every way.

Moving on to the destroyer class, CCP Ytterbium explained that the plan is to add four new ships to the Destroyer line, giving each race two Destroyers. While nothing was set in stone, CCP Ytterbium's first instinct is to make the new Gallente and Amarr destroyers drone boats, and giving Minmatar and Caldari missile platforms. Balancing Frigates, destroyers, and Barges are CCP Ytterbium's goals for the summer.

Moving up the ship-class tree, Cruisers were the next ship table. Much like with the Frigates, because of the Barge change, mining Cruisers would be retooled to be more usable Logistics ships. CCP Ytterbium explained the ship lines he had in mind for Cruisers are simply: Attack, Combat, and Support.

CCP Ytterbium showcased his eidetic knowledge of the ships and rattled off his main concerns for each individual ship. "Omen is good, but lacks fitting. Maller should get an armor resist bonus making it like a mini-Abaddon. The Caracal is good, but could use a buff as well." Speaking of the Moa evoked a hilarious reaction from CCP Ytterbium, "the poor thing!" CCP Ytterbium continued, saying he wanted to make it a viable hybrid platform. Moving on to the other races, the Vexor and Thorax are both OK in CCP Ytterbium's opinion, but they can be buffed a little bit as well. Pausing for a moment at the Celestis, CCP Ytterbium agreed that dampening was "maybe was nerfed too hard".

Seleene's reaction mirrored the sentiment of the room with a sarcastic "Really?!"

CCP Ytterbium laughed and solidified his position a bit more, claiming that the nerf was good in that dampeners shouldn't be useful on non-specialized ships, but they should be viable on specialized ships which they aren't now.

CCP Ytterbium asked the CSM to validate his assertions that the Arazu/Lachesis weren't used as dampening platforms and Elise responded that the Arazu and Lachesis are used primarily as heavy

tackle. Elise continued and added that the ships' slot layout are very anomalous for Gallente since they don't have nearly enough low-slots to be a armor tanking ship, and as such the Lachesis is used as a shield-tank platform leaving only one midslot available for the specialized ewar – which is nearly always occupied by a warp disruptor.

Two step agreed and added that Recons in general are too gimped, and their numerous high slots are nearly worthless.

Seleene mirrored the sentiments and said that he would like to see the recons trade high-slots for essential low or medium slots.

CCP Ytterbium joked saying his plans was to add slots, but that he can remove highs too if the CSM wanted.

Going back to Cruisers, CCP Ytterbium continued with his plans but warned that for Minmatar ships he wasn't completely sure with the direction he wants to go. CCP Ytterbium's initial plan for Minmatar is to make their missile ships incorporate a target painting bonus. In this vision the Bellicose would get a target painting and missile bonus, and the Typhoon would lose its split-damage bonus and become a true torpedo platform with a target painting bonus; it would become a short ranged Torpedo boat. Expanding this idea to the rest of the ships, ships like the Cyclone could become a target painting HAM platform.

Elise was quick to interject that the Cyclone is one of the most balanced and fun BCs in the like.

CCP Ytterbium agreed that he liked the Cyclone as a mini-Maelstrom, of sorts, and that he was on the fence with the Cyclone in particular. CCP Ytterbium likes the current form of the Stabber and Rupture, but added that a buff to both was not out of the question.

The topic quickly bounced over to the idea of having a Frigate logistics class.

Elise rather bluntly stated that Frigate logistics would "be bad no matter what".

CCP Soundwave countered that he liked the idea and didn't think a balanced solution was impossible to find.

CCP Greyscale chimed in saying that extreme range would be a good solution for a Frigate logistics class.

At this point Hans interjected and stated that Frigate logistics would finally give people a reason to use all the faction small remote reps they get. On this like, Two step suggested there should be faction large remote reps, to which CCP Ytterbium was apathetic.

Getting back on the topic at hand, and the balance of Cruisers in general, CCP Ytterbium mentioned that he would like to make the Cruiser class as a whole faster. He believes a big reason we see lots of Battlecruisers and not so many Cruisers being used in PvP is because of the BC slot layout, making every race capable of being a shield-buffer speed fit. He added that he would change this dynamic not by nerfing BCs, but by boosting Cruisers. On the topic of Tier 3 BCs, CCP Ytterbium stated that he believed they were fine.

Elise added that some tier 3s may a bit too agile, citing a shield-tanked nano blaster Talos.

CCP Ytterbium cringed slightly at the thought and added that the tier-3 BCs are supposed to be fast, but very thin. Moving onto Amarr Battlecruisers, CCP Ytterbium's idea for the Prophecy was more of a drone boat.

Elise asked if it would include a TD bonus like the Arbitrator, and CCP Ytterbium conceded a "maybe". The Harbinger would become a tankier version of itself, bridging the gap between the new Maller and the Abaddon. Moving on to the Caldari, CCP Ytterbium came onto the Ferox and stated bluntly that the Ferox could use some love. His first instinct is to make it similar to the Naga and Rokh, Elise suggested accepting it as a blaster platform which it is used as currently.

CCP Ytterbium responded that he is weary of making it a blaster platform because he doesn't want it to infringe on the role of the Brutix.

The conversation about BCs would not be complete without talking about the Drake.

CCP Ytterbium's view of the Drake is that it should not be a viable fleet doctrine.

UAXDEATH added that every race should have a good BC, and Seleene chimed in damning the Drakes absurd buffer.

CCP Ytterbium suggested that the balancing problem may not only lay with the ship, but with Heavy Missiles. While CCP Ytterbium hasn't amassed all the data he would like to make a decision, his gut instinct is that the problem with HMLs, and in turn Drakes, is that HMLs have too much range.

Two step added that they are a sniper weapon but do a fair amount of DPS.

Elise gave a possible solution to increase the CPU usage of HMLs which would weaken either the tank or the damage of customary Drake fits.

Gallente BCs were next. CCP Ytterbium's main concern with the Brutix is the underlying problem of armor tanks versus shield tanks. To bridge the gap between the two, giving the Brutix a more pronounced armor rep bonus would solve the problem. The Talos, then, would be the fast Megathron-like ship and the Brutix would be more analogous to the Hyperion.

The Myrmidon, which prompted an “Oh god!” exclamation from CCP Ytterbium where his main gripe with the Myrmidon is that it tries to fill too many roles and it should be a stepping stone between the Vexor and Dominix. To get there he would simply remove a turret or two and boost the drone bandwidth.

Elise added that it would be wise to do something with the mid slots because, with the new drone damage low-slot mods, the current Myrmidon would promote a shield tank. Elise went on to say that the new drone damage modules transformed the Pilgrim, of all things, into a shield-tanked blaster/neut platform.

CCP Greyscale literally cripes’d.

Touching again briefly on the Minmatar BCs, CCP Ytterbium discussed that he was torn between making the Cyclone a Drake-like missile/TP platform, or leaving it as a mini-Maelstrom.

Elise stated again the Cyclone as a mini-Maelstrom is perfect.

On the subject of Maelstroms, UAxDEATH stated that he thought Maelstroms were too agile, but both Elise and CCP Ytterbium believed they were fairly slow for Minmatar ships, with Elise adding that they are very cap unstable.

Finally, Hurricanes. Two step, with the rest of the CSM in agreement, believed that the Hurricane does too many things well – Two step in particular focusing on the two utility highs which are almost always neuts.

CCP Ytterbium did not disagree.

With all the smaller ships out of the picture, CCP Ytterbium shared his plans for the Battleship class. He deemed that Battleships are “quite OK” at the moment, a sentiment which Elise shared. Although Battleships are generally good, a few stuck out as needing significant work.

CCP Ytterbium exclaimed that the Raven needs help, but the fault lies mostly with Cruise Missiles.

UAxDEATH agreed wholeheartedly and added that he hasn’t used Cruise Missiles since the missile formula was changed in 2006. The Scorpion and Rokh – were deemed relatively balanced and overall good.

Two step had concerns on the functionality of Apocalypse.

Elise shared his opinion that Apocs are good as extreme range sniping ships, but that the problem with sniping as a play style is on grid probing.

CCP Ytterbium agreed that on grid probing is simply too fast.

Two step came back to the Apocalypse issue and elaborated his position that the Oracle, and Tier 3 BCs in general, and the Apoc's sniper role.

Elise joking added "let me tell you about losing an entire Oracle fleet to two bombers."

CCP Ytterbium questioned the CSM on their views on Gallente Battleships.

Elise was the first to respond citing the Hyperion, claiming the largest problem for the Hyperion is the "shitty tracking". He added that large blasters are effectively only usable on the Mega/Talos because of the extreme tracking bonus to blasters that those ships get.

CCP Ytterbium took note and stated he was considering boosting the armor rep bonus the Hyperion received to promote the armor tank.

Moving to Minmatar Battleships, CCP Ytterbium focused again on the Typhoon and restated his plans for making it a pure torpedo boat. CCP Ytterbium believes that the Typhoon isn't bad, per se, but it is far less popular than it should be because of its split-weapon layout.

Moving to the Tempest and Maelstrom, UAxDEATH again shared his belief that the Maelstrom is too agile and as such undercuts the role of the Tempest.

Elise again shared his belief that Maelstroms are slow, fun in small gangs, and balanced because of their terrible capacitor.

Hans added that the Tempest is also overshadowed by the Tornado and UAxDEATH suggested that the Tempest could get more alpha to make up for it.

Two step expanded on the idea and suggested that Tier 3 BCs should have seven guns as opposed to eight, to give the sniping Battleship platform a slight advantage.

Elise disagreed with the sentiment and stated that the added EHP from a Battleship is a huge benefit. Elise went on to say that Tier 3s are very good, if not too agile, in their role precisely because roaming around in Battleships is impractical, but roaming around with Battleship DPS in a very agile ship is very practical.

Two step made the case that Battleships shouldn't be impractical, to which Elise countered that Battleships shouldn't be practical for all situations, but instead focused on big fleet slugfests.

UAxDEATH and Greene Lee both responded with the sentiment that people don't fly Battleships as often because their role is mitigated by the tier-3 BCs.

Elise disagreed vehemently and stated Battleships "own tier 3 BCs all the time, they die in two shots".

Greene Lee disagreed and stated he didn't see Battleships used in fleet fights since the tier 3 BCs were popularized.

Seleene disagreed strongly with the statement and Two step agreed that Battleships were used.

UAxDEATH's solution to the problem was not to mitigate damage from the tier-3s, but instead to decrease their effective range. So Battleships would be able to fill a sniper role, but they could do so at more extreme ranges.

Two step liked the idea of varying degrees of sniping.

On the subject of sniping, Greyscale tossed out a high-level idea for a fix to sniping. He asked for CSM input on one such idea, an interdiction probe that would be launched a certain range before the bubble would deploy. In essence it would work as a drag-bubble to protect the sniping fleet, or at least give it ample time to react and reposition.

Elise was receptive to the idea and added that the biggest hindrance to sniping is the speed of on-grid probing.

Seleene and UAxDEATH agreed strongly.

CCP Soundwave chimed in with an idea of putting probes on grid and making them destructible. He argued that it would give small support a more pronounced role.

UAxDEATH was very receptive to the idea of giving support a stronger role.

Two step spitballed some ideas where probing would become less accurate with more results, and another idea where there was a probe-killing-probe.

Moving away from sniping and back to ship balance, CCP Ytterbium shifted focus from Tech 1 ships to Tech 2.

Starting from the smallest of the ship classes: EAFs. CCP Ytterbium agreed that EAFs definitely need to be looked at, but conceded that he wasn't sure exactly to do with them yet.

Elise suggested that the best EAF now – the Kistune – is decent because it's very survivable through speed and range.

Two step and UAxDEATH expanded on the thought and suggested that a possible fix for EAFs is to give them a sniper e-war type role.

Speaking generally about EAFs, Elise argued that generally the EAFs ewar role is overshadowed by Recons, and their Frigate role is overshadowed by all other Frigate classes.

Kelduum added that on top of all the issues, EAFs are also too expensive.

Elise was quick to guffaw at the issue of cost, but CCP Soundwave agreed that cost was also a significant factor.

CCP Ytterbium continued on the Frigate path and stated that he believed AF, Interceptors, Covert Ops, and Bombers were all well balanced, to which there were no disagreements.

CCP Greyscale directed conversation to Interdictors, to which Seleene was the first to respond saying Sabres are in a class all by their own.

CCP Ytterbium asked the CSM what interdictors they used in combat, and Two step responded with Heretics and Sabres as by far the most common.

CCP Ytterbium asked about the Eris in particular, and Elise described a niche situation where dual-prop armor Erises could be effective, but conceded that Sabres were so far better in general.

UAXDEATH suggested that the balance should involve one interdictor being the fastest, another having the most DPS, and another having the best tank.

Seleene jokingly responded “yea, that’s the Sabre!”

CCP Ytterbium gave a more generalized overview on what he would like to see done with the Tech 2 ship rebalance, one of which is to give the T2 manufacturing companies a consistent role. CCP Ytterbium gave the example of Roden Shipyards; at the moment the changes they make to ships is fairly random, but after the rebalance they should leave a consistent mark on the ships they manufacture, such as making Roden ships more missile based across all the lines.

UAXDEATH made a point about ship progression, citing how his fleets used to incorporate Interceptors, HACs, and Battleships – with players progressing from each ship class to the next. Now in more homogenous doctrines, UAXDEATH believed a clear progression of ships was lacking.

CCP Soundwave steered the discussion to Bombers and asked the CSM what they thought of them, specifically bomb size.

Elise declared his love for bombers with the quote “they are literally the most perfect mechanic in Eve” and went on to praise how bombers increase in effectiveness as they increase in complexity, and then reach a ceiling.

Seleene agreed profusely.

Greene Lee and UAXDEATH disagreed and argued that most recent change to cloaking (cloaked ships do not decloak other cloaked ships) marginalized bombing and made it far too easy.

Elise and Two step both disagreed.

Greene Lee argued that bombers were now too easy to fly and as such far too effective. He went on to say that bombing is no longer a profession because they are too easy.

UAXDEATH shared the belief and argued that bombers need to be more complex.

Elise countered that, while the act of launching a bomb may be easy, coordinating a bombing run is incredibly complex.

Two step moved conversation forward from the deluge and questioned the legitimacy of non-damage non-void bombs.

CCP Soundwave agreed that the lockbreaker bomb was quite underused and merited looking at.

Going back to the Recon class, CCP Ytterbium touched again on the Arazu and reiterated that dampening as a mechanic needs to be looked at. The Pilgrim, too, needs work.

Elise apologized for making a blaster shield Pilgrim.

The other Recons were agreed to be fairly balanced, at least comparatively so.

Heavy Interdictors were next; CCP Ytterbium asked the CSM which HICs were most often used. Elise argued that the Phobos was the weakest of the four, since the Devoter generally is better in every way, but continued that both the Broadsword and Onyx had very good, distinct uses.

CCP Greyscale had a suggestion to separate the HICs a bit which is to make one set of HICs faster and another set tankier – essentially the situation now, but make the differences more pronounced.

Quickly moving through T2 Cruisers, CCP Ytterbium stated that he wanted to boost HAC in general, but didn't have a specific set of changes in mind; simply making each HAC have a purpose rather than having many unused HACs.

Logistics ships were next on the list. Greene Lee made a very compelling argument for why he thought Logistics were a detriment to Eve, specifically small-gang PvP. He argued that, since Logistics ships are effectively a required ship-type for fleets, small roaming fleets are forced into flying Logistics and their effective fleet size becomes smaller.

Elise and Two step disagreed, with Two step stating that he likes the mechanic since it forces people to work together. Two step added that his main gripe with Logistics is that their efforts don't show up on killmails.

On the topic of Logistics, CCP Soundwave shifted conversation and asked the CSM how they felt about the logistical role of Capital ships, and if it has a place in Capital warfare.

Greene Lee shared his view that he believed logistics in Capital fights are especially broken, citing a case where 50 Aeons are “impossible to break”.

Elise disagreed strongly and shared his experience with Supercap fights, proudly explaining that he was on field for every Supercap killed (and lost) bar one. Elise went on to argue that the logistics chains never make the Supercarriers invincible and the perceived issue with Supercap logistics chains was a false problem.

Greene Lee countered with an example of how a small roaming gang dropped on a lone Supercarrier and then the Supercarrier cyno'd in another 20 Supercarriers, thus saving the tackled SC.

Elise took issue with the notion and stated simply “you should not be able to opt out of Capital warfare. You should not be able to combat an entire Supercap fleet with only subcaps.”

Greene Lee retorted with a scenario where Nulli Secunda and Black Legion dropped on PL Supers, to which Elise was quick to point out that Nulli Secunda in fact killed a Titan, things escalated, and in spite of having a chain of remote reps they still lost two Supercarriers.

UAXDEATH, understanding that neither party would be convinced of the others' view, shifted conversation back to ship balance and brought a concern raised by Hans of off-grid Tech-3 link ships.

CCP Ytterbium suggested talking about that issue when talking about Command Ships, and Two step quickly wanted to jump back to Logistics ships to summarize that issue up after the slight Supercap tangent.

Elise went through the list of the Logistics Cruisers and stated “the Oneiros is now amazing. The Guardian is still good. The Basilisk sucks – it's just too slow, which is essentially why few use them. And the Scimitar is good.”

Two step added that for most wormhole fights only Basilisks and Guardians are used. He continued that the Oneiros doesn't seem as good and Elise interjected that the tradeoff with the Oneiros is that it can rep more and be more nimble, but at the expensive of being more vulnerable to capacitor warfare.

Two step added that in a scenario where he had only one Logistics ship he felt the Scimitar was good in that role but the Oneiros just wasn't quite up to snuff in his estimation.

Moving over to Command ships, CCP Ytterbium addressed the concern of off grid links and simply stated “off grid boosting should not exist”, with much of the CSM nodding in agreement. With regard to Tech-2 command bonuses and Tech-3 CCP Ytterbium stated that Tech-2 are supposed to be more specialized than Tech-3, which are supposed to be more generalized.

Elise added that the problem with the link T3s, essentially the reason they have to be off grid, is because in order to fit the links on them you have to completely gimp the ship.

CCP Ytterbium explained that with Tech 3 and the new modules, such as the adaptive armor hardener, they could potentially make a new Tech-3 variant of the module that Tech-3 ships get a significant bonus to. In this vision the different Tech-3 subsystem combinations could yield a different bonus to a certain type of module. CCP Ytterbium gave a high-level example of a Tech-3 with an Attack-style subsystem configuration, which could get a bonus to Micro Jump Drives use – or something similar. In the same vein, a Command T3 should be able to get bonuses which allow it to stay on the field longer.

CCP Greyscale interjected that perhaps the solution to these problems is fiddling with the way gang-bonuses are applied through the fleet.

Shifting focus to Tech-3 entirely, CCP Ytterbium shared his main concern with Tech-3 at the moment in that they are far too specialized. CCP Ytterbium would like to see Tech-3 able to do things different than Tech-1 and Tech-2, without marginalizing the T1 and T2 ships. CCP Ytterbium conceded that none of these ideas are formalized in any way since he wants to fix T1 ships first, then move on to T2 ships, and finally end up with T3 ships.

Quickly bouncing back to the issue of Command ships, in a scenario where fleet bonuses were not an issue CCP Ytterbium would like to bridge the gap between the Fleet Command ships and the Field Command ships, preferring the current Fleet Command ships to be more like the Field Command ships – simply more fun to fly.

Two step added that obviously this could only happen with a revamped fleet bonus system.

Elise argued that the Fleet Command ships didn't need to be made fun to fly by a weapon systems upgrade, but instead that they could be fun if they were specialized in roles they fill now. Elise went on to explain that making them more beefy, with higher sensor strength, then the ship could be something that an FC could fly without worrying the he would get instantly killed or jammed.

Two step agreed that the people flying them in FC positions don't really care about using a new weapon system.

Elise added that, at the moment, the T3 ships are filling the role that Fleet Command ships should have because you can make them more resilient.

CCP Ytterbium eloquently summarized his view on the relationship between T1, T2 and T3 using the Drake, Nighthawk and Tengu. Ideally, the Nighthawk would be better than the Drake in the role it fills, but the Tengu wouldn't be explicitly better than the Nighthawk or Drake, but it would instead be able to do a variety of roles based on the subsystems chosen.

Finally on the Black Ops class, much to the joy of Trebor and Kelduum.

CCP Ytterbium quite bluntly stated "Black Ops are lame" and explained that they "try to do two things and fail at both."

Two step also added that their mass is anomalously high, and Aleks chimed in that the fuel consumption for bridging needed to be looked at as well. Two step also had concerns on the Covert Cyno module requiring Cyno V, but Trebor was quick to disagree and insisted that the Covert Cyno skill requirements were a non-issue, to which Seleene, Elise, Aleks and UAxDeath agreed.

Trebor added that there was a tension in the Black Ops-using community that if the ships become too powerful then more people will use them and their specialized niche would become overcrowded. Trebor jokingly added that many people in his corporation would like the ships nerfed. Trebor's main concern with the Black Ops was the fuel use and a dearth of Black Ops-capable Logistics ships. Trebor added that he likes the mechanic of needing to plan to use Black Ops.

Summarizing the meeting, CCP Xhagen asked the CSM what they thought of the general plan that CCP Ytterbium laid out, and asked CCP Ytterbium and CCP Soundwave what their timeframe for implementing these changes was.

Two step asked about the change to skill prerequisite for ships, and CCP Ytterbium responded that the skills would not change until the ships themselves are rebalanced. Addressing concerns that it would widen the gap between new players and veteran players, CCP Ytterbium was adamant that it wouldn't widen the gap, it would simply make the skill-training path more consistent. He added that, while it would be more time consuming to be specialized in all of the Battlecruisers, it would take less time to specialize in the T2 Battlecruisers of the given race.

Two step ended the meeting by continuing to express his objections to the idea.

‘Player to player contracts’ (feature working title)

Present: CCP Tallest, CCP Soniclover, CCP Unifex, CCP Sharq, CCP Punkturis, CCP Paradox, Alekseyev Karrde (Lync), Hans Jagerblitzen (Lync)

Foreword

The current state of the player to player contracts is “in pre-production”

- ***It has its initial goals laid out (there are many ways to reach a goal)***
- ***It’s not had any kind of formal design assessment***
- ***It’s not had any kind of formal technical assessment***
- ***It’s not had any kind of formal art assessment***
- ***It’s not had any kind of formal QA assessment***
- ***Nothing has been designed and the session below is, like the opening statement suggests, a question of what the CSM would like to include and reactions to that***

This session was used as an opportunity to pitch some very early concepts to the CSM and see how they reacted to them, to guide our own internal concepting work. Everything that is discussed in the following meeting minutes *will* change between now and whenever the feature finally reaches TQ., and anything implying concrete decisions should not be read as such.

These meeting minutes are being provided in full in the interests of transparency, but they should very definitely not be taken as any kind of commitment or firm statement of intent from CCP.

We now return you to your scheduled broadcast.

CCP Tallest opened by asking the CSM what they would like built into player to player contracts for their upcoming revamp.

Alekseyev immediately began listing a few – escort, training, POS/POCO take-downs and POS/POCO defense operations, wormhole eviction/protection.

Seleene explained that the original intent for treaties back when they were conceived for the Dominion expansion was to govern the renter relationships between those that live in 0.0 space and those that own 0.0 space (editor’s note: player to player contracts are a larger concept than that).

UAXDEATH suggested that instead of having to pay ISK, a renter might be able to complete a requisition contract for material goods instead. This way alliances could house groups that live and manufacture in 0.0 space and share a portion of their goods as payment for the rented space.

Greene Lee added that this should apply to corp members individually as well, enabling alliances to require that every pilot that lives there pulls their own weight.

UAxDEATH emphasized that another feature missing from the game is the ability to set up recurrent billing between players.

Two step agreed that there needs to be a way for players to contractually charge each other for services over a period of time.

UAxDEATH went on to explain that often in null-sec politics change quickly, and that it's a colossal headache to go and change the standings of a shadow alliance every time the parent alliance changes its diplomatic status. Renters should have the current standings of the alliance they are renting from presented to them in the writing of the contract.

Greene Lee agreed, arguing that this relationship needs to be fixed according to the contract, so that as the parent alliance changed their blues, the subsequent renting alliances would be automatically updated, to avoid blues shooting and other problems.

Seleene used the analogy of federal law vs. state law. The renting alliance could have their own policies but would still have to abide by the rules of the renter alliance as well.

Alekseyev Karrde: "That would be very convenient for mercenaries being hired by 0.0 alliances. However, reciprocating those standings would also have to happen (so the blues on the list get blue to the treaty corp / alliance blue too, not just the treaty corp adopting those standings)."

CCP Soniclover then asked the CSM if there were any circumstances where they wanted to see contracts bypass conventional rules. For example, if a corp accepted a contract to defend a POS or a POCO, would that contract have the power to override the normal rules affecting aggression in the absence of a war declaration?

Alekseyev responded that it would be super convenient for a "POS Save" contract to have a 24 hour combat window allowing them to work freely against anyone that might come to take the POS.

Seleene was relieved to hear the direction this new contract system was headed, noting that it sounded much more like a true "mercenary marketplace" than the adjustments to the war declaration system brought by Inferno.

CCP Soniclover: "This is how I see it, we want to make it smooth. To make it smooth, we would probably have to bypass the existing rules, like whom you can fight in high sec. It would be much less valuable to make a defense contract for a POS if you than had to go declare war on the target as well."

Alekseyev suggested that perhaps the contract would auto-initiate a war dec.

Two step asked if this was similar to the ally system, but CCP Tallest pointed out that POS timer lengths and the 24-hour warm-up on joining a war makes the system ineffective for this purpose.

Two step noted that the usefulness of these player-player contracts for POS warfare, because conditions could be set requiring a structure or set of structures to either exist or not exist at the end of a timed period. An offensive contract, for example, wouldn't pay out unless the mercenaries succeeded in eliminating the target within the given time frame. Similarly, a defense contract may not payout if the structure is destroyed during the allotted time period.

Alekseyev: "3rd party / escrow would be amazing."

Seleene asked CCP how far they were willing to go with the flexibility of these new contracts.

CCP Soniclover explained that they would be fairly open-ended, for example a kill contract on a POS would pay out no matter who destroyed it, as long as conditions were met during the duration of the contract.

Two step asked if you could create a contract to kill a certain number of ships, enabling everyone to set up a system not unlike the ones that Goonswarm uses to pay hulk bounties.

CCP Soniclover explained that this is where escrow would come into play, money would be placed in a fund which could be used to pay out incrementally on a specific ship kills until depleted.

Two step asked if you could have multiple copies of a contract, similar to the way items can be sold in stacks on Ebay.

CCP Tallest: "The thing is, we haven't designed them yet. We want to know what kind of stuff you guys would like to do with any contracts, and that will influence how we build the system."

CCP Soniclover clarified that things like batch sales of items or batch courier trips would be relatively straightforward to implement, but that things get trickier when you start looking at binary systems like the life or death of a POS, consideration would have to be given as to whether only one contract could govern all the others, or whether multiple contracts could be placed on it and all payout according to the result. CCP Soniclover also explained that this project is intended to bring contracts back to their original intent, instead of simply being an extension of the marketplace.

Two step then asked if it would be possible to set up free-form third party escrow, enabling a contract to formalize a Chribba-like service so that it is complete with a contract history visible by other players.

Trebor suggested that these could be used to create bounty contracts on certain ship types, through the creation of a "kill chit", a physical token dropped with a kill, or created off a unique kill mail, that could be traded as proof of a kill to those that want to pay for it. This way, Goonswarm for example could pay 100 million isk for every 10 Hulk kill chits collected.

Two step pointed out that this might curb fraud by creating a unique item that couldn't be duplicated and allow a person to redeem contracts more than once for the same kill.

Alekseyev heavily protested this idea, explaining that it only creates opportunities for mercenaries to get scammed for their efforts. Alekseyev explained that mercenaries should be paid 100% of the time for a successful contract completion.

CCP Paradox: "It sounds a lot like collecting dog tags."

Trebor: "Exactly."

Alekseyev again protested that it was ridiculous for a mercenary to have to fly a token from the kill site to wherever the contract requires in order to get paid, when verification exists in the kill mail already.

Hans Jagerblitzen agreed that there was no need for any physical item and that the data already built into the kill report system was sufficient.

UAXDEATH than asked if it would be possible to create exchange contracts that allowed a miner to trade a stack of minerals, in exchange for a supercapital.

Two step questioned whether this would work since supercapitals required escrow anyways.

CCP Soniclover answered that this would still be possible, but that it would likely just require a large collateral investment as insurance against theft. CCP Soniclover also cautioned that this high collateral may just serve as a barrier to use of the system in the first place.

Revisiting the concerns raised by Alekseyev and Hans, Seleene asked if it would be possible to just use the unique information built into kill reports.

Two step pointed out really all that was missing was a way to verify that the kill report had been used up.

CCP Tallest, reading from the design goals document for the system: "We want to give players tools so that they can interact with other players in a structured manner, with an emphasis on putting meta-behavior into this structure. Examples would be bounties, mercenary contracts, kill rights, etc. The focus should be on players or player entities taking contracts with other players or player entities, not the environment. The causality is expressed when players build the rules for a contract, then the rules are active and lasting for a period. We'd like to leverage the interaction to create social objects, and review the current system if possible, moving to the long-term goal of contracts being for all player-to-player services, and the marketplace being for item exchanges."

Alekseyev: “The challenge is this: It's a pain in the ass but mercenaries like Noir already have a contract history on our kill board and website. We already negotiate contracts informally. If your systems does not cover that in a more convenient way, it will not be used. Period. In fact, it might actually hurt because it creates confusion for new players.”

Two step added that while contracts are being designed for player-to-player contracts, there may be situations where a player may want to pay another player for a PvE service, such as mining a certain amount within a given space, or to kill rats and otherwise participate in raising the sovereignty level in null sec.

CCP Soniclover: “I don't think contracts should exclude these services, but I don't think they should be the focus of the first go.”

Seleene: “You mention first go, that's interesting. Is this something you're going to do, and then do more on later? Is there a second phase to this?”

CCP Tallest: “We haven't created our backlog yet, if we make a backlog, this would take us three years.”

CCP Soniclover clarified, explaining that in general CCP's thought process is to give the development teams more autonomy than they did in the past regarding what they want to deliver, and how much they want to iterate on a given feature.

Seleene asked if there was a particular priority for these various features.

CCP Soniclover explained that they wanted to look first at existing player transactions – renting service, kill services, etc. Next they would look at things that can't be achieved under current mechanics, such as trading kill rights to another player to fulfill instead.

Seleene asked if this was going to be a modification of the current contract system, or a replacement to the contract system and CCP Soniclover said that they would like to gradually phase out the current contract system as they push more item trading into the marketplace, turning contracts into a more free-form service. CCP Soniclover added that from a programming perspective, the current contract system is “a total mess” and that they are going to see if they can salvage it in any way, or if they just need to scrap it instead.

Responding to Alekseyev's statement regarding usability of the new system, CCP Paradox clarified that they would, by doing this, completely remove the “handshake” system and formalize these agreements so that players don't have to worry about trusting the other party, because the mechanics would provide a level of guarantee.

Elise Randolph added that the backstabbing element is fun as well, and should be considered.

CCP Paradox acknowledged that the real risk lay in the “chit” system, where verification of a kill could be looted by anybody.

Seleene agreed that this creates real risk for mercenaries to be screwed over.

Alekseyev explained that he wanted a supported system because of the added trustworthiness and that it could reduce admin costs. Clients refusing to pay or mercenaries failing to deliver should be an option, but should be tracked by the contract to help with the building and breaking of reputation.

CCP Tallest wrapped up the session by asking the CSM to continue the conversation on the internal forums in preparation for the work to be done in the Winter.

Two step asked if these contracts would be connected to Dust 514 contracts in any ways, but the development team responded that this would strictly govern EVE game play for the time being.

Content

Present: CCP Affinity, CCP Bettik, CCP Sisyphus, Alekseyev Karrde (Lync), Hans Jagerblitzen (Lync)

CCP Affinity started out by mentioning that her team (Team Five O), would be [working for two sprints on the New Player Experience \(NPE\)](#), so that players that might be interested in EVE because of the upcoming DUST release wouldn't be immediately turned off by the tutorials. While the specifics of that work would be covered in a later session, the CSM went over the list of work items that Team Five-O would be tackling.

The CSM was given a chart showing on what steps of the tutorial new players were quitting. Team Five O will be trying to focus their attention on the areas where players are having the most trouble. They have found that the areas where people are quitting are also areas where the tutorial is either broken or confusing, and will be trying to fix this.

Kelduum pointed out that many of the issues that CCP was planning on addressing were things that EVE Uni members complained about as well.

UAXDEATH suggested that instead of just telling players to do something, including a small video that shows players what to do would be very helpful.

CCP Sisyphus agreed that it probably would be helpful, but said it would probably not be possible to do it in the small amount of time they have available.

CCP Affinity said that they did plan to change the tutorial to better indicate the buttons that players need to push, with arrows or something similar.

UAXDEATH explained that most newbie friendly 0.0 alliances use videos to explain the UI, since it can be very confusing to explain with just text.

CCP Affinity responded that she felt that CCP making their own tutorial videos wouldn't be a great idea, but she wanted to figure out a way to make player-made tutorial videos more accessible to new players. Kelduum agreed, and said that making these videos was a massive amount of work.

Seleene asked CCP to keep in mind that enabling player groups to help new players may be more helpful than simple fixes to the tutorial.

CCP Affinity steered the conversation back to the short term fixes that her team would be working on. These include tooltips everywhere, re-arranging some of the steps in the tutorial, adding more incentives for completing tutorial missions and correcting areas where the tutorial mentions specific items that don't apply to all races (for example, when it tells players to board their ship it shows an Impairor, even if the player isn't Amarr).

The next topic was Incursions.

CCP Affinity mentioned that after the Escalation patch, Incursion activity had dropped off a lot. She has been working with Hans Jagerblitzen to reach out to the Incursion community to get feedback, and she laid out the short term fixes that were laid out in her dev blog (<http://community.eveonline.com/devblog.asp?a=blog&nbid=72880>).

Two step said that he actually liked the system influence changes, as it made Incursion runners actually have to work hard to reduce the Sansha influence levels. He said that it may have been over nerfed, but he asked CCP to consider not reducing it all the way to pre-Escalation levels.

CCP Bettik and CCP Affinity said that they wanted to see what the impact of the Vanguard site changes would be before making other changes. They felt that they had changed too many things at once in Escalation, and wanted a chance to see how the changes worked in isolation.

CCP Bettik expressed regret that Incursions were not tweaked at all after release, and that CCP is trying to not do that anymore. He also said that CCP wasn't sure if people ran Incursions because they were the highest income source in highsec or because they liked the group content.

Seleene and Two step said that Incursions were fun when they were new, but had since turned into a farming activity. Two step said this was similar to wormholes, which he thought were a lot more fun before all the secrets had been discovered. He asked for more randomness in general in PVE.

CCP Affinity said that her long term plans for Incursions were to fix the Scout sites, probably by turning them into mini-Vanguard sites. They would have less payout, but lots of helpful hints to teach new players how to run Incursions.

Two step pointed out that a big barrier for new players was that most of the Incursion organizing was done through chat channels and not as much by corps and alliances, which made it harder for people to know where to go to join the better Incursion groups.

CCP Affinity mentioned that she also wanted to add more stuff to the CONCORD LP store, as the current selection was too limited. She also wants to change the spawns to be objective based and more random.

In addition, she wants to make Incursion running into more of a profession by adding skills. She wants to add faction standing gains for fighting the Sansha, because it doesn't make much sense that the factions don't reward people for fighting Sansha in their space. Lastly, she wants to bring back Incursion live events.

Two step asked if they would be looking into the difference in payout between lowsec and highsec Incursions, as he doesn't feel there is enough incentive to encourage people to venture into lowsec. He said that while some players would never venture into lowsec no matter what the payout, the current payouts were far too small to draw anyone from highsec.

CCP Affinity said that CCP is currently trying to map out all the income sources in the game to better understand exactly how much people are making in all the different way people make ISK in PvE. Once that was done, they would better be able to tweak the numbers.

Two step persisted and asked CCP to look at simple stuff like upping the drop rate of Revenant BPCs.

CCP Bettik said, "The problem with that ship is no one wants to fly poop." (The room laughs).

Seleene mentioned that CCP Diagoras posted stats on Revenants and there were only two in the whole game. He asked, "Has there been any discussion with game design about maybe making these things worth a shit?" After some more laughter, he asked everyone to pardon the pun.

Two step also suggested making the Shadow Fighter Bombers more worthwhile, and perhaps upping their drop rate. The CSM was pretty universally in agreement that the Revenant needed a boost. Seleene suggested a shield resist bonus as well as the Nyx's damage bonus.

Seleene then asked if Incursions were ever going to end. From a storyline/lore perspective, it seems odd that the Sansha continue to invade even after being defeated every time.

Two step suggested that the Sansha are very persistent.

CCP Affinity said that if CCP makes it more of a career, they would probably need to change the backstory behind them to be more of a military thing and less of an invasion.

Seleene and UAxDEATH said that Incursions had become less of a threat and more of an annoyance. Seleene also said that this applies to Sleepers in wormholes. He wants them to be more aggressive.

Two step pointed out that they were probably sleeping.

CCP Affinity responded that the original plan for Incursions was to make them more of an introduction to PvP, which is not what is happening now.

Both Seleene and UAxDEATH asked why the Incursions were not more intrusive. Seleene asked why they didn't show up at the Jita 4-4 undock.

CCP Sisyphus pointed out that if Incursions impact players that don't wish to be impacted too much than those players will just get mad and quit.

Two step suggested that the gates in Incursions constellations should have Sansha NPCs fighting the faction police NPCs. These NPCs wouldn't have to engage players unless fired on, but it would make Incursions more visible to players.

Seleene said that he did feel that the game felt less alive, and CCP Bettik mentioned that CCP's game design team was thinking about how to make the game less reactive, and more active.

Right now, the game reacts to player actions, and he thinks it would be nice to have the players sometimes reacting to NPC actions.

Trebor and Seleene were surprised to learn that Incursion NPCs don't camp gates in highsec. Trebor feels that, "Incursions should be an existential threat", and that if they are not defeated, they should expand to swallow up the empires. There was some agreement from the rest of the CSM, especially if it was a once-a-year type event that required people to all work together briefly.

Alekseyev Karrde pointed out via Lync that an event like this would be a good chance to teach players about PvP and the need to defend themselves.

Two step said that he would like it if once a year everyone in EVE would be united against a common enemy.

The discussion then got diverted to a discussion of having the tutorial pod players. Seleene first brought this up, and Kelduum was in agreement that this would be very helpful, as new players are very afraid of dying for the first time, since it isn't really made clear to them exactly what will happen. Two step suggested having the tutorial teleport players to a random nullsec system and asking them to make their way home. Trebor and Seleene both liked this idea.

Seleene mentioned that doing something like that would also help to show newbies just how big the EVE universe is. Elise liked the idea as well, as a way to demonstrate to newbies that they are pod pilots and are immortal.

The discussion then went back to content. Looking at the categories in the content team's backlog, Two step noted that there was a wormhole category, and Kelduum said, "Wormholes are fine. They are perfect."

CCP Bettik moved on and explained what was on his list of stuff to do and what he had done, which included the drone alloy removal and the T1 loot nerf. He asked the CSM for opinions on those changes. Kelduum said that people that were mining loved the changes, since their efforts were now worth a lot more.

Two step said that it had turned out better than the most pessimistic estimates, and that prices had not skyrocketed.

CCP Bettik said that a lot of the price rises seemed to be based on market speculation and seemed to be a bubble. Two step said, "You guys know all about bubbles here" (referring to the Icelandic banking issues).

CCP Bettik mentioned that on his list was to make killing drones give security status increases and drone officer spawns.

Two step asked what drone officers would drop.

CCP Bettik said that he had about a dozen modules to give out.

Two step also asked about perhaps making the augmented drones more worthwhile as well.

CCP Bettik said he would look into it, and explained which modules he would be likely to include in the officer drops, but CCP doesn't want to make the list public while this is still on the drawing table.

CCP Bettik also mentioned the lack of hauler spawns in rogue drone space, which he probably would address by having rogue drone haulers drop alloys or something similar. Also on his list are rogue drone DED sites, now that all the pirate faction ones are done. He will be looking into salvage from rogue drones sometime soon.

UAXDEATH asked about the true sec levels in the drone regions, and if CCP was done rebalancing that.

CCP Bettik said they were.

Seleene and CCP Bettik started reminiscing about the "good old days" when they used to mine with frigates and cruisers. They both liked the social aspect that used to be present during mining ops.

CCP Bettik said that he missed freighter ops, and Two step agreed.

Seleene said, "It is sickening that I almost want that back... It made space alive and a roaming patrol could mess up your whole day. Now there are no roaming patrols." Seleene then joked with UAxDEATH that, "You want jump bridges and titan bridges to go away too, right?" UAxDEATH laughed and agreed, while rubbing his hands together super-villain style, and suggested removing warp to zero as well.

Turning back to the more serious problem of lack of activity in nullsec, Two step suggested that nullsec needed group PvE, like Incursions or Wormholes. This would put more people in space, and they would be in PvP like fits and fleets, with logistics ships and buffer tanks.

CCP Bettik agreed that this would be good for nullsec. UAxDEATH brought up the old static 10/10 DED complexes, which used to be a group activity right after downtime when they respawned. He liked that they mixed PvE and PvP because of the competition to get into the sites before the other people there.

CCP Bettik said in the very long term, he would like to have constellations provide some known content or resources.

Two step pointed out that this already happens with the 0.0 COSMOS constellations that provide supplies for making boosters. He pointed out that boosters are currently really good, but can be a big pain to use because people accidentally go into highsec with them.

With only a few minutes left in the session, CCP Affinity brought up a very high-level thought for the CSM to 'sniff test'. While no specifics can be provided the general reaction from the CSM was that the intent was good but it had to be done incrementally and carefully. CCP will confer further with the CSM should the idea make it past the stage of just being an idea.

Security

Present: CCP Sreegs, CCP Stillman, Alekseyev Karrde (Lync), Hans Jagerblitzen (Lync)

The meeting started out with CCP Sreegs complaining about the Icelandic layout on his keyboard and saying he had to get some people to switch out the keypad on his laptop so he could type properly.

As a true presenter CCP Sreegs opens up the sessions with truly vital information;

- Sweden won Eurovision
- Turkey made a man boat

Next slide is a graph showing botting is on the decline. CCP Sreegs says that the main goal they're after is to change the behavior of the EVE Players who are botting and to stop businesses from being profitable and making money off of EVE Online.

CCP Sreegs said before Fanfest it was something like 1,400 accounts being detected every 10 days, now it's under 10.

On the subject of detection, different criteria are weighted into a calculation, and once the value of said calculation hits a certain point, the ban is carried out.

Seleene asked how automated things are, saying that none of this had been in effect at all last year. CCP Sreegs replied stating that all detection is done automatically with verification being done manually. "We don't touch a damned thing, it handles itself."

Seleene asked about the slide and if it breaks down the different kinds of bots to which CCP Sreegs said that particular graph was everything combined but he does have the numbers broken down, just not displayed in this meeting.

Apparently the new inventory broke a bunch of bots, but every time there's a patch that breaks the bots, they bounce back within 6 hours on average and return to making money. CCP Sreegs says, "If our goal was eradication of the capacity for someone to automate process, then we will fail, it's a waste of our time and someone is always going to do it." His goal in all of this is to change the behavior of what are considered EVE Players, and to make the businesses be no longer profitable. This has partially been a success because the businesses are having to scale much higher than they used to, to continue to be profitable.

On the subject of changing player behavior, two big changes went a long ways with this. Preventing players from transferring characters that have been caught botting, and taking the illicitly gained ISK away from players.

When asked about detection CCP Stillman said that it's a combination of behavioral and technical detections that help CCP make the call.

UAXDEATH wanted to know how many people who got caught botting are now buying PLEX instead. CCP Sreegs said he has those numbers for RMT, but not really for botting.

Back to detection, CCP Sreegs said that they have gone and bought the botting software if they have a theory they want to test, but it's not something they feel necessary to accomplish their goals. They're aiming to make it more painful when caught and that is what is helping to change player behavior, rather than actually being caught itself. Painful in the form of having ISK taken away.

CCP Sreegs wants to make sure that the community knows what they're doing, why they're doing it and that they are doing their best to communicate what is going on from a security point of view

Seleene asked specifically how CCP does some of the detection with CCP Sreegs saying that he absolutely doesn't want to get into detection specifics. The bar is set pretty high for the automated detection scripts, otherwise the chance of false positives is increased.

The conversation shifted over to the "Report Bot" button in game. It has been successful in reducing the petition volume immensely, and it feeds directly into the automated detection system.

Greene Lee asked if there was any ways to have this button give feedback, maybe in an EVE mail. CCP Sreegs said that we want him to flood our inboxes with mails saying they received the report, he could do that.

Two Step suggested having CCP notify players if they accurately identified a bot and actions were taken against that player. CCP Sreegs says it would violate CCP's rules and they will absolutely not do that.

Greene Lee mentioned the notification of the report being received again, CCP Sreegs said that his memory would remember it (pointing to CCP Stillman) and that he'll have a chat with game design about it.

UAXDEATH thought now was as good a time as any to steer the conversation towards RMTing, asking about if people petition CCP saying "I'm not the botter, I'm not the source."

CCP Sreegs said about the same percentage as people who say they're not guilty while in prison. UAXDEATH continued the conversation by asking "So GMs don't even looking into it, they just 'this person has been marked as botting', fuck them."

CCP Sreegs said that if it's from his detection system false positives are very rare, but the GMs come to him if they think there's an issue.

CCP Stillman said that only two mistakes have been made with their system, and both were his fault, some technical issue in the database. UAxDEATH again asked about how they detect if multiple people are on the same network or not, quoting that in Russia he knows of twenty or thirty guys all sharing the same IP.

CCP Sreegs said that UAxDEATH was making assumptions on how CCP knows who is who, and that IP Addresses alone don't much to do with it.

Two Step stated that he's pretty sure he's heard of CCP recording a digital fingerprint of each computer, from botting forums.

CCP Sreegs moves on to some stats about RMT:

Total number of accounts banned: 1705

Accounts banned under 1 year old: 1354

Accounts banned over 500 days old: 192

Number of buyers reversed from: $248 + 519 = 767$

Total PLEX bought: $202 + 1419 = 1621$

Number of users buying PLED: $50 + 158 = 208$

Total cancellations: $9 + 54 = 63$

Accounts disabled: $41 + 150 = 191$

Accounts still in negative: $125 + 205 = 330$

Character ISK from banned accounts: 720,349,658,85.65

Character assets from banned accounts: 3,292,457,157,769.26

Corporation ISK from banned accounts: 383,349,849,981.61

Corporation Assets from banned accounts 792,010,629,991.37

Total: 5,188,167,296,594

CCP Sreegs says that a number of RMT farms had been operating for a long time untouched. Buyers are unlike sellers. The buyers are usually players trying to fund what they want to do in game, but the sellers are trying to run a business and make money off of EVE Online. He is trying to focus on

converting the buyers to buying PLEX (or at least stop buying ISK from illegal sources) and to shut down the profitability of the businesses selling ISK.

The security team does in fact measure if players are bringing their wallet balances back up to the positives with PLEX once being set back into the negative. These are generally players who want to keep playing, and are then considered “converted” accomplishing the goal of changing player behavior.

Another presentation slide:

- Authenticators are very much still on the table
- Anti-hacking improvements (client and account)
- A lot of internal policy and infrastructures stuff
- A lot of communication

Authenticators are coming, email verification needs to be sorted but it’s something they’re working on and hopefully getting done soon. Anti-hacking is mostly talking about injection stuff, which they’re working on and dealing with. Internal policy and infrastructure stuff was put there so we thought CCP Sreegs actually does work (heavy sarcasm).

That was pretty much it for CCP Sreegs’ presentation, and we moved onto the Q&A.

Seleene opened up by asking if there is a blanket set of criteria that CCP uses to identify a group of players working together to RMT and profit off of EVE. CCP Sreegs replied saying that there are places they knew RMT existed and they looked into them as necessary when starting the project.

UAxDEATH asked that if someone goes to a website makes a purchase, outside of the game, how they’re able to track it other than ISK being sent from one player to another in game. And what about systems being rented for real money and how hard that would be to identify.

CCP Sreegs admitted that there isn’t any easy way to detect that right now, but he really wants to stop people from making a business out of it. The security team is unable to stop everything at once, and has to pick a spot to start solving the problems.

He went on to say that every operation they’ve shut down has farmed ISK in different ways. There’s no pattern really except that they’re making money off EVE.

CCP Sreegs joked that UAxDEATH’s alliance buys and RMTs ISK all the time, to UAxDEATH cheering about it. It must be stated that there was heavy sarcasm involved in this exchange.

CCP Sreegs goes on to say that people are going to be making money off EVE, but they’re trying to go for the low hanging fruit first. He only has one CCP Stillman to do the work, and he doesn’t like to do work himself (heavy sarcasm).

Two step asks if it is mostly botting for money that is occurring, and CCP Sreegs says that they're finding different ways to make ISK all the time, it's rarely the same way between operations.

Greene Lee brought up the issue of selling characters for real money, as a form of RMTing.

CCP Sreegs says they haven't really gone after character selling yet, but it is something they're aware of. If they stumble across a business that also sells characters they'll ban those characters. He goes on to say that they're aware of most issues, but he doesn't have the time to do everything that he wants to. While he'd love to go after people renting systems for real money and selling characters for real money, he just doesn't have the time currently. Maybe in the future though.

Kelduum asked why this didn't happen a year ago. CCP Sreegs says that he wasn't here until about a year and a half ago, and it takes time to get all of these processes into place. CCP Unifex worked with him to get what he needed to really get all of these automated systems and people into place.

Two step said that the New Player Experience doesn't tell people not to RMT, to which CCP Sreegs said that he's already talked to the NPE people about it. It's a touchy subject and might be immersion breaking, but they're going to work on finding a way to do it intelligently.

Two step suggested having a fake RMT website that new players would go to and be told not to do this sort of thing, but was shut down pretty quickly.

UAxDEATH brought up the selling space for real money again, saying that there is only so much space in nullsec with so many alliances holding it -- there has to be a way to narrow it down.

CCP Sreegs says that he's not actively looking into that right now, but it is on his radar and he's aware of it -- it's just not a primary focus and goal.

The meeting is wrapping up, CCP Sreegs states that there's no real way to launder ISK anymore, CCP runs the game and is able to see everything that goes on.

(New) Player Experience

Present: CCP Sisypus, CCP Alice, CCP Arrow, Alekseyev Karrde (Lync), Hans Jagerblitzen (Lync)

Team Pony Express is a new team whose task is to "make players enjoy EVE more". The purpose of the meeting was to brief the CSM on Team PE's initial analysis and get feedback, and began with a presentation, the key points of which were:

Team goals: Deliver a quality game, get more people to play EVE, and make sure they are the right people.

Analysis reveals that about 2/3 of players like EVE's complexity, genre, exploration and focus, about 50% like the single-shard universe, economy, and open-ended play, but only about 25% mention PvP, corporations and community as their primary reasons for playing.

More information about new player retention was given to the CSM, but CCP does not feel comfortable disclosing more detailed information.

Two step: Do you have any statistics about loss rates from other MMO's?

CCP Xhagen: This is a closely-guarded secret in the industry.

Typical reasons given for quitting: "I got lost in the game early on", "Gameplay feels too slow", "It takes too long to figure out what the game is about", "I don't know how to proceed to the next step".

Bottom-line: The NPE is confusing, doesn't teach you what you need to know, doesn't reflect the awesome sandbox that is EVE, and is boring.

Team PE is currently re-evaluating what should be taught and how to teach it.

Short-term goals:

- * Fix the broken tutorial.

Long-term goals:

- * Retire the tutorial. Instead, work with surrounding features. If the presentation of a feature is better, it's also easier to explain. Make tools that help both new and old players -- this means better feedback, better presentation, better UI, better easing into existing features, less information overload.

Vision goals:

- * Efficient Teaching - get the knowledge you need to cope with EVE as soon as possible, less information overload, better tutorial pacing.
- * Compelling Experience - see more of the interesting stuff early, engagement - more learning by doing, consistency.
- * Seamless - should blend with exploration of EVE, should encourage initiative, not hold your hand and then drop you.

- * Social - Easier for players to work together regardless of character age.

- * Better Goal-setting - know more about what you can do, understand quicker how you can work your way towards a goal, get feedback that you are indeed on the right track.

- * Context - better understanding of your identity in the game, better understanding of how you fit in with the other players, abstract features of the game better explained (pod jumping, clones, jump drive, etc.)

UAxDEATH : Maybe you could put the noob into the middle of a fake fleet fight of some type, so he gets a feel of what a real battle is like. And not just looking at it, but participating.

Trebor: To be honest, that sort of thing would probably work better as some sort of video you can watch while the client is downloading. Sort of like a tour of the universe. For a noob, the depth and complexity of doing the simplest stuff in EVE are so overwhelming that you can't expect them to fly through a battle first thing -- they'll be totally lost.

UAxDEATH: As much as a video during the download would be beautiful, there's no amount of training that can prepare you for a real fight. You just have to go into it.

CCP Sisyphus: The topic at hand is the Player Experience, not just the New Player Experience. My next question is, I have all this stuff I can do; new epic arcs, new UI, better search and information, etc. What I want to get from you guys is, "where should I start?"

Trebor: I would not be sitting here if it wasn't for the fact that about 2 weeks into my EVE career, I got randomly adopted into a corp. At that point I didn't see the depth in the game, but within a few days of getting into that corp, I was totally hooked. So the #1 thing you can do to get those retention numbers up, IMHO, is hook people into the social structure of EVE ASAP. A couple nights ago at dinner the subject of arenas was being discussed, and one of the ideas that evolved out of that was the concept of newbie arenas -- instant-on PvP in special standard ships (no fitting requirements), maybe 3 or 4 of them, each with a different style of fighting. You could handhold the newbie through the fight against another newbie, and each noob would put up 10k ISK or something, the loser gets his ship blown up, the winner gets 15K so he makes some money on it. But the twist that came out was this:

Corps like EVE Uni should be able to sponsor the noob's entry fees -- the noob would get told "EVE Uni wants to sponsor you in the match and pay your entry fee" and if he accepts, EVE Uni gets a report that the noob took him up (a sales lead) and the noob gets a "Here is more information about EVE Uni" mail. The idea would be to automate the process of getting the noob in touch with a corp that is interested in helping him.

But after listening to you, I am wondering if you might not want to do this kind of matchmaking right at the very start of the tutorial and have corps sponsor the noob's first few days in EVE.

CCP Sisyphus expressed that he wants more guideposts in the game; when a player says "I want to do X" the game should do a better job of explaining what steps the player has to take to achieve that goal.

Two step: I think the tutorial should tell you, fairly early on, "go join a corp". There should be some sort of filter that lets them pick reasonable newbie corps.

At this point, CCP Hellmar poked his head in the conference room and attempted to appropriate it for his own meeting. The CSM firmly resisted his attempt to claim sovereignty, and sent him packing.

CCP Sisyphus stated that CCP has done a lot of research on the newbie corp concept. But just joining a corporation doesn't help, it can actually be a turnoff. You have to join the right corporation.

A short discussion of the problems of designating "newbie friendly" corporations ensued. CCP does not want to make value judgments that cause some corps to be given preferential treatment.

Seleene: But you've been running logon banner ads for RvB...

CCP Sisyphus: What we're looking at is some sort of dating service.

Two step re-iterated that this needs to happen as early as possible.

Trebor disagreed, stating that choosing a corp is a very serious decision and making it early usually is a bad decision. But getting back to the sponsorship idea, that's not joining a corporation, that's setting up a relationship. Maybe if a corp could say "we'll help out 3 or 4 noobs at a time" and they could have a shared chat channel.

CCP Sisyphus: We have numbers on the effects of corporate membership; people who are in (player) corporations will generally stay longer than people who aren't. People play for the community. When you start the game, you have (no clue as to what's going on) and getting plugged into a community has to happen as soon as possible. But joining a corp too early could be counterproductive, because at that point you can't do anything and are of no value to the corporation.

Seleene noted that for PvP corps, newbies have the advantage that you don't have to "unlearn them", you can mold them in the direction you want them to go.

Alekseyev Karrde (via Lync): We have a training corp that takes people with 30 days, it works and we like it. Make it easy for us and training programs like ours to find these people and vice-versa, so we can help you keep customers.

Two step: You have this multiplayer game, but early on players don't interact. You have to do something more to get them interacting.

CCP Alice: When you start in EVE, it's a lonely experience.

Trebor: Choosing a corp is like getting married, but what a noob really needs is a Big Brother.

Two step: People who go into training corps like EVE Uni don't stay that long.

Kelduum: Average EVE Uni retention time is about 3-4 months.

CCP Sisyphus: Why would a corp want to have a 1-day old character?

UAxDEATH: There are already corps that do want them. EVE Uni, TEST, Goons...

Two step: I disagree with the "joining a corp is like marriage" idea; you can leave a corp with no penalty.

Trebor: First of all, you're a slut. Second, from CCP's perspective, if a noob's [airquotes] first time [/airquotes] is bad... uh, my analogies are getting out of hand...

(laughter)

Trebor: ...he's going to quit the game and CCP's out 15 bucks a month.

CCP Sisyphus: Our numbers indicate that if people join a corp immediately, it doesn't make that much difference. It's when people hit 20-30 hours of play that the subscription rates start to climb.

Trebor: EVE's secret sauce is the depth of the social interactions. For me, it's all about how you can start planting the seeds of those social interactions earlier. It should be something easier than joining a corp; there are corps and people in EVE that would not mind helping out a newbie if there were mechanisms in the game that, for example, let them say "I usually play at these times and wouldn't mind taking a few newbies under my wing in a chat channel", and matched them up with some newbies.

CCP Arrow: Aren't you both saying the same thing -- that you (CCP Sisyphus) don't want people to join corps before 20-30 hours in... isn't that a recent thing?

CCP Sisyphus: The numbers tell me that I want people to be socialized and connected as soon as possible, so they have enough info to make a decent choice about what corp to join.

CCP Arrow: They could use the corp finder, and that could be hours into the game, not days.

Trebor: They need a mentor.

Two step: Aren't the volunteers in rookie help (chat) effectively mentors?

CCP Sisyphus: I'm unhappy with rookie help. It and the newbie corp chat channels are crowded and full of spam.

Discussion ensued about other ways to provide more info to newbies, including profession-based noob chats, and more reporting by ISD.

Seleene then suggested the discussion be broadened since the team's purpose is to make EVE better.

CCP Sisyphus presented some slides that detailed possible improvements, including a Unified Info system that brings together multiple information sources in a coherent way.

Two step: Show info could be greatly improved if it presented information in a way appropriate for the item being displayed.

Seleene: Show info for a gun should not be the same as Show info for a ship.

CCP Sisyphus: (The problem is that) a player says "I want to be an interceptor pilot; how the fuck do I become an interceptor pilot?" There's nothing in the game right now that...

Trebor: Gee, if only EVE had a manual.

(laughter)

Two step: Right now on the website there are some professions listed, but (for example) a noob can't immediately be a fleet commander. They need to be tree-structures, "I like to fight people"

CCP Sisyphus presented CCP's ideas for tutorial courses, which Two step characterized as "epic arcs for professions". Two step also expressed concern that these would still be single-player things and thus isolating; he raised the possibility of stealing WarHammer's public quest concept.

The idea of some corps being able to develop training missions or control combat simulators was raised; concerns were expressed about favoritism.

Trebor: One thing that would help would be the Battle Recorder. It would allow corps to more easily produce good training videos. Actually, if you want to give newbies an idea of what a big fleet fight is all about, any time there is one, you should just teleport a bunch of the newbies into it.

(laughter)

Trebor: No, just teleport them about 150km off the fight, so they can watch.

UAxDEATH: The fleet commanders will have heart-attacks.

Trebor: You say that like it's a bad thing... But you could have a banner that comes up that says "Incoming Tour Group"

Two step: The general point here is, give us tools to help us tell stories.

CCP Sisyphus presented the concept of a Ship Tree, a visual display of ship progression that would facilitate goal-setting by players. The CSM approved. He also floated the concept of "physical anchoring", animations for transitions between spaces (like undocking, jumping, going through a WH, etc.), with the caveat that they should not increase the time that it takes to perform the action. Other ideas being considered included a help button, global search, functional tooltips, fitting comparison, and more.

Two step expressed concern about the idea of eliminating the tutorial (in favor of making things "discoverable"), stating "I think you have to teach people how to use the UI".

CCP Sisyphus stated that one problem with the current tutorial is that it's too long.

Seleene stated that what the tutorial needs to do is teach the bare essentials, then CCP should leverage what players are doing to teach the rest.

Two step noted that the CQ should be removed from the tutorial.

Trebor asked how many people quit at the character creator stage. He suggested that players not be forced to do the Incarna character creation stuff at first -- give them a generic body with the option of a full resculpt later.

Kelduum threw out the idea of throwing players into a dangerous situation immediately, get them killed, and say "OK, you're dead, no big deal, you're immortal" and then create their character.

CCP Sisyphus: We want to avoid people having to make choices when they don't know what it means.

CCP Alice inquired whether letting people reset their choices after they'd gotten a little bit into the game would be a good idea -- for example, train mining skills, decide that wasn't right, get the skill points back and apply them somewhere else.

Two step suggested that career epic arcs could start off by providing skill books and some free SP to let noobs try the profession immediately. He also noted that "it is strange to me that EVE is a game about spaceships but you don't start out in space".

CCP Sisyphus enumerated key points noobs need to know: you're a clone, how to fly in space, how to fit a ship (the mechanics).

Kelduum suggested that after these basics, the player be moved into lowsec somewhere and given the task of getting to the rookie system. If he made it, he got to keep the ship. A discussion ensued about this and similar ways to immerse noobs into the game quickly. There was a general consensus that it was important to reinforce the idea that death is just an annoyance, but while Two step emphasized starting out in space, Kelduum felt that starting out in the CQ helps with the "I am a clone" concept and reduces barriers to PVP adoption. He does not have hard numbers on this, however.

Hans Jagerblitzen (Via Lync): Podding and clones are REALLY critical to explain to young players - they are baffled a lot of the time.

Seleene brought the discussion back to the issue of perceived favoritism of "approved" training corps. He pointed out that they did not pose a real threat to the social structure of EVE, and asked what CCP consider doing along these lines. He also noted that just as CCP Unifex asked about the CSM, there is the question of "what accountability would groups like EVE Uni have?"

CCP Sisyphus floated the idea of a "newbie friendly" corp finding tool.

Trebor pointed out that there is a very simple metric to determine if a corp is good at newbie training -- how many people quit. Since CCP knows the attrition rate of people who don't join corps, it can measure the effect of joining a particular corp -- good or bad.

CCP Xhagen asked if CCP promoting particular corps is favoritism.

UAXDEATH indicated that it was.

CCP Xhagen then pointed out that while the response to the RvB ads was very positive, it also generated inquiries from other corps : "Why can't we get something similar?"

Seleene asked what the process was for getting an ad. The response: "It was simple, they just asked".

Kelduum then requested an EVE Uni ad every day.

CCP Xhagen admitted that the process is broken.

CCP Alice noted that ads were going to move into the Launcher, and that Community would be the channel for getting ads placed.

CCP Xhagen noted that the challenge for CCP was "what if we recommend an organization and they turn out to be bad... it's too late"

Alek (via Skype): You'd be as responsible as Google is for the ads on your search results.

Seleene said that CCP has to decide what criteria they feel comfortable with.

CCP Xhagen stated that CCP is looking into ways to handle this situation but that they haven't found a good way yet. This might be a list of qualifications that CCP sets.

Hans suggested player-driven ratings.

CCP Sisyphus asked what could be done to foster mentoring.

Trebor pointed out that you could reward altruism by publishing "league tables" of who is doing the best job, but at the most venal level, since CCP has stats on noob attrition rates, it opens up a possibility.

Trebor : Let's assume I want to go into the profession of mentoring noobs. CCP knows what the lifetime customer value (LCV) of an unwashed, unmentored noob is. You can calculate the LCV of noobs that I have mentored (differences in attrition rate), determine if I have added value, and if I have, cut me in for a piece of the action. The better I do at turning noobs into rabid EVE crack-whores, the more I get.

Aleks discussed (via Lync) his corp's experience with a full-time training program. He stated that having noobs around is genuinely fun "if they're not dicks", that they bring an energy to the game, and that even if they don't stay with the corp, they become contacts between Noir and other parts of the community. The challenge has been in devoting the manpower to do full-time training and dealing with the fact that is diverts the corp from its main focus. Also, incentivizing corp members to be mentors is an issue; right now they are doing it out of the kindness of their hearts, and it would be easier and fairer if there was a way to help them out.

CCP Sisyphus: I'm trying to keep away from the idea that CCP, out of the game, is saying that one corp or another (qualifies).

Aleks: Give us a way to compete (with other groups); our program is top-notch, and we'll stand behind it. Make it some objective metric so CCP doesn't need to give a (stamp of approval). There could be different metrics for different types of groups (PvP, Mining, etc) and you could use these to help noobs make decisions.

Trebor: Aleks is focusing on the idea of corps mentoring newbies. I feel very strongly that there's also opportunities for individuals to mentor newbies (regardless of whether we are in the same corp), where I am a resource for that newbie, someone to talk to when he runs into a problem. You have a metric for how well I do, and you should probably make potential mentors put up collateral of some sort. If they do better than unmentored noobs, they get ISK; if they do worse, they lose ISK.

UAxDEATH: Isn't that corrupt?

Trebor: So what? I'm entering into a contract to perform services. And anyway, when I blow someone up, I'm making CCP money because the poor bastard might have to buy a PLEX. I'm performing an in-game action, and getting rewarded for that in-game action.

Aleks: I like this idea a lot.

CCP Xhagen asked that the meeting be wrapped up as time was running out.

Kelduum expressed full support for the corp sponsorship concept.

Aleks expressed support for tools that will let players help with this issue.

Kelduum also approved of the idea of participants putting down collateral.

Two step endorsed the idea of rewarding people for results.

Kelduum noted however that keeping people motivated over the long-term can be a challenge, citing experience with internal EVE Uni programs.

UAxDEATH noted an issue with rewarding corps; if the corps are getting paid for training, other people in the corp (such as FCs) might feel slighted if they don't get a cut.

Elise Randolph agreed.

Aleks pointed out that's an alliance issue, not CCP's problem -- "so get them (the alliance) to pay you". He added that CCP can reward people or groups for doing things that improve CCP's bottom line; how that gets split up is not their problem.

Aleks had the last word, pointing out that there is no reason not to support both corporate and individual mentoring programs.

EVE Economy

Present: CCP Dr.EyjoG, Alekseyev Karrde (Lync), Hans Jagerblitzen (Lync)

The meeting opened with CCP Dr.EyjoG asking an important economic question -- "when's dinner?" He was immediately accused of scheduling the session in order to optimize his chances of getting free food.

CCP Dr.EyjoG started with a general review of the EVE economy. While inflation has been high recently, looking at the economy over a longer term the recent inflationary spike was not bad until April. This spike was caused by speculation during the run-up to Inferno, and the inflation rate dropped sharply in May (Editor's note on this particular matter: Inflation numbers have dropped very rapidly in June and we are now in a period of deflation).

The major inflationary influence has been the steep increase in mineral prices during 2012. Since 2003, mineral prices steadily dropped until late 2010, then rose steadily (except for a dip in the second half of 2011). However, mineral prices dropped in May for the first time in a year.

The reason why mineral prices tended to decline was that people had multiple ways of getting minerals -- mining, looting and reprocessing. When changes were made to reduce the supply, prices did just what you would expect -- they steadily increased.

Zooming in on the data, since July 2011, mineral prices rose modestly and steadily until Fanfest 2012, with the rate of increase going up a bit when Crucible was deployed, representing increased demand due to a successful expansion. When loot changes were announced at Fanfest, prices immediately spiked, then roughly leveled off when the changes were deployed on Singularity.

CCP Dr.EyjoG: The interesting thing is, it is as if most of the speculation took place before the changes hit Singularity -- this did not give the markets much new information.

Two step expressed interest in seeing the numbers for the datacore changes, in particular after the information leaked due to datadumps from the Chaos test server.

Finally, prices began to fall when Burn Jita started, then stabilized during Hulkageddon. Hulkageddon appears to have stopped a natural fall in prices by reducing supply, but at the same time, between Escalation and Inferno, mining activity dropped in all sectors of space. The CSM had many theories to explain the changes in mining activity and prices.

CCP Dr.EyjoG expressed his awareness of concerns about inflation, and that it might price T1 ships and components out of the reach of younger players. However, he noted that EVE is a sandbox game, and the systems are functioning, so for now he is just watching to see how things play out.

CCP Dr.EyjoG : When you put it all together (game changes, wars, player events, banning of bots, etc.), you can say we had a perfect storm.

Trebor: Funny how that keeps happening in EVE.

CCP Dr.EyjoG then briefed the CSM on the PLEX monetary committee (PMC), consisting of CCP Dr.EyjoG, CCP Greyscale and a CCP “dude from finance”.

The PMC is charged with monitoring the PLEX market, proposing strategies for dealing with short-term disruptions in the market, and intervening in the market as needed to deal with these disruptions.

The PMC does not intervene to manipulate the PLEX market on a long-term basis; it is concerned with dealing with short-term disruptions, such as those caused by players attempting to manipulate the market. It conducts these interventions using the EVE Central Bank's stock of PLEX and ISK, which have been confiscated over the years from "illegal operations".

The PMC will provide reports to the CSM as needed when unusual situations occur in the PLEX market, whether or not an intervention actually takes place.

Any interventions are done by special trade characters, operating under preset limits. For example, to deal with the impact of another sale of Nvidia cards, the PMC might authorize the sale of 1000 PLEX within 3 hours, in order to provide liquidity to the market during an expected demand spike.

The PMC also reviews the results of any interventions and reports to CSM, and in due time, to the community as well. The CSM will also report to the community their opinion as to PMC activities.

Trebor: Our ability to do that will depend on the quality of information we get.

CCP Xhagen: It will be top-notch.

CCP Dr.EyjoG: One of the checks-and-balances will be you saying whether or not you got enough information from us.

So far in 2012, no interventions have taken place.

UAXDEATH inquired about the mechanics of selling other real goods for PLEX (similar to the Nvidia sale).

CCP Dr.EyjoG noted that such offers would only be considered if it was clear that they were not going to cause liquidity problems.

CCP Dr.EyjoG noted that CCP is looking for more PLEX sinks.

Seleene inquired as to whether Fanfest plane tickets will be available for PLEX, to which CCP Dr.EyjoG replied that "everything is being looked into".

Two step suggested "Nonni's for PLEX". (Editor's Note: Nonni's is a sandwich shop in Reykjavik, and is a favorite of certain members of the CSM. Double Editor's Note: those CSM members that have taste and class love it.)

CCP Dr.EyjoG's response was a masterpiece of obfuscation and evasion. He did, however, reiterate that their #1 concern was keeping the EVE economy safe, and there were real-world issues (like tax consequences) that have to be considered when using PLEX to buy real-world goods.

CCP Dr.EyjoG stated that he expects to send monthly reports to the CSM about PMC activities, and have a full 1-hour session at the next summit dedicated to PMC activities as well as the normal economics session.

Trebor ironically noted that "now that you've gone to all this effort, nobody will do anything that requires PMC intervention."

CCP Dr.EyjoG: Unless it's CCP!

CCP Dr.EyjoG then flipped to the next slide in his presentation, which detailed the two times CCP was tempted to intervene but did not; one was during the Nvidia offer, the other was a short-term bubble around the time of the Escalation release.

CCP Dr.EyjoG showed the CSM internal statistics related to PLEX; CCP's statistics regarding all aspects of the game are very detailed.

UAXDEATH: Do you have metrics on the number of idiots playing EVE?

Trebor: It's 100%, not an interesting number.

CCP Dr.EyjoG stated that the PLEX market has been relatively stable in the first half of 2012, and the internal statistics appear to show (as far as the CSM can tell) that the market is healthy.

CSM was also shown some interesting statistics about the economy. The average ISK in active player's wallets has been slowly increasing over time, but took a modest dip after Escalation. CCP Dr.EyjoG feels confident that the overall rate of inflation in EVE will return to CCP's "green" rate of +/- 1% per month. CCP becomes concerned when inflation persistently remains outside the "orange" area of +/- 2%.

UAXDEATH: Tell us who the richest people in EVE are.

CCP Dr.EyjoG: No, I will not.

Two step: Can you tell us the amounts?

CCP Diagoras: A lot

CCP Dr.EyjoG: A few people have low single-digit trillions.

In response to a CSM question, CCP Dr.EyjoG noted that the gradual increase in average wallet per character (in inflation-adjusted terms) is to be expected as older players learn to be better at playing. However, he noted that he is closely monitoring mineral prices, as those tend to impact new players the most (in the form of tech-1 ship and module costs).

Two step: I wonder if ISK/character is distinctly related to character age.

CCP Dr.EyjoG: We have done this analysis and it's much more correlated to the way you play the game than character age cohort.

Summing up, while CCP Dr.EyjoG is concerned about some prices, he believes that the recent inflation is due to a surprise shock related to mineral changes, and it should work itself out over the next several months.

UAxDEATH asked what the process would be if he (UAxDEATH) wanted to sell products for ISK.

CCP Dr.EyjoG replied that he should talk to Community, and that it would be quickly escalated to the PMC.

Alekseyev Karrde (via Lync) speculated that UAxDEATH intended to sell Thorax-themed sex toys.

Kelduum questioned whether these kinds of offers were too close to RMT.

Two step expressed surprise and concern that CCP was interested in more offers similar to the Nvidia offer -- "it does seem like a way to enable cashing out of the economy".

CCP Dr.EyjoG admitted that this was a new area for online economies and that he personally was a proponent of keeping EVE as closed as possible.

CCP Dr.EyjoG: We will just have to see how this evolves. I know of a really good book about it that is being written by two people...

Trebor: Who's the other author?

CCP Dr.EyjoG : No, there were going to be three authors but you guys keep me too busy.

CCP Dr.EyjoG also noted (referring to a comment made by CCP Affinity in another meeting) that he is trying to find a way to provide better metrics to game design for income based on profession, but

that it is proving difficult because it's hard to definitively categorize activities and professions in the game and player's activities tend to blur over multiple categories.



This concludes the meeting minutes.
Thanks for making it this far. You are a true warrior.

CSM minutes credits

Initial session drafts:

CSM: Introduction and White Paper discussion	<u>Trebor Daehdoow</u>
What is a Stakeholder?	<u>Trebor Daehdoow</u>
Winter 2012 expansion	<u>CCP Xhagen</u>
EVE Future	<u>CCP Xhagen</u>
The state of Incarna	<u>Alekseyev Karrde</u>
Live Events	<u>Elise Randolph</u>
Industry and mining	<u>Issler Dainze</u>
Starbase rework	<u>Two step</u>
EVE/Dust link	<u>Two step</u>
EVE UI	<u>Hans Jagerblitzen</u>
Null sec	<u>Alekseyev Karrde</u>
Corporation management	<u>Hans Jagerblitzen</u>
War decs and Crimewatch	<u>Hans Jagerblitzen</u>
Player experience – launcher	<u>Trebor Daehdoow</u>
Factional warfare discussion	<u>Hans Jagerblitzen</u>
Art session	<u>Trebor Daehdoow</u>
Ship balance and iteration	<u>Elise Randolph</u>
'Player to player contracts' (feature working title)	<u>Hans Jagerblitzen</u>
Content	<u>Two step</u>
Security	<u>Dovinian</u>
(New) Player Experience	<u>Trebor Daehdoow</u>
EVE Economy	<u>Trebor Daehdoow</u>
Final Minutes editing	<u>CCP Xhagen Two step Trebor Daehdoow CCP Manifest</u>