

Council of Stellar Management

Meeting With CCP 2.3

Meeting Minutes

Saturday 16th May 2009

Present: Ankhesentepemkah (Vice Chair), Bunyip, Darius JOHNSON, Issler Dainze, LaVista Vista, Omber Zombie (Secretary), Pattern Clarc, Vuk Lau (Chairman), Meissa Anunthiel (Alternate), Extreme (Alternate), Sophie Dagneau (Alternate), CCP Abathur, CCP Greyscale, CCP Xhagen (Meeting Chair), CCP Chronotis, CCP Wrangler

Apologies: none

Absent: Tusko Hopkins

While the first topic to discuss according to priority was CSM Meeting attendance, it was agreed that it would be moved to last on the agenda as it didn't require CCP devs other than *Xhagen* to be involved in the discussion.

1. Supercapitals Revised

Preliminary response from CCP:

Supercapitals are being actively discussed right now, because the need to resolve their issues is becoming pressing. We have a fairly good idea of where we're going with motherships, but titans are still an unresolved issue.

Discussion:

Vuk and *Bunyip* wanted CCP to elaborate on where they saw Motherships heading, *Bunyip* also thought Titans should be mobile stations.

Pattern thought that part of the reason for implementing T3 and fitting UI changes (subsystems) was for its impact on capital ships and wanted to know if this was the roadmap CCP was still following or had that changed.

LaVista reminded *Bunyip* that Titans as stations had been discussed and deemed not possible. *CCP Greyscale* responded that they have wanted to explore subsystem targeting for some time, and it is still on the list of things to pursue, but it is no closer to implementation than the last time it was discussed. He wasn't sure what the link between that and T3 was, but it is something they discuss regularly.

Pattern wanted to know if CCP shared the same dissatisfaction with supercaps that the players did or was the actions being taken due more to player reactions.

CCP Greyscale thought that Titans were fun for the guy pressing the button; they were anti-fun for everyone else as they stop fights. He thinks that is a bad thing.

CCP Abathur noted that motherships are just duplicating carriers on a larger scale, yet are obviously fighter carriers from their models. That limits CCP's ability to change their current role too greatly. CCP are currently working on ways to make motherships something more than just being capable of launching fighters and have more defined roles in combat. CCP has a few ideas for titan's, but nothing at an stage worth discussing yet. *CCP Abathur* also wanted to note that both Motherships and Titans would be updated/fixed/revisited/made better by the end of the year. In response to *Pattern's* question, *CCP Abathur* noted that there were people working at CCP who were just as upset about the current state of supercaps as the players and are very happy now that resources have been allocated to adjust them.

Oz wanted to know if there were any plans to include modular style systems so that the ships can fulfil multiple roles i.e. gas harvesting/mining/exploration.

Ankhe thought that players wanted to see supercaps as a more central one to a fleet rather than just being a bigger ship to fight with.

Vuk wanted a concrete 'hint' as to the changes being looked at.

Issler thought that supercaps were such a marginal issue that very few players are impacted by, modular ships would however be of more interest to a larger amount of players.

Darius wanted to point out to *Ankhe* that having more than one of anything is better than only having one, and to *Issler* that while supercaps are only flown by a few people, their impact is felt by a lot more, which is why it requires so many people to build them in the first place. They are by their nature, game changers.

Pattern noted that supercaps were 'endgame' content. They provide a goal. *Ankhe* pointed out that a stacking penalty applies to modules, why not ships. *CCP Greyscale* explained that modularization was on the backburner, but will be revisited, and on the subject of stack-nerfing supercaps - they are being looked at right now and are committed to the changes being done by the end of the year, as such any changes being looked at involve changing them need to be done without reimagining them, Titan's as fleet bases etc. is unlikely due to the programmer time involved, and even attempting what *Ankhe's* is suggesting is highly unlikely, CCP is looking at common-sense solutions right now. CCP will undoubtedly revisit supercaps again in the further future as they are iconic symbols, but they do have a lot on their plate right now. *CCP Abathur* explained that CCP was not only looking at the ships themselves, but the proliferation of them. They see motherships as combat ships and will be trending their adjustments in that direction. In regards to titans – they hate doomsdays but like it when titans explode. They do not like it when titans warp in, doomsday and warp out, the nano-nerf was not supposed to nerf titans, but it did. CCP want to see titans do something while on grid while also not have them be vaporized in 60 seconds. While he can't go into more detail now, he hopes that by the time of the next meeting they will have more specific details for the CSM.

2. **Forum Issues & CSM**

Preliminary response from CCP:

The forum moderation team is happy to be treated as the GM team for CSM purposes.

There was no further discussion.

3. **Fuel Pellets**

Preliminary response from CCP:

Fuel pellets were put on the backburner for a while due to competing priorities. Part of our goal for revisions to sovereignty is still to significantly cut down the number of starbases needed, which is a more thorough fix for the reason this is a big issue, but the underlying problems caused by multiple fuel types will still be there. We still haven't resolved exactly how the transition to pellets would work, but this is a project that we're able to revive fairly easily if the need is there.

Oz wanted to know if Sovereignty was still being revamped, could this be part of it.

CCP Greyscale that yes, sort of. POS would be much easier to refuel in the future.

Vuk thought that even with a sov revamp that POS are still used in industry and this was still a needed fix.

4. **Right Click repair**

Preliminary response from CCP:

Since "reprocess" and "trash it" are already in the context menu, repair should also be in the menu for the sake of consistency, i.e. this is a UI defect.

Oz wanted to know if CCP had a rough idea of when this would be implemented.

CCP Greyscale noted that no specific timeframe was assigned to it.

5. **Default Settings For New Players**

Preliminary response from CCP:

If the programmers in the NPW (new player experience) group are able to do this then consider this done. If they are not, this will be injected into the backlog with a high priority.

No further discussion was had.

6. Alliances & Factional Warfare Part 3

Preliminary response from CCP:

Alliances in FW is still in our backlog, but hasn't yet been assigned to a release due to competing priorities.

Ankhe wanted CCP to address the rumor that developers at the Las Vegas meeting told people that Alliances in FW would not happen. She also asked that since this was the highest priority item on the FW backlog, could CCP address what was happening to all other FW issues including an exploit.

CCP Abathur responded that CCP does want to see alliances in FW. *CCP Greyscale* added that the other FW issues were still in the backlog and awaiting resource allocation and that since no-one present was up to speed regarding the exploit, it would not be discussed.

Darius wanted to remind the meeting that they should stick to the issues on the agenda, not bring up other issues.

Ankhe asked that since FW is part of the advertised content of the retail release, CCP should allocate more resources to it.

Oz interjected mid rant and pointed out that FW backlog resource allocation was not on the agenda.

Ankhe also demanded that CCP deal with the exploit and proclaimed that no one at CCP had a clue.

CCP Xhagen thought *Ankhe* had made her point and should stick to the agenda.

7. Epic Mission Standing Recovery

Preliminary response from CCP:

This is actually a high-priority backlog item for Rubicon.

Ankhe wanted to know if CCP would consider adding a standing reward to the current epic mission.

Bunyip requested an update as to the status of the current arc as discussed in meeting 2.2 *CCP Greyscale* couldn't discuss the current status as it was unknown and not on the original agenda so couldn't come prepared with an answer from the people that did.

Ankhe wanted to know if CCP would divulge their plans regarding pirate faction recovery.

CCP Greyscale didn't have any specific details at hand.

8. Charter Missions

Preliminary response from CCP:

CCP discussed something very similar recently, and would definitely like to see it happen, it's not on in the pipelines at the moment but it is backlogged.

Ankhe requested more details so it could be discussed with CSM.

CCP Greyscale responded that the people discussing it weren't here, so no more information was to be had other than it was at concept stage and not much more than what the CSM submitted.

9. Multiple Quantity LP Rewards

Preliminary response from CCP:

Seems like a sensible and feasible suggestion; added to our backlog.

Ankhe had the suggestion of: Just make a counter at the end of each item and check-out the whole bulk. So you can order 10 probe launchers and 200 probes all in one transaction.

Bunyip wanted to add the suggestion of: add a quantity field both to this and to contracts. The ability to set quantities would vastly improve the current setup.

LaVista thought *Ankhe's* suggestion was overly complex.

Oz asked for an implementation timeline.

CCP Greyscale answered soon, but not too soon. It depended on patch scheduling and developer time.

10. UI Font Issues

Preliminary response from CCP:

Is already in the Cosmos backlog for Rubicon: New Full Unicode Set

No further discussion was had

11. Look At Objects More Than 100km Away

Preliminary response from CCP:

CCP don't see any UI reasons to have an arbitrary limit on the "look at" range, so are all for changing it, especially since the user can look at things manually anyway (as described).

No further discussion was had

12. Hide Station Environment

Preliminary response from CCP:

"Changes to shader textures and modeling will no longer put excessive stress on older graphics cards. This means they will no longer overheat while players are docked in a station." Included in Apocrypha 1.2

No further discussion was had

13. Cyno Effect

Preliminary response from CCP:

Talking to Ben Bohn, the art producer, regarding the new effects he said: "The new effects have not always fulfilled our need for gorgeousness and are currently at the center of our attention. Bare [sic] with us until you'll have a Kleenex moment every time you jump, warp, shoot, cynose [sic] or dance [sic]"

No further discussion was had

14. Smuggling For Pirate Standing

Preliminary response from CCP:

Smuggling and related areas are for the most part tied in very closely with the dynamics and mechanics of low-sec space, which are in general need of an overhaul. This is a fairly large project, however, and isn't on any immediate release plan; a lowsec revisit definitely needs to happen, but it's likely that any revisit of smuggling/contraband in the meantime would fail to live up to its potential due to an inability to address the whole lowsec package.

Issler wanted to know when players could expect the lowsec revamp.

CCP Greyscale responded that lowsec revamp is long overdue, along with sovereignty, factional warfare, agent system and underlying pirate faction revamps. There was some public speculation about the things discussed at EVE-Vegas, but he had not reviewed the material yet. What he had seen was in the general direction they wanted to go, one big comprehensive fix rather than small little fixes here and there.

Bunyip thought that the proposed fix would discourage players from entering lowsec, not encourage them.

CCP Greyscale pointed out again that he hadn't read the proposals in detail so wasn't in a position to comment on them other than that anything that goes into the game goes through the design department and the design department will discuss things rigorously.

Ankhe wanted CCP to consider implementing some of this as part of Factional Warfare.

CCP Greyscale reiterated that the discussions at EVE-Vegas were just that, discussions, a brain storming session that hasn't been looked at by the design team.

Darius pointed out that while the EVE-Vegas discussion made the ideas pretty, most of what was discussed had been previously raised at CSM level with CCP already.

CCP Xhagen echoed Darius' comments.

15. Restoring Old Graphics Options

Preliminary response from CCP:

We never had an option to enable anti-aliasing in the client. It's always been done in the graphics card settings. I [Torfi] think we did something in Trinity that bans anti aliasing. Probably in Trinity when we introduced shadows.

Bunyip wanted to know if it was possible to allow players to disable shadows so they could enable AA.

Pattern thought it was possible to disable shadows already and that dev time spent coding this option when it is only really available to one graphics card manufacturer was a waste of time and would be better spent explaining the existing workaround and putting the information in the evelopedia.

Issler thought it should be up to CCP's graphics developers to allow/disallow this.

CCP Xhagen thought that evelopedia was intended for use of eve (in game) information rather than technical info which belongs in the knowledge base. He would double-check to make sure.

16. CSM Meeting Attendance

Preliminary response from CCP:

A simple meeting attendance is a poor measurement for activities. My [Xhagen] initial response is that those who are elected go to the Fanfest, alternates being backups; i.e. no change in how those things are handled. Meeting 'slackers' in person and chew them out there is... effective?

Secretary's Note: I could have detailed this 1.5hour discussion blow by blow, but I thought rather than bore the readers with it (and to save my poor carpals) I would summarize it.

1. The CSM was deeply aggravated that *Pattern* *Clarc* would be flown out to Iceland to attend Fanfest considering his lack of attendance at CSM meetings.
2. The CSM wanted a mechanic where it would be possible to remove a delegate due to inactivity to discourage similar behaviour from future CSM delegates.
3. After much debate and thought, *Pattern* announced he was not going to be attending Fanfest (*Extreme* would be taking his place as first Alternate), and the following is being added to the CSM whitepaper:

Removal of a CSM member.

Should a member be unable to attend a meeting – by being present and active during the meeting – he or she is to inform the chairman and the vice-chairman of the absence. The next serving alternate will serve in the absent member's place during that meeting.

If a member is absent from a CSM meeting and gives no notification of absence the chairman will announce the members absence and the next serving Alternative will sit that meeting. Should the same CSM member be absent for two meetings in a row without a notification, the next serving alternate will take the absent member's seat and serve as a full CSM member for two meetings, during which time the absent member will be unable to reclaim his seat - he will have to sit the meetings as an Alternate. If absent for the third meeting in a row, the next serving Alternate will serve as a full member of the CSM for the next three meetings and should the absent CSM member return during any of those meetings, he will have to sit them out as an Alternate. During the fourth meeting in a row a CSM member is absent the chairman is to announce the absence and notify the council that a removal of that CSM member will be requested to CCP, who in turn will make sure that request is legitimate and valid. Should a CSM member be removed he or she is still considered having served a whole term.

Meeting End.

Minutes compiled by *Omber Zombie*, some modification for clarity by CCP.
Any errors or omissions please contact Oz (Omber.Zombie@esm.eveonline.com)