

CSM3/CCP Meetings Report; September 3rd to September 6th 2009

These meetings took place in Iceland in early September and were followed, for some of the issues, by follow-up meetings with the Content Team at Fanfest in the beginning of October.

Preamble:

Despite some issues being championed by individuals within the CSM and some features on occasion being supported by only a subset of the CSM and opposed by another subset, the CSM has generally had a unified front on all issues and the members of the CSM are hereafter referred to as "The CSM" rather than the individual member having made such or such point. In addition, points have sometimes been made by different individuals on both side, i.e., it was more of a discussion between the CSM and CCP than a battle over conflicting positions.

Keeping track of who-said-what during a live discussion being an arduous task, that was not recorded - a summary of the discussion is however provided.

1. CSM Internal Discussion and CSM-CCP relationship

CCP Reps: CCP Xhagen, CCP Diagoras, CCP Dr.EyjoG (all 3 present at all meetings)

CCP asked how the CSM felt about the level of participation and voter turnout.

Everyone agreed the level of direct player participation (through the CSM section on the forums) as well as the voter turnout was not where it should be (it could potentially be higher).

A number of explanations have been suggested as a reason:

- Less than 40% of the players have ever posted on the forums.
- Most people are not particularly interested in the "meta" aspects of the game.
- Many people play casually and are unaware of the forums.

A number of ways were suggested by the CSM to increase visibility and participation, mostly revolving around in-game integration of the CSM (both for issues presentation and in-game voting):

- A possibility to vote in-game, not only from the website.
- A "discussed with CSM" sticker at respective items in release notes.

CCP asked the CSM where it would want to be in the future.

The CSM generally thought it was being under-utilized and should be used more frequently as a feedback function, which CCP used only marginally in the past (on PLEXes, the POS exploit, and a brainstorming session about 0.0 during CSM 1 and CSM 2).

CCP agreed that feedback was valuable and will make better use of it in the future.

The CSM also requested that statistics be made available on topics it discusses in order to make the outcome of such discussions pertinent. CCP agreed to provide such statistics and information if they are available and do not give sensitive information (alliance data, titans data, etc.) as need occurs.

The CSM complained about the Monthly Q&A not getting answered. CCP Xhagen promised to look into what holds it.

CCP asked where and how the CSM would like to grow.

The CSM replied it doesn't want in-game powers or special abilities (except for Zastrow who requested colored chat). The CSM reiterated its desire to be included in the design process in order to be able to give feedback on upcoming features.

1. Adam Ridgway resigns

We were informed of the resignation of Adam, the CSM delegate known as Larkonis Trassler. The statements of the involved parties can be read here:
<http://www.eveonline.com/devblog.asp?a=blog&bid=692>

2. EVE Production

CCP Rep: CCP t0rfifrans

Torfi gave a presentation of the EVE development process and upcoming developments. One of the points emphasized was that EVE has been around for quite a while and, as such, its code base has grown to hundreds of thousands of lines of code (above a million with client and server combined). A direct result is that a significant amount of time is spent on maintaining old code and refactoring it. While this time does not directly produce anything visible to the player (except in cases where the new code has better performance than the old one), they are required to build new features.

The other limiting factor in time available is the time spent on QA, fixes and post-patch monitoring process. CCP mentioned that they have revisited their development process to split the development teams in semi-autonomous SCRUM units comprising not only developers, but QA and designers as well to minimize the overhead of going back and forth at each code iteration. A process that has proved its value with the comparatively smoother release of Apocrypha.

The famous “backlog” was also explained. It is a continuously sorted list of “to-dos” that is regularly revisited in total, to see if priorities need to be shifted. Issues brought in by the CSM in fact have a special stamp on them and get extra attention.

On the subject of Walking In Stations (now renamed *Incarna*), Torfi assured us it was still very much alive. The reason it has been delayed so much was due to tying its development to DirectX 10 and Vista, which few people adopted. Not wanting to leave the majority of its player base out, CCP had to, among others implementation issues, retrofit the code to be compatible with what players were actually using (i.e., DirectX 9).

A few recurring concerns of the player base about *Incarna* were addressed:

- Machinima tools should be available to players in *Incarna*
- *Incarna* features will not be solely “run by NPCs”
- Features present in *Incarna* will involve a low barrier to entry (and as such be available to newer players)
- Will not become a mandatory part of existing features.
- No timeline was given to the CSM, but it won't be in *Dominion*.

Despite being still very much closemouthed about *Dust 514*, a few of the player concerns were nonetheless addressed:

- *Dust 514* will not take sovereignty control out of the hands of the EVE players
- There will be limited causality between one game and the other, they should be regarded more as a symbiosis than one requiring the other. Should either totally be absent, the other will still function correctly.

1. Meeting with Team Fibonacci

CCP Rep: CCP Eris Discordia

Eris Discordia presented the team responsible for the data gathering and analysis at CCP as well as the new player experience (NPE).

Efforts have been made to improve the data gathering being done in order to improve the experience both for new and experienced players, as well as detect potential exploits and abuses. Their work is part of what made Unholy Rage (the banning of a large number of RMTers) possible,

as well as the detection of and fix to the POS exploit.

While some of their efforts have been published, some others haven't (like a recent exploit in Epic Arcs that basically allowed for printing ISK) [CCP addition: proper actions have been taken on all fronts there regarding].

The efforts they have made to improve the tutorials lead to a better tutorial where bits have been shuffled around to match with the usage statistics where players would skip some parts only to return to them later, as well as the addition of things that were missing (information about corporations, among others). They have stated their intention to continue on that front and try to include some PvP specific topics (such as tackling). Eris Discordia, an otherwise nice-looking person, had a devilish grin when she told us about her intention to make players see one of their ships blown to smithereens in one of the tutorial sequence as part of learning that in Eve, unlike other games, you die and actually *lose* things.

She also told us about an upcoming feature ([the Fleet Finder](#)) and requested feedback from the CSM about what they have ready for it as well as what we would like in it and how we would use it. Discussion ensued, the results of which are uncertain at this stage. Team Fibonacci was however very responsive to the CSM suggestions/requests, some of which will be part of the feature and others that may not make it in the first iteration.

CCP and CSM discussed briefly the learning skills, and the CSM was clear in depreciating learning skills altogether. Implants were mentioned as an acceptable addition to improve learning speed – but not skills that act on skills. CCP mentioned their thought of using tutorials where the pilot would gain learning skill levels

2. Dominion

CCP Reps: CCP Whisper and CCP Abathur

The masterminds behind the upcoming expansion told us what they have in store for the upcoming expansion, the highlights of which have been the subject of a series of dev blogs, the remainder of it looking equally (if not more) interesting. It is worth noting that a significant number of features in *Dominion* had been discussed in (very) lengthy brainstorming sessions with previous CSMs and that the feedback that was given then and the ideas that were thrown at the designers was definitely taken into account.

It is clear from the details provided that the designers actually know and play the game they design, the CSM was thus very hopeful about the quality of the expansion, despite the inherent difficulty of providing a decent balance to the whole concept.

3. Meeting with Team Slartibartfast

CCP Reps: CCP Fear

CCP presented the CSM with the new in-game browser and its ties to *New Eden* (the still mysterious “Spacebook for EVE, among others”, formerly known as COSMOS, not the PvE constellations). The bottom line is that EVE is getting a fully functional, RSS + JavaScript + HTML + “maybe”-Flash capable browser.

The CSM voiced their concerns about the potential viruses/exploits/etc. that could be used to gain in-game information through the browser. CCP Fear laid these concerns to rest by explaining how it technically works (separate threads, limited inter-process communication, JavaScript limited to the browser, etc.).

Discussion ensued about the features the CSM would like to see in the new browser, both in terms of authentication, header provision, APIs and others. Flash was a component that may not make it into the initial release of the new client, however complex Java applications such as Google docs would work. Flash still has issues on the Mac client leading the whole game to crash, while on PC it only crashes the browser process.

4. Unholy Rage CCP Reps: GM Grimmi

GM Grimmi provided the CSM with more information regarding the ongoing “Unholy Rage“ process. The additional information unfortunately cannot be shared for security reasons [CCP addition: if the methods involved in the process would be disclosed it would give the perpetrators unnecessary information, thus the mandate of withholding the information] . The CSM encouraged CCP to keep being public about their efforts and the results thereof, inasmuch as possible without providing information to RMTers. CCP showed that in addition to the initial “big kick” that happened in June, there is an ongoing effort in that direction.

5. Meeting with the Game Masters over the GM Competency issue CCP Reps: all Lead GMs (Lead GM Grimmi, Lead GM Guard, Lead GM Ender, Lead GM Q and Lead GM Panzer, Lead GM Fate) http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Competence_of_the_GM_department

The CSM has expressed its dissatisfaction with the GM teams in many ways.

The GM team showed the CSM data about petition ratings that are constantly going up (and reach 79%). The CSM regretted very much the absence of a category breakdown, because while “stuck” and “account payment” issues may get frequent 100% satisfaction, reimbursement issues are more likely to be in the bottom of the satisfaction rating. And stuck/payment petitions are most likely to dwarf the other ones.

The CSM conceded that the GM Team does a great job in some tasks, but not in others.

The GM team said they had refined the hiring and training process, and that due to the complex nature of Eve, training people to know the intricacies of EVE was not an easy task (they mentioned a 200-page document that was supposed to cover information about nothing but POSes as an example). And this despite the fact that they sometimes hire former volunteers. They explained the steps taken to make sure that experts are available in different fields to make sure a GM less knowledgeable about a particular topic has the possibility of transferring the issue to someone who knows, or get the information.

They produced data showing decreasing waiting times on petitions, except around new releases.

The CSM conceded that customer support was not an easy job, and expressed their opinion that the GMs were shooting themselves in the feet by not communicating to the player base about the status of customer services on a regular basis. However despite the data presented, the CSM thinks there is still very much room for improvement, especially on the competency issue.

On the “fairness” and/or partiality issue, the GMs said that all allegations of misconduct/unfairness/etc. can be petitioned and they will be investigated by the Internal Affairs staff to prevent such things.

6. Issues

Issues were introduced by the individual CSM member who championed them.

CCP Rep: a number of game designers, programmers, QA and producers answered the questions, including, but not limited to: CCP Abathur, CCP Chronotis, CCP Fear, CCP Zulupark, CCP Tuxford, CCP Explorer, CCP Baldur, CCP Arkanon and the GMs represented mainly by Lead GM Grimmi, Lead GM Guard, Lead GM Ender, Lead GM Q and Lead GM Panzer.

6.1. Corporation and Alliance tool overhaul http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Corporation_and_Alliance_tool_overhaul

Notifications will be overhauled as part of *New Eden*, there will be a notification tool separate from the mailbox.

CCP is not messing with EVE mails at the moment because mails are being overhauled as part of *New Eden*. The deployment should be happening at the same time as *New Eden* gets in (i.e., in *Dominion* for the first features), the rest of the alliance/corp tools overhaul will come at a later stage.

In addition, the roles are being condensed as part of *Dominion*, although the whole topic is given a low priority by CCP because it affects a lower number of people than other issues.

Due to less reliance on POSes as part of *Dominion*, the nightmare of POS management (with which CCP agrees to) is not going to be as much of a problem in the future.

It was also noted during this conversation that Corporation-insured ships are going to change, although we weren't informed in what way or when.

On the subject of standings-based POS access, that is not going to happen.

6.2. Remote repping and aggression

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Remote_repping_and_aggression

CCP informed us that it is not trivial to program, but they like the idea and are definitely going to look into it. The most likely short term solution is to limit the limitation to jumping and docking, not generally flagging the people as being aggressed so they don't get Concordokken'ed.

6.3. Whatever happened to the industry expansion

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Whatever_happened_to_the_industry_expansion

The short of it is CCP is not going to do a 100% industry expansion, as there's a more pressing need for refactoring the underlying industry processes.

Some of the features requested got a design and prototyping done, but they required some heavy refactoring, which happened (faster S&I interface and hangar responsiveness are a result of this).

The initial technical difficulty lead to features not being added but to improvements instead.

A few things made it through such as the Orca (designing a new ship takes a long time) and rock beautification (asteroids got new models/textures).

The CSM rightly pointed out that the industry section of EVE had been neglected for quite some time.

CCP agreed to allocate resources of the upcoming (non *Dominion*) expansions to industrial and market upgrades, they will however require a prioritization of industry and market topics that need improvements. Taking into account that smaller things lower on that list may get slipped in as development time allows.

This will not cover the addition of new ships because of the large amount of work involved in creating new ships.

6.4. Factional warfare - allied forces

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Faction_warfare_-_allied_forces

The answer to that request is “no”.

The justification is that war declarations already exist and CCP doesn't want big alliances to move into the “newbie PvP zone” that is Factional Warfare.

CCP and the CSM agreed that alliances could be allowed to join FW, but holding sovereignty will not be allowed during participation. These terms are those under which an alliance participation in FW will be considered.

6.5. Outpost dock radii

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Outpost_Dock_Radii

Not in *Dominion* but possibly 1.1, CCP will get the art team to look into it.

6.6. Manufacturing and invention at POSes

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Manufacturing_and_Invention_at_POSes

Not going to happen, the reason is that the code for POSes and industry at POSes does not easily support such additions or changes without very time-consuming tasks.

CCP is unwilling to devote resources to untangle that and would much prefer replacing it with a system that actually makes sense. The CSM agreed with the intention, but not with the time industrialist will have to wait, especially in light of the limited will on the side of CCP to take on industry projects.

CCP agrees it's limiting and annoying, but the effort require to write additions the thing as it is now is too much. POS need and will receive a full refactoring in the future.

6.7. Fix to logoffski

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Fix_To_Logoffski

CCP attempted to fix it before but ran into technical issues. They agree logging off should not be considered a valid tactic.

Making emergency warp a fixed location has a number of difficult technical issues associated with it. Besides there's no technical difference between accidental and purposeful loss of connection.

It boils down to erring on the side of caution and giving the benefit of doubt in case of disconnections.

No amount of arguing from the CSM changed their stance on the issue. CCP, however, agreed to look again once more into providing an unchanging emergency warp-out location to prevent multiple log offs being used to get away from their warp-in.

6.8. Personal wallet divisions

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Personal_wallet_divisions

CCP doesn't like the personal wallet divisions much, they however agreed to add more filtering options within a single divisions and tabs, like it has been done with the hangar.

Specific needs can always be met by using API.

6.9. Assault frigates 4th bonus

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Assault_Frigates_4th_Bonus

CCP agreed their role has to be looked into and will not say no a priori to the idea of a 4th bonus.

A bonus to afterburner speed was suggested and discussed.

CCP agreed to take the time to investigate this issue in the near future.

6.10. Send hail message on convo invite

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Send_Hail_Message_On_Convo_Invite

Adding a "show info" link on the initiator of a convo is trivial and agreed to. The other aspects needed more clarification, as CCP read the issue to be solely about the modality of convo invite windows.

The UI people will take a look and decide if a compromise can be reached between block all

and block none without having too much of a level of intrusion.

6.11. Armageddon day 2.0

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Armageddon_Day_2.0

CCP is planning to have one or more large scale shooting event on Singularity, the test server, in capital ships before *Dominion* goes in, specifically to test the super caps.

Singularity, however, does not have the material infrastructure to support more than 2000-ish players, and because the hardware and software used by Singularity and TQ are different, hardware from TQ cannot be borrowed to use on a special large-scale Armageddon day on Singularity.

Doing an Armageddon day on TQ is not an option as not everyone would actually appreciate it and secondly backing everything up and restoring would take more than a day (half a day for each operation)

6.12. Add probes to overview

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Add_probes_to_overview

Without any discussion whatsoever, CCP agreed.

6.13. Station Owners un-rent offices.

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Station_Owners_Unrent_Offices

Remote un-renting may be looked into.

CCP agreed on the principle of the thing that new owners should be able to enjoy their station.

In terms of process, CCP will do a bulk look at all the processes that can or should happen when one captures an outpost.

6.14. Faction vessels

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Faction_Vessels

Rebalancing of faction ships was underway and the results have been put on Sisi. Feedback process is currently underway and has been the subject of numerous dev blogs.

6.15. Skill Injection

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Skill_injection

Not going to happen.

The design decision was that at no point should the queue be internally inconsistent, and injection of skills whose requirements are not met would lead to inconsistencies.

They feel that the gain of skill injection is not significant enough to warrant assigning significant developer resources to the problem.

6.16. Visible aggression indicator in 0.0 Space

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Visible_Aggression_Indicator_in_0.0_Space

The service (program) tracking aggressions, called the aggression manager, is a service that doesn't run in 0.0 nodes. Turning it on would decrease performance and fleet fights would grind to a halt. This service is part of the reason FW warfare had lag when fighting in low sec.

CCP is not opposed to the idea of a visual indicator (yes/no) should the aggression information already be broadcast to the client instead of just checked by the gates and stations when a ship is trying to use them. Should they not be already broadcast to the game client, they agree to

look into the possibility of adding an option to display that timer on request through a button or some such mechanism, the very latest should the user try to log off he will receive a warning.

6.17. Show Implants on POD kill mails.

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Show_Implants_on_POD_killmails

It is currently technically difficult (and has always been) because the service responsible for sending the kill mails is asynchronous to the fights.

A ship death is a static thing, but the character keeps changing as time goes. By the time the kill mail service gets a request to send a kill mail, the character is already alive and kicking elsewhere with other attributes.

Artificially dropping the implants for 100% destruction to generate the kill mail or some other such technical artifice is something they are going to look into, but if they have to interrogate the database to figure out what happened in the past (such as if the pilot had implants), they will not happen.

6.18. Fix rockets

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Fix_rockets

CCP agreed to look into rebalancing rockets, they are however not certain the explosion velocity is the parameter that they would want to tweak.

6.19. BPO Locking Changes

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/BPO_locking_changes

The solution as proposed will not be implemented. CCP however has a possible solution in the works in the form of an upcoming feature (called the Blueprint Manager) that currently exists as a concept but hasn't yet been approved (i.e., don't hold your horses on this one). Players are invited to give their ideas for such a concept, too.

Corp voting doesn't support voting on multiple items at once and reworking them to do so is not a viable solution.

6.20. Dynamic Missions

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Dynamic_Missions

CCP objected to the proposed changes that some people like the grind and don't like surprises.

For the ones who do, new content of increased difficulty has been introduced in the form of Epic Arcs and new missions introduced by the Atlanta team.

Applying Sleeper AI to missions such as L4s would cause a severe load issues on the server but is being considered for some limited subset.

For challenges hard AI can also be had in wormholes, which is PvE content for the adventurous.

Two dynamics CCP could go for:

Make it more difficult by adapting to the player setups (i.e., moving about, popping drones) give a wider range of missions.

An idea given by the CSM during discussion was the introduction of some player-interaction aspects in connections to missions, like the requirement to complete a goal faster than someone else. So, not directly PvP, but still interaction.

6.21. Revisit the standings matrix

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Dynamic_Missions

Epic Arcs have been proposed as a way of recovering from bad standings at a point of no return for people.

CSM suggested maybe degrading standings over time, CCP didn't like the idea.

Stories have been revisited to give some background that would allow for better access (like the Thukker Tribe).

It has been agreed that the CSM would meet with the mission team at Fanfest [CCP edit: which they did]

6.22. Stuff about characters transfers and the problems caused

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Stuff_about_character_transfers_and_problems_caused_by_it

While CCP agrees that Petitions should not be transferred along with the characters and are not opposed to a reminder that data may need to be cleared out, deleting everything automatically is not something they're going to do.

They aren't going to "brand" people as having been traded either, as they see trustworthiness in-game as a valuable asset some people may be willing to trade. The CSM objected that the character "trade" would simply constitute one additional information in a thorough investigation which would be done anyway by Corporate HR on a new member in important cases and is not *per se* a bad mark.

CCP also doesn't want to get into the business of enforcing in-game trust.

Lots of discussion ensued following the relative value of Trust and the aspects of in-game versus out of game character vs. player, but no result was reached that made CCP think any differently.

6.23. EVE Account security proposal

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/EVE_account_security_proposal

Generally, countering account hijacking has a rather high priority within CCP.

One time password is being investigated. They also intend to implement "Log In History" that one can see to verify his account has not been used.

Whatever additional security measure CCP would implement, if any, would anyway be optional for people who don't want to be bothered.

One's ability to change their account name is also going to be investigated.

6.24. Bring back zoom buttons

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Bring_back_zoom_buttons

The Zoom buttons were removed because data gathering done showed they weren't used, and were cluttering the UI needlessly. Additionally CCP points out that they didn't have the function described in the issue.

Shortcuts to perform the zooming functions should exist (they don't work at the moment) so people don't have to use the mouse wheel.

The request is going to be forwarded to the UI team, as CCP agrees to get something in place functionally equivalent to the old buttons.

6.25. Corp Hangar Audit Logs

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Corp_Hangar_Audit_Logs

Won't happen.

CCP implemented Hangar Containers just for that reason, as it was and still would be a performance issue.

The CSM complained that Outposts do not have those and they are not transportable.

CCP agreed to look into transporting audit containers in ships, possibly in repackaged form.

6.26. Personal Hangar Improvements.

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Personal_hangar_improvements

CCP intends to go beyond the requested feature and implement “tabs” with filters attached to them instead of compartmenting the hangar, in much the same way they have done with the inventories.

6.27. Factional Warfare, RFI (request for information)

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Factional_Warfare_-_Request_for_Information

CCP agreed that the distribution of complexes can be made more even, it is currently skewed because “presence” is a determining factor in the distribution, if people always frequent the same system, the complex distribution is going to stay the same.

Also, some people are trying to run complexes and avoid PvP, this is something CCP would like to change.

CCP says they definitely haven't left FW aside, as can be seen by the recent changes they have made, such as LP store, PvP rewards, FW-only rewards, medals, integration with the storyline, etc.

CCP also intends to try and find a way to make occupancy meaningful.

The CSM voiced its concern about Generals in FW basically not getting any reward anymore for killing other people. CCP will look into that.

Lag has been for the most part resolved.

Cloaking in complexes has been resolved too.

The attribution of medals for Caldari FW was based on people being present in FW at a given time, which was a deliberate decision by CCP. The FW team will look into an appropriate solution of the perceived unfairness.

6.28. Looting from wreck you didn't create = looter flagged to killer in empire

[http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Looting_from_wreck_you_didn't_create_%3D_looter_flagged_to_\(wreck\)_killer_in_Empire](http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Looting_from_wreck_you_didn't_create_%3D_looter_flagged_to_(wreck)_killer_in_Empire)

CCP thinks this situation would create more problems than it solves. They also want friends of the victim to be able to recover partially from losses as circumstances allow. While “vultures” may indeed be considered a problem, CCP finds them better than the alternative.

The CSM argued vehemently in favor of a change, in the spirit of 'spoils of war', yet the spoils always belong to the victim while they may be readily available to the killer. This stance however counters the logic used with the NPC wrecks - which is again done under the 'flag' of PvE not PvP, making the comparison flawed.

6.29. Covert Cyno in Empire

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Covert_cynosural_fields_in_high_security_space

CCP agreed to analyze the concept and get it through their review processes for evaluation.

6.30. Ship Fitting visible via show info without boarding the ship

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Ship_fittings_visible_via_Show_Info_without_boarding_ship

For technical reasons, it wouldn't be possible to show the effect modules have on the ship being info'ed. Also, this feature would, for the same technical reasons (ship contents/fittings not being loaded by the client remotely), only be available for the ships in the same station the person is

in. The CSM found this compromise adequate and would welcome the feature despite the restrictions, considering the use that is going to be made of it.

Consequently, CCP agreed to implement this feature.

6.31. Sound Engine Woes

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Sound_engine_woes

Most of the issues are fixed with Apocrypha 1.5.

CCP revealed that, contrary to popular belief, about 70% of the players have sound on (a fact which apparently surprised CCP itself!).

Improvements have been made already, and CCP has hired more people to work on the audio aspects of Eve.

CCP Baldur vehemently requested that people file bug reports whenever they encounter a sound problem.

Sound notifications for currently only visual feedback are going to be added (CCP requested “wish-lists” from the CSM)

A few examples were enthusiastically given by CCP Baldur of the things he's eager to get in, such as notifications when shield/armor or hull gets below a certain percentage, configurable and many others.

CCP Baldur recognizes the need for short, clear and unequivocal sounds.

6.32. Forum profanity filter

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Forum_profanity_filter

For the new forums coming along with New Eden, the profanity filter will be optional. Considering the proximity of its release, current forums will not be retrofitted to that requirement. However, the first iteration of the forums will not have the profanity filter as optional.

The Calendar will also come at that time (2nd iteration)

6.33. Re-tweak Minmatar ewar capabilities

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Retweak_Minmatar_Ewar_Ship_Web_Abilities

CCP agrees Gallente and Minmatar suffer from subpar ewar capabilities at the moment. They will be investigated but no timeline is given, not even Soon™.

6.34. Split Show Effects settings into separate options

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Split_the_show_Effects_setting_into_separate_options.

CCP agrees on principle.

The suggestions will be sent to the UI designers but the granularity will not be that detailed.

They won't go the “overview way” and make more options than any one person can understand.

6.35. Move Recover probes away from Analyze button

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Move_Recover_Probes_Away_From_Analyze_Button

“Sure, consider it done”, they said.

6.36. Toggle logging on/off for chat channels

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Toggle_Logging_On/Off_for_each_Chat_Channel

CCP agreed to put that in contextual menus, it has low priority in the backlog however.

6.37. Improve refresh time on loading Corporate Hangar contents

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Improve_refresh_time_on_loading_Corporate_Hangar_contents.

No, it will not happen due to the caching mechanism being there for performance reasons, CCP agreed to look into making it faster for capital ships however.

6.38. Improve people and places search results for solar system

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Improve_People_%26_Places_search_results_for_Solar_Systems.

CCP agreed, “People and Places” will get a new UI as part of *New Eden*.

6.39. Sort Ctrl+Tab window list by last activation.

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Sort_ctrl-tab_window_list_by_last_activation_instead_of_time_created

CCP agreed to get the UI team is going to look into it.

6.40. Hull Maintenance Drone

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Hull_Maintenance_Drones

Trivial to implement, CCP is not opposed to the idea but they'll have to get that through the art department who will want, as is requested of them, new models and/or textures for the drones to be unique. Depending on their evaluation it may or may not take time. [CCP edit: It is necessary to reiterate the point that introducing new models and/or textures is not a trivial thing to do and is very time consuming.]

6.41. More orbit range options

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/More_orbit_range_options

CCP agreed in principle. They will have to get that through UI who may want to go beyond what the CSM requested.

6.42. Docking in capital ships

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Docking_in_Capital_Ships

Definitely a NO. CCP explained that this is really not trivial. CCP gave a detailed explanation about why it's not possible (e.g. session changes being requested by someone other than the client whose session changes).

The CSM tried to suggest ways around the restrictions, both technical and “philosophical”.

As much as CCP likes the idea (and they do), it's just too complex on the technical side.

CCP encouraged the CSM to come back with the idea if they think it really worth the cost, i.e., suppressing another feature from an upcoming expansion.

6.43. Outlaw remote repping

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Outlaw_Remote_Repping

Larkonis having resigned, the issue was introduced by Meissa Anunthiel.

After much discussion, CCP agreed to reevaluate that game mechanic. If they find it exploitable, it will not be implemented, otherwise it will. On the face of it CCP thinks the proposal fine.

6.44. Share dividends payout value

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Share_dividends_payout_value

Quote the dev (CCP Tuxford): “I can do it in less time than it takes to talk about it”.

And lo!; there was much rejoicing around the table.

6.45. Apocrypha 1.2 default overview settings

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Apocrypha_1.2_Default_Overview_Settings

CCP explained that they had gathered lots of data on usage with new players, that they went through design and UI iterations over this and were convinced by the new settings. They also found that the new settings cause less confusion (and petitions) from the new players, so the default overview settings will remain the same.

6.46. UI Add support for POS module in the Overview

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/UI_Add_support_for_POS_Module_Status_in_Overview

Unlike the overview, whose contents are broadcast continuously to the clients, the “space” content is not broadcast in the same way. Adding the status might prove too straining and as such is unlikely. CCP agreed to look into it however.

6.47. UI Show Info button on chat invite

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/UI_Show_Info_button_with_Chat_Invite

Not a problem.

6.48. UI Client remembers POS passwords changes between session changes

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/UI_Client_remembers_passwords_between_session_changes.

Strangely enough, CCP explained that this was very difficult for all sorts of performance reasons, but they agree it is annoying. CCP agreed reluctantly that it might be solvable. CCP Tuxford agreed to investigate it, without any promise whatsoever. An intermediate solution would be the 'ye old' copy & paste.

6.49. Improve fleet commander UI by showing fleet composition

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/UI_Improve_Fleet_Commander_UI_by_showing_fleet_composition.

CCP likes the idea. As a matter of fact it was already being looked into.

It may or may not be included as part of a total revamp of the total UI (i.e., if it is not, it may come separately)

6.50. Sentry Gun aggression and drones

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Sentry_Gun_Aggression_and_Drones

CCP agreed to revisit the sentry AI and damage dealt to potentially use sleeper AI or some other mechanism to make using drones in low sec more possible.

6.51. AFK/Busy/Available Indicator

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/AFK/Busy/Available_Indicator

This feature is being looked into as part of *New Eden*.

6.52. Drone Stance Interface

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Drone_stance_interface

CCP Tuxford offered his apologies for it not being visible (this is what happens when a developer implements something without UI feedback). It will definitely be implemented, although some paperwork involved means it might not be as fast as “just doing it”.

6.53. Store Bookmarks server-side

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Store_bookmark_folders_server-side.

CCP would like, as a general rule, to store everything server side so one could log in from any place and find all his settings. It is however non trivial to create a back-end for parameters storage considering the amount of configuration options available.

CCP agreed to look into it.

6.54. Remove pause for Jump Clones and implants

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Remove_pause_for_JC_and_implants

The proposal as suggested is difficult to implement. However an alternative button for pausing/resuming placed in the jump clone interface is considered acceptable by both CCP and the CSM.

Plugging in implants may, however, be fixable as proposed.

6.55. Make certain factions more valid for mission running

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Make_Certain_Factions_More_Valid_for_Mission_Running_-_Part_2

CCP notes the number of agents was purely to decrease the server load and not a measure to increase the popularity of one faction over another.

A meeting with Scott at Fanfest has been arranged to provide answers.

The answer given by the Content Team is basically the same, that it was a server load issue and not a popularity issue. The content team agrees that more agents gives an advantage to mission runners of that faction (through having more agents to potentially turn down missions from), but regrets not being able to do much about it for the time being. They will however keep the issue in mind.

As far as “underdog” factions are concerned, such as those without agents or with a limited number of them, the issue stems, among others, from the faction in question having few systems they call home and other than adding a several agents in one system or creating new systems (very hard to do), there is a limited number of options for the Content Team. They will discuss that topic with the other teams and see if a solution is possible.

6.56. Add a meta-column to the item detail list view

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Add_meta_column_in_item_detail_list_view

CCP agrees it is trivial and that it will get done.

6.57. Ship crews

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Ship_Crews

While CCP likes the concept, the crews, according to the CSM's description, would basically serve as extra modules, which aren't very compelling.

In addition they don't want NPCs to become more valuable to flying your ships than skills or player created items such as rigs and modules.

CCP went over this concept when designing subsystems (apparently subsystems started their existence as “crews”). However they concluded crews wouldn't be beneficial from a game design point of view.

The CSM argued it could be used as a “reward” for ships that go regularly into battle, which CCP said would only lead to people AFK-ing to obtain the benefits.

In summary, CCP is unclear as to what role this feature would fill.

As long there's no game play reason, CCP will thus not add another item that makes ship

balancing more of a nightmare than it already is.

6.58. Client Add-ons

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Client_Addons

CCP sees the potential, and regularly revisits the idea, but they don't like the security issues it poses, and it creates more problems than it solves. The current answer to the request is no.

6.59. Make guns continue firing at the previous target

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Make_guns_continue_firing_at_previous_target_after_reload

While technically doable, CCP Chronotis surprised just about everyone by stating that “some people would not want to keep firing at the same target after a clip reloads”, which baffled many members who vehemently opposed such a notion and defended the proposal.

CCP also pointed that AFK-ing may be a concern (which the CSM replied was not such a concern for Amarrian player, apparently).

Based on the arguments provided by the CSM, CCP agreed to look into it.

6.60. Add the feature of switching without relogging

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Add_the_feature_of_switching_characters_without_relogging.

CCP said it was technically problematic, because clearing the state of a client fully and without creating memory leaks was a large undertaking.

CCP agrees it'd be nice to have but the cost of the convenience is too big when the current design of the client is kept in mind.

6.61. Factional Warfare – NPC review

http://wiki.eveonline.com/wiki/Factional_Warfare_-_NPC_Review

CCP conceded that faction NPCs were never really balanced against each other, since for regular mission runners of either faction that does not make a big difference. They agree to revisit these (especially with regards to ECM).

They explained that the current design was for NPCs to be a “light” add-on to the other players defending the place instead of the sole opponent.

They added that fine tuning damage output was easier than tuning ewar, but as FW is getting a higher priority recently, this is being looked into.

7. Previous CSM issues

Issues from previous CSM have been revisited, most had already been implemented and those that weren't are still in the backlog. Noteworthy points were:

- Contract Volumes are still in the backlog, and are going to be reprioritized
- Empire wardec mechanics take a lot of time to revisit and need to be given a higher priority by the priority-setters, something which hasn't happened yet. They are however very much still in the backlog
- Insurance on suicide ganking is tied to a revisit of insurance in light of T2/T3/Capital ships etc. which will happen, with no ETA.
- Bounty Hunting may or may not be included in a low sec revamp that is currently in the concept state.
- Matari weapons are being checked for rebalancing right now
- Some ideas are being discussed about ways to make mining more enjoyable, several designs exist in that regard
- Live Events are not going to happen on the “Aurora scale”, due to dedicated people needing

to be hired, issues with perceived fairness, etc. CCP mentioned the possibility of doing “automated events”, whatever they may end up being

- R&D job security (jobs being visible to more people than needed) is going to be altered when role granularity is revisited
- “Abandoned POSes” unanchoring is being investigated
- Corp Market orders being modifiable by more than the initiator needs to go in a market revamp, which won't happen immediately
- Alliance Logos will be part of the *New Eden* upgrades
- API Upgrades will happen when *New Eden* is released, as the decentralization that happens then will help in freeing resources
- Fuel Pellets are still very much on the agenda, although they're not coming in *Dominion*
- UI Fonts. CCP pleased everyone by announcing they hired a “Font Guy” which means that improvements on that front are to be expected
- Cyno Effect. Lots of people have been complaining about it, both among the players, the CSM and even CCP. The Art Team is going to release a new shiny one at the same time as others, as a package upgrade
- Probe placement issues are resolved as time goes, several improvements have already been made and more are coming

8. Low sec plans brainstorming session

A brainstorming session occurred on the topic of low sec improvements. The contents of which will not be discussed at this point.

9. Feedback:

CCP specifically requested feedback from the CSM on the following topics:

- As to the areas the CSM would like to give feedback on and how
- Feedback on data publishing that is gathered, too much? Too little? What kind?
- Sound as it is used in Eve, both what can be improved and what could be added
- In-game browser uses, what features would it need or could it use
- How to best visualize fleet finder fleet size
- Banking/Trust system features
- PLEXes adoption vs RMT. Ideas how to promote one vs the other
- reduction in hacking: thoughts?
- Possible venues for CSM expression in-game or out of game
- File a bug report for bookmarks in corporate hangars decreasing performance

Minutes compiled by Meissa Anunthiel. Any errors or omissions please contact
meissa.anunthiel@csm.eveonline.com