

## Minutes of the Seventh CSM Winter Summit - December 12<sup>th</sup>-14<sup>th</sup>, 2012

### Contents

Minutes of the Seventh CSM Winter Summit - December 12 <sup>th</sup> -14 <sup>th</sup> , 2012 .....	1
EVE Online - The Next Decade .....	3
CSM as Stakeholder.....	18
CSM Whitepaper & Election Systems.....	25
Null-sec: Part 1 .....	35
Null-sec: Part 2.....	41
Ship Balancing .....	47
Factional Warfare .....	51
Bounty Hunting.....	57
Mercenaries, Wars and Crimewatch.....	63
EVE UI .....	71
Live Events.....	76
CREST .....	81
Out of Client .....	87
Player Experience .....	92
ART .....	97
EVE Economy .....	101
Customer Loyalty .....	108
The EVE / Dust 514 Link - Part 1.....	112
The EVE / Dust 514 Link - Part 2.....	119
Community Website Exercise.....	123
Marketing Feedback Session .....	123
Prototype Feedback Session.....	123
Summit Minutes Production Credits.....	124

Note: as of publication time, CCP had not completed NDA review of two sessions that focused on the link between EVE and Dust 514. These will be published separately at a later date.

The following abbreviated names are used in this document for clarity and conciseness:

Trebor	Trebor Daehdoow
Elise	Elise Randolph
Alek	Alekseyev Karrde
Kelduum	Kelduum Revaan
Hans	Hans Jagerblitzen
Meissa	Meissa Anunthiel

CCP staff members are identified by their dev names without the CCP prefix.

Sections of text that begin with a speaker's name followed by a colon are direct quotes with minimal editing for clarity. For example:

Alek: EVE needs more ponies.

## EVE Online - The Next Decade

Present: CCP Unifex, CCP Seagull

Note: while this was not the first session of the summit, the CSM believes it should be read first in order to provide the proper context.

Unifex began with a bit of history about the company, recounting that EVE Online was shipped by guys that “were about to lose their houses” and that shortcuts were taken to get the game built on time. It wasn't until Exodus that Unifex personally felt “we really had a game” but that it was still a game that appealed to hardcore players who could look past the flaws to enjoy the experience. In fact, the hardcore will always look past flaws. Despite that, “we're a different company these days”, one that Unifex describes as finally in a place where they can build to a vision, essentially building the game “the way it should be, not the way circumstances forced it to be”. Pulling this off has required some shifts in focus and procedure, Unifex explained, adding that they're taking the time to write a new roadmap for helping them build EVE through the next decade.

Unifex: One of the tasks that sits with me and Andie [Seagull], though it is Andie that is primarily leading this, is to ask ourselves ‘what do we want EVE to be going forwards’. This is a fairly big piece, in terms of trying to define a system that won't put arbitrary constraints on us but will help guide us moving forwards. There are some things that I hope never change in EVE – It is a dark game; it is a game of consequences; it is a game of tough choices and social interaction. It is a game of pain; it is a game of joy; it is a game of extreme emotions. I would never change EVE from that. But that doesn't mean that it has to have a spreadsheet UI, it doesn't mean that EVE has to be what it's been the last 10 years. There are certain things that we need to maintain what EVE needs to be, and if we were to all sit down I think we would find ourselves in violent agreement about what they are.

Unifex: But the game can be better, it can be smoother, it can be what an audience 10 years from its launch date wants. It can have a broader appeal without losing the things that make it EVE. We want to set a roadmap down, a way of thinking about EVE, that will take us into the second decade so that EVE becomes a better product for all of us.

Unifex explained that it was a busy time in the office, as they were not only developing their roadmap but also looking into options for their next release effort. He recounted that at FanFest last year, he had delivered a 12-month roadmap which was: “get our shit together, focus on the core game, and recover from an ‘interesting’ 2011”. At this year's FanFest, Unifex wants to be able to outline what CCP will do for the next 3, 5, and 10 years.

Unifex: If we don't have a goal, if we don't have something that is aspirational, there are competitors out there that are going to challenge us. There are players who will say, ‘you know what? You're no longer shooting for the stars’. One of the things that has become clear to me throughout Crucible, Inferno, and Retribution, is that it's not the way we have done our best expansions. They are good, but they are collections of features that are loosely themed. We want to create something more inspirational, that players aspire to play, while still concentrating on spaceships.

Unifex: This is why I've asked Seagull to take up this position as head of Product Development for EVE Online, because she has a got a way of looking at this which is an incredibly good way for us moving

forward, without losing what EVE is. That's what we want this session to start out as, and I also wanted to get your input on what you consider makes a good release.

We've touched on this today in a number of areas, we've sort of skirted around this. We've talked about null-sec, the mercenary marketplace, wardecs. We've got some good examples, and some good things, but I wanted to get your input as we go forward identifying the things that make a compelling release. Is it Incarna? Is it Inferno? Is it Retribution? Is it Apocrypha? It probably isn't any of those on their own, but they all have bits that make for really compelling releases. That's where I want to try and end up today, and we'll likely take it with us to the bars tonight because this is going to be a really interesting session. Seagull, you're welcome to take it over now.

Stepping up to the whiteboard, Seagull briefly recounted that earlier in the day, the split between her and Ripley has been explained, and that her role is very much focused on EVE as a product. Not just the game mechanics, but the whole product.

Seagull: What is it we're selling? Why would anyone care about it? How do you pay for it? How do you engage with it? I believe that if we're going to have a productive conversation about what EVE is as a product, we need a couple of tools and vocabulary for talking about this. So I want to put these stakes in the ground in terms of that vocabulary, and tell you about my starting point for how we should approach what we're going to do with EVE. I'll just take you on a little journey here and present this to you both so I can get feedback and we can tweak this vocabulary, system, and approach and also so that you get to see how I understand EVE, and whether I should be allowed near it or not.

Unifex: She should.

Seagull began by explaining the first vocabulary stake to be driven into the ground – that CCP as a company engages people on three levels. “For me it's important to keep them distinct because it helps us talk about the different layers of your experience”. The first level is with people as a customer. CCP builds a product, they market a product to turn people into customers, and that they manage those customers through account management and support. This level needs to be handled professionally.

Seagull: There are actually features from within the client that still engage you at the customer level. For example, you might get a pop-up informing you that you're on a trial account and need to pay us to continue playing.

Seagull: The second level that CCP engages people on is as a player. This is after someone becomes a customer, has characters in New Eden and engaged in game, where they've become part of the player community.

Seagull: We do things to support this, the player forums for example. These are things we do to specifically engage with you as a player, which don't even necessarily have to do with anything particular you are doing within the game. You can be a solo-playing carebear, and still be part of the overall player community. This is important for me, for us to talk about that fact, because engaging in specifically-social gameplay mechanics is not necessarily the same as being 'part of the community'.

Seagull: The third level is with the characters themselves. The bulk of what CCP makes are features for people as characters acting within their science fiction universe.

Seagull: This three-layer model is something that is fundamental to how I talk about what we're doing. It is a way for us to keep some kind of integrity between these. For example, if we actually need to help you as a player, we don't engage you as a character. Characters don't export overview settings. You all have needs as a player that shouldn't be entangled with our science fiction universe. This is why I needed to create a tool to talk about it.

Seagull explained that they needed to separate game development from product development, and they had begun to recognize that CCP often has discussions that wildly cross all three layers of engagement with people. Her new position will be focused on EVE as a product, which encompasses the sum of the three layers. The company also has its entire design crew focusing on the science fiction universe, meaning that while it can touch on the other two layers, game design itself is primarily focused on engaging characters with features. Zooming in on the character level, "the game", Seagull explained that she will be outlining some tools that allow her to ask "What are we making? And for whom?" without getting stuck by talking only about individual features.

Seagull: Sometimes we become victims of things that are already in the game, and it becomes hard to talk about higher level things.

Seagull: In terms of what we're doing, to make an army analogy, if you imagine a core of troops marching forward – we have this science fiction universe, and you can do stuff in it. There are all kinds of ships, systems, various things that you as a player can engage with. There are two things I have to say here as far as what I think the company should be doing. One is that whatever we offer on this menu of the million things you can do in EVE, they need to be challenging, interesting, well designed, game play elements for whatever players they serve.

Seagull: The other is that as a science fiction universe, it has to be ambitious and fucking amazing. EVE Online is a unique piece of science fiction that is 'participatory'. Whatever you want to call it, the fact that your actions have an impact on this science fiction universe, instead of Star Wars or Star Trek where you are simply consuming the science fiction. There are derivative games, and so on, but this is an original work of science fiction where you can act. And I believe, that, for a lot of people, is a big, big, part of the draw. Whatever it is you want to do in the game, you should want to do it here rather than in one a derivative clone where the feature set may be similar but the look, the feel, the lore, the depth of the universe is just not the same.

Seagull: We can zoom way in and talk about this system being broken or that thing being crap, or this activity being boring. And we should continue doing this. Renovating, upgrading, looking at each player group being served, that's just the continuing work of the product development process.

Seagull then began to describe the two "flanking" approaches besides the core universe and all the things there are to do inside of it. The first flank would be to focus on and start designing explicitly for what Seagull called "the enablers" and "the instigators".

Seagull: Instigators are players who have plans, who want to do things, to make an impact on the universe. They are the ones will go and organize people, or inspire people, to go do things. There's always someone starting it. There's always someone that says, 'I'm going to have THAT'.

Seagull: Enablers are the people who make the logistics for these large-scale things actually work. They are people who run mad spreadsheets to organize production lines for war efforts, they are people who

manage roles and membership of big corporations and alliances, they build tools to do different tasks. And we kind of have a history of treating these people like...shit. We put these people through a lot of painful, unnecessary work.

Seagull: The approach that I want to take, is that if we look at these people and design exciting things for them, and make their lives less like hell doing the things they want to do anyway, that will create all kinds of interesting dynamics in EVE Online as a world.

Rather than just looking all the way in at the newbie and trying to guide them into joining a corporation, Seagull explained that she was confident that if the instigators and enablers were stimulated enough and excited about what they were doing, they would support the recruiting efforts plenty themselves. In her opinion, the superior model is to focus on having more exciting things going on that people want to be a part of.

The second flanking effort Seagull described revolves around the question: "What should I do now?" asked from the player's point of view.

Seagull: This is a question I often think we do a bad time of answering in many cases. As a young player, you go on the website and you decide you want to be a pirate, for example, and then you come into the game and you go 'OK, What should I do now?' And we're not doing a great job of mapping people into those things that they can do. Given that we make all the things good and exciting, how are people supposed to know that they exist? You have to go on the internet and end up reading a lot of things to figure out what is even possible.

Seagull: This question, for me, is what is driving all of the accessibility work. It's not just about new players, it's about any player, anywhere in the game, that is sitting there asking themselves this question. You can be well into your EVE career, and checked a lot of boxes, and still can sit there wondering 'What should I do now?' This is the tool I want us to use to engage this issue in a very hands-on way.

Seagull then elaborated that in addition to the flanking efforts focused on instigators and enablers, she wanted to work with three more targets, that on the product level, need to be engaged with. The first of these is the solo player.

Seagull: In online community terms, this is a 'lurker'. We have a lot of these people, they constitute a lot of our accounts. But we don't necessarily have a great way of identifying them and engaging them. A corporation of 5 players and 5 accounts can still be one person.

The second design target Seagull described is the group player, who joins social activities.

Seagull: In Reddit terms, this is someone who comments on a thread someone else created. Followers, whatever you want to say. They want to socially engage with something, it might be Incursions, it could be all kinds of systems. It's not about people who only do a certain feature, it's about the people that migrate between different areas of the game depending on which delivers the best form of a specific type of play.

Seagull emphasized that this is about zeroing in on which tools serve different types of play style. For example, the solo player isn't in need of tools to communicate with corpmates to coordinate a mining

operation. For CCP to effectively develop their product, Seagull believed it is essential to create tools to identify the various play styles and address each area of need.

The final of the three design targets is what Seagull described as the small scale leader.

Seagull: In Reddit terms this would be the thread starter. Someone who initiates small things. Not necessarily instigator-scale, it's not on the size of Hulkageddon, or Burn Jita, or running a massive corp or starting something like Red vs. Blue, it's more like someone that puts together the op for the evening.

Seagull: These are useful as design targets for us in terms of product development because they allow us to see how changes to this group can facilitate things for other people that show up to participate. If you don't have thread starters it's a pretty dead forum, so what kind of tools can we give people to initiate these small scale things.

Seagull: For me these three very high-level design targets, describe the mainstream of our player base. If you decide you want to do something, you can look at what's going on, look at our menu of things to do in the universe, and ask "What's available, what looks like fun to me?" I believe that our answers to that need to be a combination of different things. It can be content you complete with other players, or it can be something that other players are doing that you want to be a part of. This is not a question of this type of things being available only in null-sec. Once you decide what kind of player you are, there are other parameters that affect how risk averse you are and where you decide to place your gameplay. But in terms of product development, these three design targets apply across [all areas of space.]

Seagull asked if the CSM had any questions so far, and Two step asked if helping people find things to do was as high-level a goal as creating new things to do. Seagull replied that this was just a tool that enabled them to take a kind of inventory on the things that CCP offers players. If in the process of taking inventory they discover that a player type is lacking an answer to the question "What do I do know?" then they can begin to plug the holes. UAxDEATH asked why the three design targets were one flank and the instigator/enablers on another flank, when they all represented 5 different yet related player types.

Seagull: Our world, as a science fiction universe, should guide you to exciting things to do. No one is excited by these categories, these are just a way for me to talk about how we can very practically satisfy people's needs. This person needs a tool to manage a thousand items. This person needs to find a way to join a group. This person needs to start a group. These are very tangible and very practical things. But no one signs up to the game and says 'I'm going to be a solo player'. That's not what these are for. These are product design tools, not descriptions of truth.

Unifex explained that what often happens when everyone gathers around the conference table is that they jump right into the feature. "For example, we need destructible stations because it gives a sense of death", rather than looking at EVE as a complete product

Seagull: I have a hundred people working on this game, and I cannot make them all play EVE for 5 years. We need a tool so that if we're designing something for instigators, we treat this very practically, almost as a game-within-a-game. Where if the player wants to move his pawn, he needs to organize a bunch of players to move the piece. Whatever it is you give these people, it has to be something they can turn around and share with the participants. I think the best instigator goals are the ones where you get to affect the reality of the universe to some extent, rather than just have the system give you more money, for example. That is a conversation we can actually have as a development organization.

Seagull: There are probably roughly 2000 of what I would call instigators, we should find out who these people are and what they're interested in doing. We should also look at how easy it is to become an instigator. Right now, politics form an entrenched barrier to becoming an instigator that is extremely high. Building that pathway towards doing something great is a specific design problem we can address. We can do all this without drowning in specific features. We can assign developers to solve problems on individual features. But if we're looking at engaging different customer types, we're engaging marketing, we're engaging the community people, and so on.

Seagull: We need this vocabulary so that if we talk about mission runners, for example, we're also asking 'how do we engage new people?' If we're only designing looking at existing users of existing systems, it becomes much harder to address the 'what should I do?' question and much harder to engage new players'.

Seagull explained that this vocabulary can also be used to describe what CCP is trying to accomplish with each of its expansion efforts. They could select 5 different systems, that might create new things to do for 3 kinds of instigators, which might require new things to be manufactured. The people in manufacturing might need some kind of tool to make their life easier, or to call together a small group, which might lead to exposing feeds X, Y, and Z in the CREST API, so that preparing for that activity is less painful. In this manner, expansion features can be created such that they provide meaningful roles for all game play styles and serve a proper cross-section of the player base. Additionally, it allows CCP to zoom in and balance things so that a particular player group isn't unduly burdened by a new feature or feature change.

Seagull: For a long time we haven't had a way to work with this type of level for what we are doing with our product, and that's a big reason why I'm going to work full-time on this type of stuff, and to use this type of stuff to get us a credible 10-year type of roadmap that isn't drowning in these features. This is not about the features. It's about how to make the world's craziest science fiction universe that is exciting to do things in.

Two step then asked if this was the roadmap, expressing concern that players might not be able to relate to "we want to give instigators new things to do". Unifex clarified that this is just the framework that will be used to create the roadmap, not a concrete course of action on its own.

Unifex: I wish we had this way of thinking when we were working on Incarna. If we go back and think of how many new things we've added into EVE, not a variant of a ship, or a different type of ammo, but how many new things we've introduced into the EVE universe – there are some big obvious ones. We introduced (for example) outposts, POS's, tech 2 ships and modules, wormholes and tech 3 ships. What we've found is, as we add these new things into the universe, we need to ask ourselves what is the best bang for our developer buck, and is it a sensible thing to deliver to our community. It would be really interesting to take, say, Planetary Interaction, and produce it through this model. This isn't a roadmap yet.

Unifex: We need to sit down and ask ourselves, what do we want EVE to be? What is that mad, crazy stuff that you would love to put in? Is it joystick flight? Is it first-person mode, looking out your cockpit window? Is it Ring Mining? What actually are those things, and do they make sense for what our game actually is? Because we could put ponies in. We could put avatars in. We could put in first pers...

Alek: Back up. We COULD get ponies?



Unifex: (laughs) These are the things we need to ask ourselves going forward. We've got a massive job just balancing and fixing the things that we've got. But that alone will not make the game we want.

Hans agreed that this is exactly what was needed, and warned that a project like modular POSes, for example, could turn out disastrous if the proper "why?" questions weren't asked first. They could end up like Incarna, where we have a new shiny skin, but no actual game play value, if they were developed without an informed design framework that solved real problems for players and gave them new things to do.

Unifex: We need to take a step back and think of CCP as a company that wants to provide a product that will entertain as many people as we can without deviating from the things that make EVE special. I think we want different groups of people to have goals that they can achieve and the ultimate success will be saying 'Look at how we worked together as a group. Look at how I led this group. Look at how I was a part of this group. Look at how I saw the endeavours of this group'. We need to make something that all of us desperately want to play instead of some other game in 4 years' time.

Unifex: When you guys were saying, 'We need to be involved with the tactical sprint reviews, but you know what? We also want to be involved in this high level stuff and know where the hell we are taking this game'. Then THIS is the conversation we need to start having. And we can't have that by starting with 'I think Dread Guristas ammo is underpowered' or something similar. We've spent enough time doing that. I'm not saying we shouldn't do it, but we've spent plenty of time doing that. I want to get [the CSM's] input as we put together our roadmap for the set of expansions coming this next year and beyond.

Unifex went on to explain that CCP is ultimately a business, and has to look at what features have been successful. He points out that while the numbers are still early, Retribution has been arguably our most successful expansion from a numbers perspective. He also cited both Apocrypha and Exodus as great examples of releases that offered the feel of "Holy shit, I don't know what's out there".

Discussing Apocrypha specifically, Unifex pointed out that its success wasn't that there were 2,500 new wormholes, it's that there was new space, containing new NPC's, that provided new resources, that built new interesting things that created new agencies of destruction. It required exploration. There was a sense of awe and wonder, and cut across a broad section of what EVE is. It wasn't just things like modular POS's, it wasn't just something like Sovereignty, it wasn't just a revamp of mining or whatever. It was about tying those types of things together into something that was more aspirational. Unifex admitted that the biggest mistake CCP made with Apocrypha was to not keep doing that for another 18 months. It wasn't treated as a starting point, but as a single project.

Unifex: We're going into a new world, a new time, a second decade of EVE. So, how should we be delivering the MASSIVE amount of features that we've already got on our plate as well as the all of the things we'd really love to see added to our science fiction universe. And that, gentlemen, is the question that I'm asking. I want your help. I want your input.

Seagull added that she wanted to move away from just adding in a system or group of features that may work on its own, but that hasn't been properly thought through from the customer / product perspective. If a feature was interesting enough, even the lurkers of EVE will be drawn to what is going on and engage with the community on some level. Two step cautioned that some of these lurkers never truly engage the community, playing exclusively solo.

Unifex replied: Yes, but does that player that is completely on their own, do they buy anything off of the market? Because that is a form of community participation as well. When we talk about a social game, it's not always about having lots of conversations with people. We have to broaden what we consider social participation in a game like EVE.

Seagull further explained that when looking at a group like the lurkers, two approaches can be taken. One is to find ways to make their lurking a more interesting part of the activity in the game, but that CCP should also look at ways to turn lurkers into more active participants in group activity. Two step asked if Seagull's intention was to drive everyone as far to the right (on the whiteboard) as possible, meaning away from solo play. Seagull explained that everyone has to be allowed the opportunity to lurk and observe, before choosing to participate deeper socially. For example, Reddit users have to be able to lurk and read posts and get a sense of where they can participate. If CCP doesn't support that use case, and let people ease into things, then they simply end up forcing people into social situations too fast.

Seagull: It would be like saying you cannot read Reddit unless you comment on one post.

Unifex reminded the CSM once again that this group, the lurking single players who are already subscribed, are the majority of characters on Tranquility. Essentially the "social value, or social equity" of a player group increases as you move from left to right (on the whiteboard), even though the size of that player group becomes much smaller in number. In other words, the 10,000 combined instigators and enablers become as equally valuable as the much larger lurking population. Unifex admitted that historically, CCP had not been good at balancing their efforts and servicing all groups.

Kelduum asked why CCP found it challenging to tell whether the one person with 5 characters and 5 accounts in his own corporation was actually just a single person. Seagull explained that right now, the focus was on tracking accounts and characters, but not necessarily humans. Identifying unique humans that are being added to the community would be essential going forward, as Seagull didn't feel comfortable working under the illusion that increased character participation in an activity or increased subscriber count actually meant that they were gaining new customers as a business. Unifex reiterated that this was an absolutely critical problem to solve in the near future, and that their analytics team was actively researching the number of human users in particular. Seagull added that CCP needs better tools for examining cancelled accounts, for example – which could represent either players quitting the game entirely, or people still playing the game but reducing their accounts.

Seleene asked if Seagull could take some time next and share how she planned to use this new toolset to examine the feature set that was likely be addressed in the coming year. Unifex asked if anyone wanted to take a break, but the CSM wanted to continue and so he hopped up to man the whiteboard himself. Unifex admitted that in addition to delivering new products to the marketplace, and maintaining their existing product, he wanted to grow the overall number of people playing the game as well. One example he gave was that CCP had at one point taken a close look at the corporation search tool, which he now considered "as quite possibly looking at the wrong problem".

Unifex: Corporations recruit people in order to achieve a goal.

Unifex lamented that right now, the only way you get into a big corporation is if you know someone. Paranoia is rampant, and the barrier can be high to accessing player organizations. While [opportunities] such as EVE University exists, for very young players, the vast majority of corps in EVE are simply off

limits for various reasons. Unifex explained that while CCP wants to turn this around, he wants to turn this around by creating more things that corporations would want players to help them with.

Unifex then asked the CSM to list some of the reasons that make EVE a game they want to play. The reasons that they've stuck with the game over many other options on the market.

UAxDEATH responded first, explaining that for a lot of the null-sec players especially, EVE becomes a "social society", and provides a strong sense of community. Two step and Alek both added that consequence was a major factor in making EVE so compelling. Seleene elaborated further on the community aspect, pointing out that the single-shard model was the driving contributor behind this sense of community. Meissa Anunthiel mentioned that for him, building very complex things was something he didn't experience in other games, and kept him interested in EVE. Alek discussed diversity, the fact that EVE's combat isn't about rock-paper-scissors, but about "rock, paper, shotgun, missiles, lasers, railguns, nuclear bombs, you name it". Hans explained that emergence was one of the most interesting elements of EVE, that events taking place on Tranquility often go far beyond what the designers ever intend for a feature or toolset.

Unifex: How many of you would play this game if it were set in a fantasy land?

The CSM unanimously replied that if the same sandbox-style game play existed, it would be just as compelling in settings other than the science-fiction universe it happened to end up inside. Unifex explained that he wants to get back to that place of wonder, that sense of the unknown, that existed when wormholes first came out and when no-one knew what was out in deepest null sec.

Unifex: Is that a powerful place for you guys? Is that one of the reasons you play this game?

Two step and Alek both agreed that the sense of mystery brought by the introduction of wormholes was one of the funnest times they'd ever had playing EVE.

Seleene: You know how I feel, this is the speech I gave you for two and a half hours last night.

UAxDEATH shook his head, saying that the mystery element wasn't particularly interesting to him.

Hans: This is also why I bring up emergence – that unknown can happen just as much from what players create. When you go into a new area of space, you don't always know what the locals are like or how they'll react to your presence. Like you said yourself, CCP shouldn't fall into the same trap as games like World of Warcraft that simply add canned content, but continue to allow emergent design to provide a layer of unpredictability as well.

Trebor: Because it is a single shard, the community network complexity is so high that you get emergent behavior, and it results in an environment where you are constantly beset by unexpected consequences. And that's what makes it interesting.

Unifex asked the group to consider the fact that the most cynical view would be to say that there really hasn't been anything new added to the game since Apocrypha, and yet somehow EVE has managed to survive for those three and a half years. He went on to explain that it was because no one knew what the next person was going to do next in the universe (and also there has been a lot added since Apocrypha). Unifex added that while it is easy to say "the reason I log in to play EVE is to be with my mates", relying

on that factor alone is a very bad thing for CCP, because there is the chance that will dry up and people will want to move on and do other new things.

Unifex: If we don't give you the things you need to stick around, hopefully they'll be provided in our social connections. But we can't rely on them, social connections only take us so far.

Trebor: I'm actually going to hit you up with one of my famous analogies here. The EVE social network is so chaotic, it is often like weather forecasting. You can make short-term predictions, but you can't make long-term predictions. However, since the underlying factors in the environment that affect the weather have remained static more or less since Apocrypha, the players weather forecasts, our predictions, are getting better. And that is why, over time, the amount of chaos in the system, especially for the instigators, is being reduced. Every so often, you need to change up the inputs, the underlying factors that drive the weather system.

Unifex: I agree with that, 100%... Crucible was about fixing things. Inferno was a lightly-themed bag of good bits, and Retribution was an even better themed, slightly more coherent bag of good bits. I think Dominion could have been something that was actually game-changing, but for a whole host of reasons didn't deliver deep enough or wide enough. What I'm trying to get here is an understanding from [the CSM], a set of touch points that can go into a good expansion, bearing in mind that we have a good amount of things to work on and a finite amount of development resources.

The CSM began to list off a series of elements to be included in the perfect expansion - Chaos and new emergent game play mechanics. Stronger community-building tools. New occupations. New environments. New things to harvest and build. A mixing up of the PvP meta.

Trebor: New worlds and new civilizations.

Two step emphasized again the need for more tools for instigators and enablers to make their lives easier. Hans added that this was the area of the model where CCP can save the most time and money by simply allowing players to do this work for free via the CREST API system. Alek called this "raising the barrier to burnout", praising the recent changes to saving ammo for ship fittings in terms of removing unnecessary pain from logistic players' experiences.

Hans: One of the things lacking here compared to other MMO's is personalization, customization. The ship fitting aspect is great, or the option to build your own unique POS, but we haven't really seen anything else new since then. This is what a lot of players were looking forward to with Incarna, the ability to project yourself into the game with a unique identity. Even things like ship logos, custom ship colors, could potentially add enormous product value for the time they take to develop.

Falcon: One of the things that is sadly missing in EVE is the existence of a real, working, stock market.

Unifex elaborated that while much of the day ended up being spent talking about fixing things that were already in the game, he was most interested in fixing problem by introducing a new feature that can potentially destabilize the other things that had grown static and were need of refreshment.

Alek added that one of the long-term business values of replacing old systems like Crimewatch was that CCP had fresh code to work with, enabling them accelerate the pace with which they add more features, using less resource investment since they have more options immediately available to them.

Unifex: Let's be honest, it's really hard to deal with 13-year old piece of code. It takes a lot of effort for us to do that, but we have to. This is exactly why we haven't produced as much in the last few expansions, because we had to get our shit straightened out that had accumulated over the last 9 years, and we've made a good start.

Unifex: If we want to give ourselves a really loose template, for what we would say is a good expansion, I'm really interested in how the CSM would define that. I have a point of view, I know for a fact Soundwave has a point of view, Hilmar has a point of view, and we at CCP I think are getting better at being much more on the same page about what that point of view is. But I have to have your opinion, to help validate that, correct it, change it, and learn from it".

Trebor: You have to have it, but do you want it?

Unifex: Yes, I do. Even if it's not what I always [want to] hear, initially. I'm not clever enough to come up with it all on my own. EVE is many things to many different people.

Two step questioned the significance of tool-building in the list of things that make up the perfect expansion, referencing CREST's ability to allow players to build their own tools. Unifex responded that tools, in his opinion, needed to go into every expansion - even if all that meant was making the conscious decision to expose the parts of CREST that were needed to create tools supporting that expansion's feature set.

Seagull: My very practical way of working with this where I specifically call out the enablers as a specific type of behavior needing support, means that no matter what feature we work on, we can look at the enablers and identify the things they have, the things they can do, so that supporting them isn't just an afterthought. By looking at things we can expose in the CREST API, we can solve problems for these groups and step aside when 3rd-party developers can do a better job at building the specialized tools that players need. Other times, a function will be so crucial that we decide it needs to be built into the client itself, depending on what it is.

Trebor: I think I need to address the elephant in the room here, however. Assuming you want to do all these things, how do you plan to achieve them with your current level of manpower? Is this your way of saying you're going to hire an extra hundred people?

Unifex responded by explaining that for many years, CCP has tended to focus primarily on subscriber retention and less on new subscriber acquisition. And that looking at the path that people take to find themselves playing the game for the first time, isn't something that was being given enough attention. Ideally he'd love to put everything the CSM listed as part of the ideal expansion elements into each release, but recognized that in reality they could include many but not all. Not being able to build perfect expansions shouldn't preclude having high-level goals to be achieved.

Unifex again revisited Apocrypha, mentioning that they took a theme and used it to build a bunch of other features that tied into that theme. This contrasts with Tyrannis, which was an expansion devoted to a single feature which focused on a certain, tightly focused subset of players.

Unifex: I want to get your feel – where do we want to pitch it? Where do we want our expansions to lead? Do we want to be much less particular about a certain "type" of expansion for the quarter, or half-year that

we are in? Or do we want to say OK – an Apocrypha, but let's spread it over 2 years. You could say let's look at modular POSes, and do it all in one go but that leads to very large parts of our player base getting nothing from an expansion. This is the sort of thing I want your input on as we begin looking at what makes the game what it is, and what the best way is to move it forward.

UAxDEATH asked why Unifex hadn't looked at separating these expansion elements into individual and separate platforms, that could then be outsourced to third party developers. Unifex explained that is roughly the mindset behind adding products like Dust 514.

Unifex: If I had it my way, I'd take Planetary Interaction out of EVE, the game, and put it on that [gesturing at Seleene's iPad] as a fully-fledged game in the EVE Universe. If I want to land on a planet and pull out a gun and shoot someone, I have to ask, does it make sense for me to do that in EVE Online the game? Or in the EVE Universe but through a different interface point?

UAxDEATH: So it's all doable?

Unifex: It's all doable. Take planetary flight, for example. That will be available when Dust launches, because you'll be able to cruise around in dropships over planets. CCP is growing up to the point where we no longer have to put every single thing in the EVE universe into EVE Online if it doesn't make sense. Some of these things should really just be different games. We shouldn't be trying to put all games into EVE Online. We could be trying to put more games into the EVE universe, however.

Two step asked why players would want separate games, if they could get the same experience at the same quality for the same resources and just have them meld into a single game with a single subscription price. Alek added that while he'd love to engage in the shooter side of the EVE universe, he can't as he doesn't own a PS3 and refused to buy one just to play Dust 514.

Unifex: Yes, but then we beg the question of do we want to spend spaceship resources on making shooter gameplay.

Meissa Anunthiel clarified: If you had made PI a Civilization-like game, and made it on the PC, I would have played it, and enjoyed it. The issue here is only one of platform, not the separation of games on that platform.

Unifex: The thing I don't want to do is to put games into EVE Online that actually aren't EVE Online, and would be much better games if they were able to stand on their own feet as a good game. You're absolutely right, there's a platform issue but I don't want to get dragged down into that too much. We've got 10 minutes here left.

Unifex: What I'm pulling out of all this, and I'll try to summarize all my thoughts which will be difficult over the next 24 hours, what we'll be doing in the coming weeks is looking at all the things your constituency is interested in, and how those pieces fit into this framework and vocabulary we've been discussing.

Unifex: What I would like to do to start, upfront, is getting a theme for a series of releases for the coming year. Last time it was War for 2012. And it wasn't the grandest theme, but I didn't have much time, and we needed something to cause some excitement. Apocrypha had wormholes – and fit a number of different features into that wormhole theme. Exodus was about the colonization of the unknown space beyond the empires. And actually, we're still doing expansions today that piggyback off of that.

Unifex: We need to find that theme, and make it something that people desperately want to be a part of. I personally think one reason Retribution is being better received than Inferno, is because Bounty Hunting is something that is aspirational and immediately identifiable by anyone who understands anything about sci-fi. You don't have to be an EVE player. Everyone knows what Bounty Hunting is. Wormholes, again, easily identifiable.

Unifex: Once we have a theme, we can begin to thread the issues you've identified as needing to be prioritized into that theme. POS's, for example, desperately need some improvement. How do we fit that work into our theme? Maybe we don't do all of the modular POS work at once, but we start by making some modules, solving the hangar problem, for instance. But that new hangar module would also exist to support other new activities as part of the themed expansion.

Unifex: Am I crazy here guys? Am I out of my skull, or what?

Elise: Sounds pretty reasonable.

Two step asked if CCP already had a theme for summer expansion, since they had already loosely begun to talk about elements such as null-sec improvements and POS improvements. Seagull explained that there would be a theme for summer, but that it would be a smaller theme and not Jesus-level quite yet. But that despite the theme being smaller in the science fiction scope, she would attempt to get artists, writers, designers, all working together creatively and with a proper process to see if they can find something that can weave together some of the elements they already have in mind for May.

Seagull: This is what we'll be doing in January, so we release something in May that speaks to the science-fiction universe we have and to the sandbox nature of our game.

Seagull: Whatever we pick for our theme for our science fiction universe, the features we choose have to make sense for each of our design targets that we previously discussed. We're not just going to put some new system or something in there, I want us to look at all kinds of personas and playstyles in EVE, but particularly at the instigators and enablers, and see what we can do that feeds these people. And for May, this first attempt, it will likely be what we'd call a minor theme.

Seagull: But as we look at the next year, 2 years, 10 years, I want us to find what we'd call the major theme and apply this method, so as we start to pick things to do based on that theme, we have the same extremely practical system for put exciting stuff in. We have to put ourselves in the shoes of the people who are going to use this and ask 'What is in this for me? Why is it that I'm going to turn around and tell my followers - 'this is what we're about to do', making sure that across the different groups that we have in this online community, we support them and that these things actually make sense.

Seagull: Between these two approaches, both looking at the science fiction theme and introducing new environments into the game, as well using the design targets to make sure we're addressing a cross section of player types, I think we can begin to build actual roadmaps for the next 10 years. We shouldn't have to promise to fix specific feature X and let that constrain us, we should be able to say we're now looking at shaking up the stale experience of instigators and enablers in this area of the game, and we'll tie that into the theme of whatever we're doing. These are the types of conversations we should be able to have.

Unifex: It's actually good that Andie is so sensible about all this, because I'm a little bit more bullish. Apocrypha was four months. We've got six.

Seleene: So one of the things I'd like to know, we had these meetings with Ripley and Soundwave, where we were like 'Oh my God, what the fuck are they talking about, skill trees and such?' So a lot of us are still wondering, are you guys going to be making ship fitting tools and such that we already have out of game?

Alek: Part of what concerns me is that the features we've been hearing about for the May expansion don't really fit nicely into the model Andie is describing.

Unifex explained that the first part of January / February is pre-producing groundwork [for] what CCP is going to be doing as part of that May expansion, based around the decided-upon theme. They'll be looking at features which they don't have to start completely from scratch, but that they'll start conforming to this model.

Unifex: If they don't start conforming to this model - which I fully endorse and that I back - then they're probably not the best thing for our game. We'll look at each of these features, and apply this model for evaluating them. Can I tell you what the outcome of that will be yet? No, I can't, so I won't. But we're going to do it, because we need to make sure that with the finite number of people we have working on this game, they're all working on things that are not going to be lame ducks.

Unifex reiterated that what the CSM were shown in the Stakeholder meeting with Ripley and Soundwave were ideas at an early stage, that they were simply a list of things they were investigating, not features that were locked into a production plan as of yet. Some needed to be cast off as a waste of time, others needed to be carried out to completion.

Alek replied that he appreciated the fact we were shown those ideas in such an infant stage, but that it became problematic because that the CSM was left thinking that this was the direction production was headed.

Alek: We have always been telling you earlier is better, so there's that.

Unifex: And it was great to get your input, too, since what we've lacked for a long time is this kind of structured product development model that makes good decisions.

Two step: Jon, my problem is that up until this point, every single summit, we're shown items that are coming in the next expansion. Other than a few items we were shown today in Crimewatch, do you have more features you know for a fact you want to work on? Or is that all you have at the moment?

Unifex: This is part of the process that Andie is going through right now. We're getting your feedback into this, you're going to begin using the same language in terms of narrowing down what needs to be put in. Are we going to be deciding what needs to be put in the May expansion right now? No, because we've got work to do first, which you guys need to be involved in, as we go through the first part of next year. Expect to be involved guys, in January, because we'll still need that input as Andie takes us through this new process and ask - What are we actually putting in? You will be pulled into those discussions through January.



Unifex: I don't want to get to that point where I come to you right now and say, 'This is what the May expansion is'.

Two step: And I don't want that either, but normally there's at least a proposed idea...

Seleene: But that's the point. Those days are over now, apparently. And maybe this goes back to our conversation earlier, maybe it's time to start changing the dates of these summits.

Unifex: Guys, can I tell you one honest thing? I know we're all being very open, frank, and forthright here. Do I wish that we [the development group] had been doing this piece of work 6 months ago? Of course I do. But I've got a business to run, we've got certain things we need to do and all sorts of other things, but I want to try and move us forwards. So yeah, we're doing a bit of catching up here. Do I still think we can do something that is really good for May? That becomes more meaningful because we're hitting more of these things and threading them together in better ways? Yeah, we will. Does that give us even more time to worry about what we're doing in the second decade of EVE? Sure. I've already talked to Andie, and we want to have our Winter expansion feature set decided by May, end of May at the latest.

Unifex: I wish that I had been able to get this done sooner – my intention was to get us here much earlier in the year, but what a naive chap I was, it was a bit harder than I was expecting. But I think we're making genuine progress. I'm not just blowing smoke up your arses, I genuinely believe we're making progress. I think we've got the people in the right places now that can make a real difference for us.

Unifex: Can I just say one last thing at the end of today? Thank you for being forthright. Thank you for being passionate about this. I've got absolutely no problem with people being passionate about making this a better game. I just want to thank you all for doing that. And please, continue doing that for the rest of this week.

Two step: We don't have an off switch.

(Room laughs)

Unifex: And to you at home as well, [gesturing to the videoconferencing CSM members] I really appreciate it. Thank you.

## CSM as Stakeholder

Present: CCP Unifex, CCP Ripley, CCP Seagull

Note: this session took place before the "EVE Online - The Next Decade" session.

In pre-meeting conversation, it was learned that CCP devs ignore fire alarms but become highly agitated when the internet link goes down.

Unifex provided CSM with an overview of the company reorganization that has taken place over the last year. See his recent devblog for more details.

Unifex is now the executive producer of EVE Online and his duties are completely focused on EVE; he coordinates development, marketing, EVE's websites, customer support, community and so on.

When it comes to development, there are really two major tasks: figuring out what needs to be done, and managing the process of actually doing it. These used to be the responsibility of one person; an almost impossible job.

Going forward, these responsibilities are being split and will be performed by two people who report directly to the executive producer.

The senior producer, responsible for deciding what needs to be done and creating the appropriate plans, is Seagull. She took over from Unifex as senior producer of the core technology group when Unifex replaced Zulu as EVE's senior producer.

The development director, in charge of creating and executing the development plans from the product roadmaps created by the senior producer and approved by the executive producer, is Ripley.

Together, Seagull and Ripley are in charge of the day-to-day business of developing EVE Online. As executive producer, Unifex remains very involved in EVE development.

Unifex: I think we have the right people in place now to deliver on this stuff.

Seleene: When is the next reorganization? [laughter] It's like every time we come here, you've reorganized.

Unifex: I think we're there. Never say never, but I think we've got all the pieces.

Trebor: So what are you going to do with your new organization?

Unifex: We'll talk about that later today, but for now, let's discuss your organization. Let me outline how I see the outcomes of what we discussed in May and June [making CSM more of a real stakeholder].

Unifex: I'd say it didn't work; that it failed; and the reason why it failed was pretty much entirely on my shoulders. Part of the reason for that was that I didn't have the time to give it the attention it needed. Also CCP did not provide the kind of engagement CSM wanted.

Unifex asked for CSM to provide a retrospective, focusing on the problems from CSM's perspective, so that CCP and CSM can iterate and make it work.

Ripley asked for specific feedback about a particular sprint review recording CSM was provided with.

Seleene noted that CSM got the recording on a Friday and produced a multipage report over the weekend.

Ripley clarified she was looking for specific process-related feedback.

Seleene: First: we were not involved early enough, and this affected everything thereafter.

Two step: What we were told at the summit was [the feature] was going to be player-to-player [service] contracts, and the next thing we hear, without any input from us, was that it was going to be bounty hunting. Our expectation was going to be that we were going to be consulted about decisions like that -- and we didn't even know there was a decision being made.

Seleene: Secondly, as a potential resource for the team, we were underutilized. Over time, it devolved to where we were as involved with bounty hunting to the same extent as with anything else, like ship-balancing. And later we found out that the people in the team were not even aware we were involved [as stakeholders].

Seleene: The few times we did get solicited for feedback, we strived to provide it as quickly as possible.

Trebor: We made a commitment to provide feedback in 48 hours or even 24. At the last summit, Unifex was concerned we could not fit within CCP decision-making cycles, but every time we were asked, we beat those deadlines. The problem was that people didn't know that we could do this when needed. Another issue was that we didn't have a private Skype channel with the team. The CCP/CSM Skype channel is fine, but there is a lot of social chatting on it, so things get missed; there needs to be some :srsbsns: channels, not just for general CSM/CCP stuff, but also for teams for which we are a stakeholder. Just like some previous CSMs, in May we said "Use us!". How much more do we have to beg?

Hans: How many sprint reviews did the [Bounty-Hunting] team have?

Ripley: 6; the one that was sent to you was the 3rd that was recorded. You got included very late in the process and there was not a lot of freedom to act on your feedback. I think that if you had been involved sooner this would have worked out.

Seleene: We made it very clear [at the first summit] that we needed to be involved early, before things started getting settled. When we found out the feature was being focused on Bounty Hunting, [we were very frustrated]. While the feature turned out well, there was a lot of resentment in CSM.

Alek: It was definitely disorienting. I recall feeling blindsided by the design changes, and it set the entire process off on an adversarial note which didn't need to be struck.

Hans: One of the telling things was that in the spring review we received, there was a document visible on the screen that listed the stakeholders, and CSM was not listed.

Ripley noted that stakeholders are defined during the task review, and that something must have gone wrong.

Unifex added that team members had told him that they didn't know CSM was a stakeholder, but that he distinctly remembered telling people and sending them emails.

Unifex then questioned his own grasp of reality. The CSM politely declined to render an opinion on this possibility.

Unifex further noted that during the August planning period, in part because of vacation schedules, events were proceeding with great haste (just a few days), and even 24-48 hour turnaround might not have been fast enough. However, as a result of this experience, CCP intends to have the proper amount of lead-time for planning of subsequent expansions, starting with the next one in January.

Editor's note: this schedule is one reason why CSM decided to push very hard to get a substantial portion of the minutes out before the end of the year, to allow for community feedback.

Two step noted that one potential problem is the timing of summits; CSM arrives, has wonderful discussions, and then everyone goes on vacation and by the time they get back everything has changed.

In response to an inquiry by Unifex, Xhagen noted that summits happened after deployment of an expansion but before release planning.

Ripley further noted that when release planning starts, the general outline of an expansion has already been decided, so having summits right after a deployment allows for CSM input right at the beginning of the process.

Unifex explained that getting more lead-time before release planning is an important high-level goal for the company, and that in Q1 2013 they intend to produce a high-level roadmap for the next 3 years' worth of expansions. Simultaneously doing planning about multiple time-frames (6 months, 18 months, 10 years) will be difficult but is something they simply have to do. In the past, EVE planning has been focused on the short term, simply because it was easier to do.

Ripley also noted that plans may change based on statistics and trends culled from the early weeks of the previous expansion's deployment, making the task even more complicated. That is why CCP sometimes appears to be contradicting itself; it's because when the data changes, the plans change. This is one of the challenges of this type of business.

Unifex: We will be doing the planning cycle for the May expansion in January, and you will have the opportunity to provide input, starting here at the summit.

Unifex: Obviously there were some communications problems we don't want to repeat. But are the goals we want to achieve the same as they were when we discussed this at the last summit?

Elise: Essentially yes. We don't want to be a burden.

Unifex: So, we want to get your feedback on the team's plan, and validate their progress -- as a stakeholder -- as they do their work.

Trebor: One of the biggest lost opportunities of the last iteration of this was that we didn't get the chance to discover how to make the best use of the CSM's input. I assume you have teams working on your 6-month, 18-month, and 3-year plans, correct? Why don't you make us stakeholders for those groups?

Trebor: While those groups aren't sprint teams, I think they are excellent groups that could benefit from CSM being a stakeholder. Right now, most of the advice and feedback we give is concentrated at the micro- and medium levels, but if we know about the long-term high-level goals and strategy you are developing, we can not only give you feedback on that, but that knowledge will help us give better low-level advice because we'll have a better understanding of how a particular team's task fits into the big picture.

Unifex: I think that kind of advice is what we should be getting at the summits, with us also touching base from time to time between them. We will start that process at our meeting later today.

Trebor: An issue I have is that every six months we come here and get an overview of what you want to do, and often these are fragmentary -- partially this is just the nature of the beast.

Unifex: "has been" [the nature of the beast]. We need to change that.

Trebor: I agree [the summits are] a good place to get broad overviews and give general feedback, I think it would be helpful for us to get updates as your plans develop -- the same sort of documents that you would be sharing with other groups inside the company to help keep them on track.

Seleene: To use a biblical metaphor, we would like to be part of the group that brings the stone tablets down from the mountain, not just be the ones that read them and say "Oh, that really happened up there?"

Two step: If you look at the last summit, there was a lot more talk about longer-term stuff than in previous summits, but all that stuff we were told is not what's happening. I mean there was all this talk of Modular POSes and null-sec...

Unifex: We can't do everything in our long-term plan in the next 6 months. And when we actually do the prototyping and figure out how tough something is to actually do, our plans may change.

Two step: I think what Trebor is saying is that we want to be part of that decision-making process.

Trebor: I won't quite go that far. We want to be kept informed so that if there's something we don't understand -- that doesn't seem quite right -- we can question it and give you an outside perspective.

Two step: Part of the problem for us is that we not only don't know about the decisions until after they're made, we don't even know they are being made.

Unifex: I hear what you're saying and agree with it. But we have to recognize that things will change, and we don't just do it for shits and giggles or to mess with people -- we do it for good reasons. So I think us being clearer on the long-term plans... absolutely.

Hans: What is the nature of your long-term planning process, and how does it differ from other planning methods used in the company [for active development, for example]?

Unifex: We now have a project management group, headed up by Seagull, that develops the overall feature set we want in the game. The job of working out how those features get implemented, given all the different competing resource demands, is done by a group headed by Ripley. I am very involved in this but I also have other responsibilities. Some of the outputs of those groups are things we would definitely want CSM to comment on. We have two summits a year; I don't know if we should be giving you quarterly or monthly updates as well, that's something that needs to be worked out.

Unifex: Going back to a more tactical level, my feeling is that we didn't execute very well when it comes to incorporating CSM as stakeholders, and I am interested in Ripley and Seagull's feedback on how to get your feedback as early as possible and properly incorporate it [into the process].

Ripley: The planning process is always in flux; if you nail things down too early, you miss things. In one of our Skype conferences, I made a point of saying we were evaluating things, not that we had a plan. I think CSM should come into the process during the evaluation stage, before we have a plan. Seagull is going to be consolidating all the product input in January, including the documents you've been sending, and things are going to change between now and then.

Two step: You're doing work and so things will change, we get that. We don't want to be the decision-makers, but we also don't want to just see the outputs of the planning process, we want to be one of the inputs. Sometimes that's been happening, sometimes not -- for example, when Player to Player contracts became Bounty Hunting. So I wonder, what happened there, and was there a way for us to be part of that decision-making process?

Meissa Anunthiel (via Skype): We need to be there before release planning gets worked on so we can influence that, then we need to know the results of release planning, then be involved when things are worked on and any subsequent plan alterations.

[smiles around the room]

Seagull: I think you have a point that there are two layers to this. First is the longer-term strategic product planning that provides reasons why we should be working on specific features, and so on. I'm new in this job and still putting together how I want to do this, but I do want to find a way to involve CSM in the process. Then, once things are in motion, how do we make it possible for a particular team to use you as a stakeholder? That would be more in Ripley's court.

Seagull: Historically there have been few people able to concentrate on product planning full-time. The people involved had other jobs that kept them busy so they couldn't put as much time into this as we wanted. But I will be doing this full-time, and there should be some improvement in this.

Unifex: About you getting up-front input, we had a plan for the last release [as described in the previous Summit's minutes] that we didn't really execute. Do you think that if we did execute on it, it would be sufficient?

Trebor: Well, it has the virtue of never being tried...

Unifex: I'd like to get some concrete things out of this.

Seagull: What I'd like to try is see if I can involve you in the higher-level stuff -- what are we doing for what kind of player -- and try the lower-level stuff with one team. Then we can see if either group gets overloaded.

Trebor: That was the plan.

Two step: I've heard this before.

Trebor: I'm getting a strange feeling of déjà-vu.

Trebor: Doing multiple experiments -- slicing things horizontally and vertically -- is fine. One thing that came out of the first iteration is that we proved we can execute within your time requirements.

Ripley: I can confirm that. In my interactions with you guys, we talked about things and you were just on it. That's why I want to focus more this time, because last time was more trial-and-error.

Seleene: Are you aware of how we do that? What our process is? I'm wondering if that might give you a little more confidence in us.

Seagull: That's not a problem.

Ripley: I didn't go into this doubting you could do it.

Trebor: Believe it or not, when we create those responses, most of the time is spent trimming them down so we don't waste your time. You don't want to see the first drafts...

A short discussion of how/when to move forward on this process ensued.

Trebor then informed Unifex that CSM intends to expedite the minutes release, with the goal of getting a good chunk of them out to the community before the New Year.

Unifex: Are you going to do 30 pages on a session again?

Trebor: No, I just did that to screw with certain bloggers.

Seleene: They wanted transparency, we gave it to them.

Trebor: We'll be doing 5-6 pages per session, a detailed summary with highlight quotes.

There was a brief discussion of the logistics of getting quick CCP review given holiday vacation schedules. It was decided to prioritize those sessions where individual participants agreed they could provide fast turnaround, (48 hours) and get the rest of the minutes out by mid-January at the latest.

In response to a suggestion from CSM, tentative plans were made to create a video devblog showing what actually happens at a summit.

Loki, Video Producer/Video Director/Script writer (for most of the videos CCP makes) joined the meeting to discuss the various possibilities.

Ripley: It should be about the process, not the people.

The discussion broadened into one about how CSM visibility in the community can be increased, in the hopes that it will increase turnout in future elections.

The meeting closed with some review of how CSM and CCP will move forward with the Stakeholder experiment in the future:

Unifex: So, about how we execute the tactical bit with the team, Stefanía (Ripley), are you OK to pick that piece up?

Ripley: What was that? Sorry, I was not listening to you. – Just pulling your leg, of course I will.

[laughter]

Unifex: Story of my life.

[more laughter]



## CSM Whitepaper & Election Systems

Present: CCP Xhagen, CCP Dolan, CCP Veritas

Xhagen opened the meeting by stating that because the community site was being revamped, it would be possible to have a new voting interface in place before the next elections.

Hans expressed his opinion that a new voting system and a revised white paper go hand-in-hand, and the current white paper is dated.

Seleene noted that the massive changes in the way CSM operates and interacts with CCP requires an update.

Hans stated that it was also needed because it is important to clarify for the community what the CSM's roles and responsibilities are.

Xhagen partially disagreed, stating that while a lot of the language is dated, one of the reasons why a lot of stuff is not specified is because he believes it's important for the CSM to "figure it out", and not have restrictions that might get in the way.

Alek countered that the baseline roles and responsibilities ought to be stated.

Seleene agreed, pointing out that CCP is investing significant resources and management attention into the CSM; there ought to be a statement of what they expect.

Two step: People need to know what they're getting into. It needs to be abundantly clear that this is not something you can spend an hour a week doing, and if you don't have the time and energy, you shouldn't be running.

Hans opened a discussion on member responsibilities, in particular dealing with CSMs who are not pulling their weight. He expressed skepticism that this could be done internally by CSM itself -- "I love the idea of voting for chairman; I hate the idea of voting someone off the island; it opens the door to all sorts of meta-gaming".

Alek: I think we ought to be able to vote to recommend that CCP take action regarding a particular CSM.

Hans suggested that CCP set broad performance standards, and noted that if CCP yanks someone out who's clearly been performing, there will be community outrage. But if CCP haven't heard a word from someone for months, you should be able to say 'Why are they here? Goodbye!'

Hans: I want people to run who intend to seriously participate, and know that if they don't, they won't get to stick around, and they won't get to attend summits.

Two step: You can't kick people off unless there's some sort of criteria that's stated up front.

Seleene: There needs to be a commonsense standard of participation which will be determined by your peers and/or CCP.

Hans: The NDA is vague and can be used to swat any of us down pretty much at will. Have something like that.

Two step noted that in conversation with Xhagen the previous night, it was clear that Xhagen knew which people on the current CSM were not performing -- "I didn't have to prompt him". So there could be a process where Xhagen says...

Veritas: It could be some sort of approval vote.

Trebor: I think it works both ways. If 2/3 of the CSM come to you [Xhagen] and say "These people are not performing; they should not be coming to summits or FanFest; and quite frankly, they should have privileges removed", and you agree, then you do it. And similarly, it could work the other way -- if you think someone, even if they're active, is being disruptive, you could come to CSM and... why is Veritas looking at me funny?

[laughter]

Hans: This is in CCP's business interest. You guys are spending money. You deserve to get your money's worth.

Xhagen: Yes. But I don't want to be put in a situation where I have to remove someone. I don't want to be meta-gamed where I have to remove someone who is active, because of some clauses in the white paper.

Two step: Don't overly legislate it.

[Everyone starts talking at once about what constitutes activity]

Hans: I am perfectly fine with putting in a rule that says "Xhagen is a Viking badass, if he doesn't like you, you're gone".

Alek: I like the porn rule. I know a penis when I see one.

Two step: However, there should be a public warning for people who are non-performing or under-performing.

Veritas: This is quickly turning into an HR department.

Xhagen: [chuckles]

Seleene: Even though we are volunteers, CCP is paying for us one way or the other.

Xhagen: I don't want to be seen as capable of removing someone unilaterally because I don't like what he says.

Two step: Have you ever not like someone on the CSM?

Xhagen: I choose not to answer that question.

Seleene: I think you've been too impartial in the past because you wanted to step lightly with the community. A lot of people think of us as some sort of watchdog, and that is not what we are.

Hans: I would disagree, we are a watchdog.

Seleene: I mean, that's not our only job.

Two step: We are not an arm of IA, we don't have that level of access.

Seleene: When CSM was created, CCP didn't have a security department, and the IA rules were a lot looser. Now, that's not the case. We definitely are watchdogs in the "this will fuck up the game" sense, but not in the sense of dealing with devs going over the line in the game.

Trebor: Let's refocus a little bit. I think there's a difference between removing someone from the CSM, which I think should only happen if they break the rules (the NDA), and an underperforming person not getting the perks. Quite frankly, I do not feel that coming to summits should be a perk you get by getting the most votes; it should be a perk you get for working your ass off. You're paying all this money to bring us here, and you should bring people you know are going to sit at this table and really contribute -- not people who are just going to sit here and represent the interests of their in-game group. There are people in each of the CSM's I've served on who deserved to be here at the table and never got to be here.

Seleene: Exactly. And to allay your fears about being seen as an emperor, the community has gotten much more active as a whole about demanding transparency and tracking who is working and who isn't.

Elise: You won't be seizing this power.

Two step: We want you to have it.

Dovinian: The danger is that there may be a perception that we are removing anyone who isn't a yes-man. If someone is removed, I would want statements from each member of the CSM stating their opinion on the removal.

Trebor: We're not talking about removal.

Two step: I disagree. We should remove them, and pick the next person in line.

[various people agree and disagree with this at the same time]

Trebor: Let me be absolutely blunt. I have now served on 3 CSMs. In each of them, 95% of the work was done by 6 or less people. Okay?

Two step: I agree.

Trebor: The fact of the matter is that the chances you are going to get hard workers out of positions 15-18 is almost...

Two step: The difference in votes is very small.

Trebor: I agree, but we're going to fix that.

Two step: Who is the person who just barely didn't make it in CSM6?

Two step: I think if we look at the current CSM and who might get removed, I think most of us would agree on two people who have not participated at all, Meissa and Darius, and I'm perfectly happy to say that. It bothered me no end yesterday when Meissa dialed in and talked, because he hasn't earned the right to talk -- he hasn't talked the whole time.

Seleene: Darius shouldn't have been allowed into the town halls.

Hans: Until there are some changes to the institution, I don't think we have the power to exclude him.

UAxDEATH: So let's say today it's Meissa and Darius. And they get kicked. Then tomorrow it'll be, "you know, UAxDEATH isn't that active, and Greene Lee kinda sucks, lets remove them too". Then you guys will be sitting around and it'll be, "Fucking Seleene, I never really liked him". It's always politics, it was never fair and it never will be. People will vote for the same guy over and over again, doesn't matter how it was achieved. If people voted for Darius, they voted for him, not for you or you or you.

Seleene: You think Darius belongs in this room?

UAxDEATH: Doesn't matter.

Alek: Every single elected body in the entire history of human civilization had a way of policing its own behavior; censure, removing people, what have you. That the CSM does not is ridiculous.

Greene Lee: To kick you need to have reasons, yes? And none of you could have enough knowledge to know if someone is performing. You could imagine a Japanese guy -- well, [Trebor] knows Japanese -- you will never know his activity, how good his translations are. A guy who gets elected and comes here and says one good thing, it's worth it for him to be here. He was elected by people who know and trust him. And if someone doesn't work, we have enough other people to do the work.

Seleene: Dima [Greene Lee], I understand what you are getting at, but the core question is one CCP has to answer. It's about what CCP wants from this group. If you're translating stuff and so on, that's great, but in my opinion it's about more than watching what's going on and passing it on to other people. There should be some level of interaction and communication. But it's up to CCP to determine what they expect to get out of their investment. If they think it's fine for someone to sit in a corner and report things to their constituents, that's fine. I don't think that's fine, and a lot of other people agree with me.

Alek: Anyone can translate the minutes, you don't need to be on CSM. You have to have actual engagement.

UAxDEATH: Once CCP starts deciding this or that, then we lose the point of the CSM being independent of CCP. CCP could decide, "this guy said something we don't like, so we're going to get rid of him".

Hans: And that guy can say anything he wants at that point.

Two step: The statements that Dovinian was talking about, those should not be under NDA, we should be free to speak our minds. So if CCP decided to dump The Mittani, we could say, "we disagree with this, go shoot the statue in Jita".

Dovinian: Well, you couldn't use those to leak proprietary information.

Xhagen: This is an either-or debate. What about the middle ground?

Trebor: Good idea. While I appreciate Two step's concerns about dead weight on the council, I think a lot of those concerns can be addressed by an election system that generates a more representative CSM. I think the average quality will go up, which will deal with some of your concerns. I really strongly believe that someone should not be kicked off the CSM for lack of communication or contribution. Douche-bag though he is, Darius should not be kicked off the CSM unless he breaks the NDA. That said, given the level of non-engagement that he demonstrates, if he somehow scammed his way to the #1 position in the next election, CCP shouldn't have to pay for a plane ticket for him to come to Iceland.

Two step: CSM terms are long now; there's a whole year.

Elise: So the middle ground would be, instead of kicking the non-productive members, only invite the 7 most productive, regardless of their order.

Trebor: The compromise would be, "CCP picks 5, CSM picks 2". You pick the 5 that you think are the best performers. And if there are 10 hard-workers who are kicking ass and taking names, each of those guys will get to go to a summit. I mean, Alek should have had a trip to Iceland this year. Take Hans here: I was so glad when Kelduum couldn't come, because I was struggling with the decision about not coming, so he could get a seat here -- because he deserved it, he earned it, and he worked for it from before he was even on CSM. You [Hans] proved yourself before you came here, and you've proved yourself here. Alek earned a trip based on what he did at the last summit, attending remotely.

Seleene: Alek wrote a big chunk of that strategy document that got produced over a weekend. [He stepped up].

Trebor: We'll take 2 slots, to fill in with people we think you've overlooked.

Two step: My only problem with that is that I don't like the politics there.

Hans: I think that what has some merit is something you [Trebor] have talked about before, with the top vote getters getting guaranteed seats at summits. Going back to the watchdog issue, I'm not hearing that the community would be concerned about veto power as much as they are the lack of performance. I think they'd respect you more and us more and would participate more -- not just in the elections but also in communicating with us. There are a lot of people who just don't know that we'll work with them

regardless of whether or not they voted for us. So if it's structured so that it's clear that you give a damn about having people here who are performing, the respect level is going to go through the roof.

Xhagen: As UAxDEATH said, this is politics and in politics you can't win unless you have all the cards on the table and follow set rules from the beginning. Currently the community is in good shape, so much so that I'm a bit worried.

Seleene: Nobody rioted when you said "Alex [The Mittani] is gone". There was a lot of resentment, but because Alex was being cool about it, everyone calmed down.

Hans: Their problem with Alex not being here was that Alex performed.

UAxDEATH: He wasn't kicked for CSM reasons...

Hans: They don't care about the exact reason, just the fact that he isn't on the CSM.

UAxDEATH: Fair point.

Seleene: You've removed people before [for various reasons]. The community recognizes you as the Godfather of this project, and nobody has ever accused you of bias. As a group, we would like you to take a little more ownership and apply the cattle prod as needed.

Elise: Part of the reason the community doesn't see you as a slaved river is that you don't have the power to be one. But this isn't a case where you're taking control and censoring us, it's us asking you to make this decision. I don't think the CSM should have the power to [choose who comes to Iceland] because as UAxDEATH points out, that'll just create political problems.

Hans: I disagree with UAxDEATH that this is politics.

Seleene: It's about performance.

Hans: We all play the political game during elections, but...

UAxDEATH: But you haven't had a chance to play politics while on the job. But if the opportunity exists, then if someone throws you a bone, you're going to eat it.

Two step: Take CSM 6, which had a lot of bloc-level null-sec guys. Do you think they couldn't have voted out Trebor, who was one of the few non-null-sec guys in the top 9?

Seleene: He was editing The Mittani's statements within a month of the start of CSM 6.

Two step: I know, but...

Seleene: When you get in the room, in the circle, generally you figure, "I'm going to work with this guys because I tend to agree with him on most things". These are abstract scenarios that are possible but they don't seem to happen that much.

Xhagen: But then again, I want to be prepared for when they happen. I would be willing to consider this, but nobody gets kicked out of the CSM unless they break the rules. CCP would be more critical about who they fly over to Iceland; it makes business sense to bring over the more active.

Xhagen: When we started doing remote access, we had the rule that remote people would be on mute [and ask questions through CSM Skype] but that changed when we did the Factional Warfare stuff with Alek.

Hans: We only have 30 minutes left, and we still need to discuss voting systems. With respect to white paper stuff, how do we proceed?

Xhagen: Give me a list of change proposals, and I'll come up with a draft.

A short discussion of philosophy and document structure ensued. Immanuel Kant was mentioned once too often. Xhagen committed to having a new white paper finished before the next election.

Hans: Great, now we can talk about voting.

Veritas: Yeah!

Hans gave a short recap of the history of CSM voting reform.

Alek: The community made it very clear that Xhagen needs to be the initiator of any changes.

Xhagen noted that in general, when it comes to CSM-related stuff such as voting, he wants to try and make life easier for everyone, but (going back to the white paper) he wants an escape-clause that lets him deal with unanticipated circumstances.

Veritas: This is a very interesting discussion. Y'all are so serious.

Greene Lee suggested that people who get elected to the CSM make it more clear what areas of the game, and CSM activities, they are best suited to handling, and that this information be used by Xhagen when choosing who comes to summits.

Hans and Alek both objected strongly to the idea of candidates being categorized and flown over based solely on a particular area of expertise.

Xhagen: So let's say in 2013, CCP decides to work heavily on null-sec for the Winter Expansion. In that scenario, it makes sense to bring over more PvP / null-sec / supercapital experts.

Hans: That may be part of why you pick 5, and we pick 2

Xhagen: For example, why bring over a Faction Warfare guy to a summit where there will be no Faction Warfare work being done?

Alek: That's a question for the voters to decide, not CCP.

Hans: [Xhagen], do you think my value here is only because of Faction Warfare?

Xhagen: No, no, no.

Veritas: It's also because of your fantastic beard.

Trebor: Just do it this way. The top 2 vote-getters go to all the summits and FanFest, and you pick the rest. If one of the top 2 can't come, the CSM picks his replacement. So there's an advantage to getting the most votes, and it eliminates the CSM politics.

A discussion of how much voters should be encouraged to vote then occurred. There was a consensus that people should not be forced to vote, but that there should be a button in the Neocom that flashed like the EVE-mail button, with options like "Vote", "Do you want to know more?", and "Leave me alone!"

Seleene: Do you want to change the actual voting system this election, or just make changes to try and raise awareness?

Xhagen: Two months ago, I was leaning towards the latter. But now, since the CSM pages are going to be redone anyway, it makes sense to put in a new voting system while we have web development resources. If we have a system that lets people choose candidates and then rank them, then that can be the input to any election system we decide upon.

Two step: You can use one system this time, but also run the votes through other systems, and settle on a final system based on the results.

Veritas: Not doing it now is a wasted opportunity.

Seleene noted that whatever is decided about the voting system, everyone is agreed that raising awareness is a good thing, and pointed out that CCP could be doing more to publicize CSM events like the town halls.

Hans agreed, but noted that the CSM could also do a better job in this regard.

A short discussion of ways to achieve these goals ensued -- more town halls, video devblogs, CCP promoting the CSM as an institution and stakeholder, etc.

Veritas: If the video guys are telling you "no", just hook up a webcam and do it yourself. That's what I did with the Time Dilation devblog. If it's good, we'll put it out.

Trebor offered to do some video editing. Alek expressed concern that this might introduce unwanted tentacles. Trebor replied that certain CSM members seem obsessed with anime tentacles, whereas he had never even seen any.

The CSM asked their voting systems consultant, Veritas, for his advice on what system would be best. He replied that he was a big fan of Schulze (see [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Schulze\\_method](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Schulze_method)), however it does have a weakness: organized groups would be able to manipulate elections by running multiple candidates ["ballot-stuffing", not to be confused with ballot-box-stuffing] and voting for them all.



Veritas: Large alliances have an advantage right now; they have more information than regular voters, and can leverage that information. The hope is to find a system where either that information is harder to get, or less valuable to have. However, a lot of the potential solutions rely on some barrier to getting on the ballot.

Trebor: That was the point of my original proposal; by killing the transferability of overvotes, you blunt the information advantage.

Two step: As someone who is not running again, but who has been approached by 6 candidates who want to represent WH space, my big concern is that a new system doesn't result in similar candidates committing mutual suicide.

Veritas: You want to avoid the spoiler effect.

Two step: Yes. So maybe some sort of primary (rather than the current likes system) that gives candidates a chance to say "I'm not going to get elected, so I should drop out and not be a spoiler". That might even out some of the information advantage. If WH people had split their votes efficiently, we could have had 2 people on CSM7, with me still in the top 7. That said, I don't think there's a lot of value in that; one of the reasons CSM7 is so effective is that we have people from many different areas of the game.

Veritas: So the question becomes, how can we ensure that happens again?

The discussion turned to other systems where voters get to specify preferences.

Two step: Other systems like STV aren't as vulnerable to stuffing, are they?

Veritas: They do to a similar extent. That's the problem we are facing here, where...

Trebor: ...you have a malicious electorate.

Veritas: Well, we have malicious politicians. In normal elections, that's taken care of by having parties. We don't have such a filter, nor do we want one, because that would be gamed to balls as well. So the question becomes: can we develop a system that is resistant to ballot-stuffing, or alternatively, install barriers to getting on the ballot that are fair.

UAxDEATH: What is the biggest problem with the current system? Right now, the goons might run two candidates, but if you say "you can have only one"...

Veritas: ...they'll try everything...

UAxDEATH: ...because somebody said "no".

Alek: The problem is that the null-sec alliances, because they're big enough and organized, do act like political parties in a way that nobody else can. Goons have their own primaries, for example. Can FW choose a candidate between the 4 factions?

Hans: Well, I'm here in Iceland.

Two step: It is possible to do. I'm organizing a primary for WH right now. But these people have to campaign twice, and what happens if the top candidate has to drop out?

Hans: Why should we penalize a group for being good at organizing?

Veritas: That's not what I'm saying. The two problems for me are the spoiler effect [where a broad group doesn't get represented because they can't focus on one candidate], because we as a group want them to be represented; and second, under the current voting system, not only do organized blocs vote effectively (within themselves, so their candidate(s) are good), they have extra information that means their votes count for more, so they can run -- and elect -- more candidates than a less-organized group. That's a problem.

Two step: I'm not as concerned about the second one, because there should be a benefit to working.

Veritas: Absolutely. I'm worried about it being overpowered.

Trebor: They should have an edge, but given that the purpose of the CSM is to provide effective representation and feedback, on average you're going to get less work out of two very similar members than from two people from different areas of the game.

Alek: Let's debunk that a bit. We've had people like Zastrow and Mrs Trzrbk on CSM 4 and The Mittani and Vile Rat on CSM 6...

Elise: ...and White Tree, they ran 3 candidates. And towards the end, when White Tree didn't want to do it any more, he literally said "I'm not showing up, you can take my spot".

Seleene: And even then, when you had The Mittani and Vile Rat in the same room, well I love Vile Rat, and whenever he had something to say it was worth hearing, but The Mittani was the heavyweight, and an argument could be made that the Goons would have been just as effective with just The Mittani in the room.

Hans: But you just can't control or prevent that.

Trebor: I don't think it's a matter of preventing. It's about acknowledging that it's good to be big, but that there are some possible negative consequences that we have to be aware of, so maybe there should be some bungee-cords in the system.

Veritas: Right.

Trebor: I will point out that a big factor here is that until now, the CSM has been the haves who get to Iceland, and the have-nots who don't. It was not so bad when it was 9 and 5, but now its 7 and 7, so there's a huge premium in getting on the top 7. But if we change it so that it's mostly determined by how much work you do, then there's [less incentive for election gaming].

At this point, time ran out, and the parties agreed to continue discussing this matter via Email and Skype.

## Null-sec: Part 1

Present: CCP Soundwave, CCP Fozzie, CCP Greyscale, CCP Unifex, CCP Ytterbium

Note: this session took place before the “EVE Online - The Next Decade” session.

Soundwave opened the discussion by asking the CSM to individually make a list of five high-level goals for what null-sec should be. Going around the table Seleene started and stated his vision of null-sec. “I want to explore, exploit, and re-find the sense of wonder, mystery, and fear that I had when I first started”. He further explained that null-sec is currently too predictable and well-known. Two step added that he felt wormhole space was suffering from a similar problem due to time – the unknown is no longer there. Seleene continued that a main issue is that he felt as though he accomplished all that null-sec had to offer in its current state.

Trebor was next and echoed the sentiments of Seleene, stating that on a high level that is what he believed null-sec should be as well. Going into more detail, Trebor emphasized ownership of space as an important factor. Living in a place, he argued, should be based on the ability to use the space as opposed to blowing up structures and alarm clocking. The next issue on Trebor’s list was terrain. That is to say, the notion that some places should be harder to get to and easier to defend, with the tradeoff possibly being less value. Trebor argued that one should not simply be able to “cyno around the bastion”. Trebor continued by arguing that in the current state terrain is “flat”, and all places are equally easy to get. In Trebor’s view, force projection should have more strategic consequences than it does now instead of traveling a few regions away and coming back “in time for tea”.

The next issue on Trebor’s list was some sort of new industry: stuff to give people reasons to be IN space and utilize the space they have. Trebor’s most important long-term null-sec goal is to include in null-sec an area with “radically different rules”. He gave a hypothetical example of ring-mining with fog-of-war such that a certain ship class could see 50km, while another (large) ship class may only be able to see 30km. Soundwave queried if this had anything to do with the notion of “the unknown” that Seleene had mentioned, and Trebor agreed.

Alek and Kelduum chimed in and said that part of “the unknown” has to do with the ability to document things. The unknown should be “undocumentable”.

Greene Lee was next to give his list of null-sec goals. He argued that in the current form null-sec has devolved to “blob warfare” because it is the only effective way to hold space and small professional entities can no longer live by themselves. This problem, Greene Lee says, is paramount. He singled out passive income as a big issue. Another issue: supercaps. His solution, which he prefaced by saying wasn’t perfect, was to give them an upkeep travel cost to promote fights being localized. He continued on the list saying that upgrades should exist outside of the IHUBs so that smaller entities can disrupt space without having to take space. Greene Lee’s final issue was with industry. Citing current problems, Greene Lee mentioned that even empires with their own space still rely on buying from Empire and importing the ships in.

Hans continued the discussion and emphasized that space should be valuable. Null-sec in its current form cannot attract enough people in large part because it isn’t lucrative. Hans argued that people should want a reason to go “into the dangerzone” of null-sec. He cited examples of how the changes have been

very reactive to a problem without giving players a better means of accomplishing objectives. Hans' next issue was sovereignty itself. Hans tackled the "blob" issue by saying that sov is simply tedious and boring and more players make it easier. The key is that small groups need to be able to hurt large entities. Hans pointed out that currently small groups feel as though they cannot carve out their own section of space without having to rely on a large group. Ownership of space, he concluded, should come down to an entity's ability to utilize the space. Hans' final issue was of different areas of space having different, unique, value. "Everyone coalescing into two large entities is a symptom of the current system". Hans added that people should strive to live in a certain area of space because of the value, not because they have friends nearby.

At this point Kelduum politely asked for it to be noted that he believed that this exercise was a waste of time.

It was now Two step's turn to talk about the goals, and his first and foremost concern was a way to populate null-sec. "There shouldn't be empty systems, there should be people doing things that others can disrupt" was the crux of his argument. Two step also cited the risk vs. reward being off in null-sec and suggested that it should be risky (destructible stations) but have some real rewards. People should not need to have mission alts/FW alts/incursion alts while being in null-sec. All of the new activities should be taxable by an alliance to aid in a bottom-up approach. Two step's next concern was that of industry; "real industry – something that is more efficient or unique to null-sec". Examples like invention being more efficient in null-sec and far less efficient in empire. Maybe not that example exactly but the general theme of null-sec having a unique industrial resource or a vastly more efficient one. Two step's final issue was that of pilot skill and it an individual's skill should be meaningful. Two step added that wormhole space is a success because the skill of the individual pilot – not to be confused with skillpoints - is directly correlated to his survivability and money-making skills.

Seleene interrupted and made his displeasure known, stating that this is the same brainstorm processes with the same issues that the CSM had raised in previous summits. Two step tried to regain focus by reasoning that although the process may not be optimal, the remaining CSM should get the opportunity to list their goals before changing directions. Soundwave added that the list of goals is very valuable to him; typically, he says, he leaves the meeting with a hundred or so very focused, low-level, changes. "I want to see the patterns where individuals agree and where they disagree rather than talking about tweaks to current systems".

Elise agreed and noted that although the CSM is incredibly diverse, they all have very similar ideas to what null-sec should be and that it was very telling because it is nothing like it is now. Elise continued on his list and mentioned his first issue: a change to the income stream, namely from a top-down point-resource allocation to a bottom-up member-driven income stream. Certain areas of space should have more value – as that is what promotes conflict – but that value should be dependent on the members. That allows you to have a disruptable income stream, which brings about small gang objectives. Elise added that while there are many ideas out there on how to foster roaming within the current construct, they "are all shit" because of the current system. Elise went on to argue that this type of roaming mechanic would alleviate many of the other problems that people are citing, such as blobbing and "boring sov-war".

Elise added that "The reason people partake in the large fights is because that is the closest thing to meaningful combat that we have now. There is no middle ground. We keep hearing the phrase 'null-sec is dying' – which isn't true – but there is a huge lack of FCs because of the lack of a middle ground. You

either camp a gate or go after large sov fights – nothing in between”. A roaming mechanic allows for FCs to naturally develop and find their way. This holistic view of space has far-reaching implications to Elise and he suggested that currently space has no value and entities hold space for no reason other than they can. Which, in turn, hurts the prospects of smaller alliances. Elise’s goal includes forcing groups into a much smaller footprint, achieved by using the space you own. Smaller footprint will allow the large alliances to fight over the good space, but would let the smaller alliances fight over the less valuable space. Elise’s final point was that it was vital that all these changes to null-sec work within the framework, as simply throwing out the current system and starting over would be tragic; Soundwave added “that is what we tried last time”.

UAXDEATH had a slightly different approach to his goals and began by asking the room how many of the CCP employees played Eve and PvP’d in some fashion. The room was quickly filled with hands. UAXDEATH reasoned that there is some perfect mix of null-sec mechanics to push people out to null-sec without breaking the balance of the game. However, he argued, that the current state of null-sec is so fundamentally flawed that any single change to the system would be futile. UAXDEATH drew a diagram of what makes null-sec: farms and fields, POSes, sov, PvP, et al. He went on to say that farms and fields are broken because of how alliances make ISK. With respect to sovereignty and POSes, UAXDEATH added that, unlike the pre-dominion sov system, the current sov system eliminates the possibility for a small community to get space if they’re in the wrong time zone. So with all these pieces fundamentally broken, UAXDEATH asked Soundwave how he would fix null-sec, given all these broken mechanics.

Soundwave, after hearing the list from all the CSM, said that his goal in this exercise was to get “a collective priority”. Small gangs and resources are more important than the sov system, for example. Speaking about high-level concepts, Soundwave said that the approach to attacking every piece of one issue in a single expansion is fundamentally wrong. “Our goal should be to prioritize what is wrong and tackle the major goals first and continue on with the other issues. That’s what we did with FW. We prioritized and attacked those issues first, then we followed up on another expansion with some other things, and continued to iterate on it until we were comfortable with the final product”. Soundwave offered an example: creating a certain resource and tying it into small gang PvP, such that a small group has to actively harvest it and a small group can disrupt it. Soundwave added that it is essential to first find the set of priorities that hit multiple play styles, then create of a set of goals based on those priorities.

UAXDEATH disagreed and brought up an example of priorities like POSes, “you promised us those things”. Greyscale replied that coming into meetings with the mindset of CCP promising a certain feature is a fallacious, and flat-out wrong, mindset. With conversation now completely deteriorating, Unifex took control of the conversation and spoke about POSes.

Unifex stated that what CCP did was spend effort and prototype what would make a good POS system. It would, however, only affect the group of people who manage POSes. Focusing that amount of time and effort on some small singular aspect of the game and delivering only that “is what will kill the business”.

The atmosphere was notably tense at the point.

Unifex continued by stating that they cannot, and will not, do sov in a standalone release – it’s simply too large. He cited FW as a successful framework: prioritize the pieces that are wrong, find what we can succeed in doing. Unifex compared FW – which he viewed as a success – with War Decs – slightly less successful. The difference is that FW was one feature across multiple expansions that got better each time, while the war decs were one standalone release that was mired in problems. Unifex was happy to

state that CCP has shown the community that they are able to commit to a feature in multiple releases until it is fixed.

Taking the opportunity to talk about POSes, Alek queried why the CSM were so late in learning that POSes were hard to do now. Further, he disagreed that POSes would only touch a small subset of the players and asked how did CCP feel able to accomplish the feat of balancing null-sec, which Alek viewed as comparatively more difficult than POSes. Soundwave was the first to respond and told Alek that he felt some of the assertions he made were incorrect and, from a game design perspective, implementing changes to null-sec and the sov system in general would be easier than revamping the POS system. On top of that, Soundwave added, the POS system by itself would only affect a small portion of the community.

Hans added that this piece-by-piece iteration that Unifex and Soundwave were talking about was the purpose of the design document that the CSM presented to CCP and the community.

After some unconstructive POS-related banter, Trebor brought the topic back to null-sec. Trebor asked Soundwave what he was getting out of this meeting and what action points the CSM could expect to see? Trebor added that in a few months when game design had time to digest and plan on these ideas that the CSM would give feedback, but would like to know what their initial thoughts were like.

Soundwave responded by saying that he'd like to take this CSM-generated list, work on it with a team, and approach the CSM with an extra session to get the CSM's feedback and ensure that CCP are on the right path from the start. Soundwave added that he understood the frustrations on the CSM's part because many of the goals were stated in previous summits. Soundwave was quick to point out, however, that this time a null-sec revamp was on the roadmap for next winter whereas in previous meetings it was not necessarily the plan. Two step interjected that when the CSM had requested the topics in previous summits it was to influence the roadmap.

Reacting to the question of what he got out of this meeting, Soundwave responded with "What this has shown me is that null-sec is sorely lacking in activities that small groups can accomplish – as every one of you mentioned something to that effect. We all agree on that. I want to take this list and come back on a second session".

Seleene, Hans, and UAXDEATH questioned Soundwave on his goals – not as the Lead Game Designer but as "spaceship pilot to spaceship pilot". Seleene was confident that Soundwave understood the situation in null-sec but was more interested in his personal thoughts.

Soundwave was happy to respond and talked about some high level ideas. First and foremost was that "Eve is a game where you fly spaceships in space". Null-sec, ideally, should be a place where everyone is undocked and doing "stuff" in space. Soundwave offered an analogy: "Two people in a closet is interesting, one guy in the closet is kinda creepy". Soundwave was quick to add that an individual should not feel a barrier to play; null-sec should include a venue for many playstyles. Soundwave's final point was that taking something in game should always come at the expense of someone else.

Seemingly satisfied, Seleene asked Soundwave if he felt that there should be some area of the game that catered explicitly to older players. Soundwave responded with his belief that there should be some advantage to playing the game longer, but it shouldn't be to the detriment of other players: the more in

null-sec the better. Greyscale asked Seleene why there should be an area of the game that caters only to older players? “For right or wrong, older players have a sense of entitlement” was Seleene’s response.

Alek jumped in and added that it goes along with the sense of wonderment; “even if I’ve been playing for a long time, there should be things that are very hard that I can only succeed at by drawing on all my skills and experience”. Greyscale agreed to a point and suggested that there could be a part of the game that is limited but that it should be merit-based and not entitlement-based. Fozzie clarified the issue by stating “We need things that only a few people can achieve, but it shouldn’t be based on how long you’ve played the game”. This simple explanation ended that tangent and all parties seemed satisfied with the result.

Getting back to personal beliefs on null-sec, Unifex weighed in with his views. Namely that combat at the base level is fine, but the problem that was plaguing null-sec was a lack of reason for fighting. The same, he added, held true for manufacturing. A null-sec without goals would delve into groups holding point-source income levels and fighting for the same reasons over and over which would lead to a very boring and stale feeling. But, and Unifex was clear, he felt the combat system itself was fine. Meissa chimed in that he agreed a reason for fighting was pressing, but also the location where the fighting happens was equally as significant.

Alek agreed that the actual PvP mechanics of EVE are fine, fun even, and took the more laid-back feel of the meeting to ask Unifex and Soundwave how they felt about the role of structure grinding. Soundwave frankly stated that he personally found it to be a very boring way to do things, but that at its core PvP in null-sec should be non-consensual and that sort of dynamic is very hard to plan. Soundwave further explained that structures aren’t fundamentally wrong but the fault lies with the fact that they are the only tool. Alek added that he felt the larger structure-grinding encouraged people pooling up and excluded smaller entities. Soundwave agreed to something that he mentioned that all the CSM had listed earlier: the complete lack of meaningful smaller-gang objectives.

Ytterbium gave his own personal insight into the game. Prefacing his opinion with “I’m not elite or anything”, he suggested that perhaps the larger problem is the lack of balance between creation and destruction. Ytterbium continued and noted that the issue he was seeing was the accumulation of “creation” without a “destruction” sink. Greyscale agreed, and described a situation that he always enjoyed seeing – groups starting out with a ship like a Drake and then moving to a more specialized – and more expensive – ship like a Tengu. Trading a significantly higher cost for a smaller chance to win was a dynamic that he appreciated greatly.

Ytterbium took the idea of creation and destruction a step further and, noting that the CSM were keen to have new “big objectives”, questioned if perhaps it is wise to take a broader view of the problem and look to increase scarcity of some assets.

Greyscale clarified: “Instead of building a taller tower, pushing someone else's tower over”.

Unifex said that, personally, the most meaningful goals he achieved in game were the ones that he and his alliance set out to accomplish. In that view, no single system, no single fight, or single ship was as meaningful as the group objective. There are a number of ways to set your own goals, like taking space. Unifex believed that another problem was that the act of taking space was far too trivial and that the defender had too many advantages.

Spitballing on that idea, Two step interjected that the goals Unifex was talking about, be it taking space or adding a station, should be hard. It was imperative, in Two step's opinion, that the difficulty scale appropriately. The alliance-level goal of building a station has long since deteriorated to individuals being able to drop outposts.

Unifex anticipated where the conversation was going and added that he didn't want to talk about destructible stations since it was, after all, a game design question and he was just talking as a general Eve player. Soundwave, meanwhile, gave the CSM a thumbs-up when Unifex mentioned "destructible stations". Unifex continued with his assertion that passive safety was part of what gave the defender too much of an advantage and let creation beat out destruction in the overall balance of things.

Hans suggested that this aspect of the game was seamlessly integrated into the revamped Factional Warfare system – at least to an extent. "If we don't physically undock we lose the system", Hans added simply. Hans clarified that, from a game design perspective, you can change "running a complex" to any other activity.

UAxDEATH stated that Eve should be a cold, dark place.

On the topic of creation and destruction Soundwave brought up a "neat" game design mechanic that CCP were unable to squeeze into a previous expansion. He explained the mechanic wherein there were a new set of system upgrades, "IHUBs on crack", that were incredibly powerful. To temper the power creep, the mechanic allowed for only three of such structures to exist. Further, the only way to get said structure is to physically take it from someone else. Elise was quick to praise the idea. Soundwave continued that if he were ever to go into the issue of making an end-game objective that he would definitely put a similar type of hard-cap on it to keep the goals in check.

Trebor added that it could in fact be a soft cap that increased (or decreased) depending on a variety of metrics. Using a hypothetical example of how such a feature could be used, Trebor brought up Titans and Supercaps in general. Using this type of soft-cap mechanic, Trebor suggested that to build a new supercap would require the "core" of a dead supercap. So to build a new ship you would need the same materials and time, but also a supercap "core" that has a chance of dropping after a ship is destroyed. With that plus an adjustable drop rate of the cores in rare NPC spawns, one could manipulate the population of the ships. Two step liked the idea and talked about the issue of difficulty scaling; accumulating resources shouldn't universally make everything easier.

Summing up his ideas, Unifex shared his belief that the ultimate end-game for null-sec should be about how well you can organize people. Soundwave interjected "and giving those people more value than they have today".

The meeting adjourned after a brief discussion of the logistics of arranging the second, extra session on Null-sec.



## Null-sec: Part 2

Present: CCP Soundwave, CCP Seagull, CCP Greyscale, CCP Fozzie

Soundwave began the meeting by presenting the initial high-level questions that he and the team came up after the first meeting with the CSM. Narrowing down the main issues led to three overarching topics: resources, infrastructure, and alliances. Soundwave added that the alliance structure as it exists today needs to be reworked. It doesn't exist the same way a corporation in Eve does and he noticed it became very difficult to talk about resources and infrastructure without dealing with alliances as an in-game construct.

Soundwave narrowed down his thoughts into three main categories: the various reasons to want space, types of things to do with infrastructure whether it is to build or destroy, and simply creating alliances. Soundwave went on to show how his team took the main categories and mapped them to the different user demographics that Seagull outlined earlier. After presenting the process, each one was discussed in detail, but these exact details cannot be divulged at this time.

Alek asked about resource distribution and the efficacy of having competing resources, such as one area being very good at mining but very bad at ridding (for example). Fozzie emphasized the importance of variety – relying on one income stream, he argued, is counterproductive and even bad. The dynamic he envisioned was one such that an entity would either crave a certain area of space because it suited them, or an entity was in the best possible region and was forced to defend itself from attackers craving the resources it had.

Hans asked if that was a deciding factor in rebalancing the Drone Regions – where resource gathering (in mineral form) was the dominant activity such that it superseded everything else. Greyscale explained that the main reason was that it negatively impacted mineral supply, but fleshed out the idea of variable value in space by adding that there should be a spectrum of value within a region as opposed to a linear progression. Fozzie added that perhaps one region can be better at one thing than others.

Trebor brought up the issue of fallow space and argued that it should be very costly to maintain. "If I don't use it, I lose it" summed up the argument well. Trebor explained that there should be a means for people to move into underutilized space and use it better without being stomped. Elise interjected that an alternative would be to have fallow space be comparatively easier to take. Trebor agreed, and continued by explaining that active space should be very difficult to take compared to space that is not being used.

Greyscale had an interesting interpretation and stated his opinion was that null-sec should, at its core, be accessible to all sorts of players. The problem, Greyscale argued, was not alliances holding space that they did not use, but instead alliances holding space that they did not use as a detriment to new players. Greyscale explained they didn't particularly care about the issue of fallow space in and of itself unless it prohibited other players from gaining a foothold. Trebor reiterated that the issue of fallow space was very important and that Greyscale should care. Greyscale asked why, and Trebor explained that the current dynamic has alliances holding vast swathes of space, such that a small alliance could not gain a foothold. Fozzie agreed that insofar as fallow space is blocking accessibility to 0.0 gameplay it is an issue worth fixing.

Soundwave brought up the issue of formalizing alliances by giving them the same tools as corporations. Seleene and UAxDEATH both wondered if there was a plan to formalize coalitions, or groups of alliances. Fozzie countered with a question of his own and asked what tools would be helpful to coalitions. He explained that the most important issue that he could think of was one of standardized standings – a problem that CREST can help out with. Seleene added that coalition identity was a significant factor, and UAxDEATH mentioned that a coalition chat could be useful. The team acknowledged the concerns, but believed alliance structure was a significantly more pressing issue.

Soundwave presented some possible ideas for alliance level taxation, including asking what the CSM thought about allowing alliances to collect a tax on market transactions. Noting that alliances aren't privy to market transaction tax, Soundwave described that as an interesting boost. UAxDEATH shared these sentiments. Two step wondered if it was feasible to restrict the market by standing. Greyscale responded that at the economic level there were some ideological reasons for dictating how markets should work, but added that he was fond of the idea and did not by any means dismiss it. Hans countered that he enjoyed the concept of war profiteering and selling to his enemies. Two step stated that in Empire it may be good, but noted the difference between an Empire station and an alliance-owned nullsec station. The nullsec station, he argued, should have more control. Greyscale suggested that once the alliance and industry tools are formalized, then issues like this would surface as natural "pain points" and could be better understood and addressed at a later point.

Seagull emphasized the importance of making a roadmap and not getting bogged down in minute details, and explained that in any single release several stories could be addressed. Seagull added that she was most interested in establishing the [development] tools to scope problems in a meaningful way such that an expansion could not just focus on a single system and instead look at a holistic approach. She continued to emphasize the importance of coming to an agreement on the overall strategy and roadmap prioritization rather than implementation issues. Finalizing the point, Seagull explained that after the roadmap was agreed upon then finer details could be discussed at length in January.

UAxDEATH questioned CCP on how they came up with their stories [being discussed in this meeting]. Fozzie explained that they began by taking the information the CSM supplied on the first session and combined it with their belief and knowledge of null-sec to create a list of "pain points". They then prioritized the list and looked to see the relationship between the points and categorized them as such. The idea, Fozzie explained, was to use these stories as a base. Greyscale stated that the main headers were what they deemed to be the most pressing, but that working on one issue did not preclude them from working on another in any given expansion. Seagull agreed completely.

Hans inquired about the process and wondered if CCP were intending to prioritize the stories and then create a feature which best addresses the most stories. Seagull responded by explaining that there was no single order and that the features can aim to hit all the stories simultaneously, or scope the stories in a certain way such that one feature addresses a small part of a story with the intention of building upon it on the next expansion and integrating the features. She concluded by saying that the most useful feedback at this stage is stating whether you fundamentally disagree or agree with the stories and then moving on from there.

Trebor argued that a fundamental problem with control in Eve is that it's binary – "you either control a system or you don't", asserting that this type of system is inherently unstable and prone to runaways [where one group or a cartel would end up dominating]. Trebor suggested that control that could wax and wane depending on various parameters (population, activity, structures, etc.). Greyscale disagreed and

believed that there was no such way to have shades of control over a fight – “I’m fighting, I lost, or I won”. Fozzie explained that both parties were perhaps thinking of the same thing and provided an example of how a new system could work: winning a fight would allow a small disrupting force to do some time-consuming action while fending off defenders. Trebor still believed that the binary nature of ownership would lead to a runaway, while Greyscale disagreed and argued that there could exist a binary system that did have this result.

Soundwave asked the CSM what they believed to be good reasons to take space. Two step suggested a unique resource. Elise added that there should be a non-economic reason to take space, be it a geographic location or some home-like feel. Greene Lee agreed and stated that some alliances feel at home in certain areas simply because of historical reasons. Hans noted that concentration of activity was a very important factor in having space. Two step suggested that maybe some areas of space should simply be more fun, or challenging, than others. Alek explained why his alliance took space: simply because they could combine economic and PVP opportunities to stay closer together and because they could set up their own set of rules. Seleene stated that there should be opportunities to improve bad space to an extent.

Soundwave asked the question: why undock? Elise began by examining the current gap in activity: individual money making activities were optional, but not at all necessary, which leads to a problem of not having anything to patrol and by extension, fight over. Elise added that this was the primary reason for people having larger scale fights: simply because there is nothing else to do. He stated that the best option, in his view, was to provide some sort of content that requires a response. Greene Lee noted that this should be able to be accomplished by a small gang, which Elise agreed with.

Adding to this, Hans noted the importance of obtaining information as a reason to undock, but pointed out that the information should be usable and easy to pass. Two step pointed out that whatever the activity in space, it should be valuable enough to fight over. Theoretically having a disruptable income source is beneficial, but if that income source is not valuable enough the members can simply leave null-sec and earn money some other way. Elise emphasized that the resource should be both valuable and unique. Trebor suggested that this unique resource should be both harvested and consumed only in null-sec to avoid farming a resource and then exporting said resource to empire.

Soundwave asked the CSM what they would like to build in space. Two step started the discussion by saying that he believed that the investment into space should not be able to be taken down or moved – one should want to protect the space they live in because they invested money into it and they simply cannot just tear it down and move to another area when harassed. UAxDEATH added that these static constructs should also be able to be destroyed by an invading force.

Greyscale responded that this idea of static infrastructure created a ‘movement’ conflict. That is to say, Greyscale suggested that having people striving to move to better space is better and he feared that this type of investment would instead keep people tied to their space. Two step countered that this investment can be considered a cost of living and a way around the issue is to transfer ownership of this infrastructure so that some value could be retained. Alek echoed the sentiments that transferability of whatever is made should be a priority, citing the current pains of transferring sov, stations, and moons between alliances.

Seleene added some things that he would like to build in space to include bigger projects like stargates, or anything to improve existing space. UAxDEATH asked CCP what sort of things they had in mind with

respect to building. Soundwave responded that ideally he would like to see hundreds of options to customize space. Two step liked the idea, but added that additional customization should have diminishing utility, to which Soundwave responded positively. Alek stated that he would like to make physical vanity items in space, and even wormhole effects. Elise and Two step both agreed that being able to change the properties of a system would be a really interesting idea.

On the subject of vanity items, Two step expressed many player's desire to be able to build a penis in space. UAxDEATH suggested that possibly income in a system could be gathered at a certain structure, which an invading force could disrupt and even steal from if given the time. Elise summed up the ideas by stating that his goal would be to have anything and everything that adds meaningful value, be it economic or not. Alek expanded on the idea of non-economic value by stating the constructs should help visually identify that a certain entity owns an area of space rather than simple text on the top right of the screen.

Elise stated that whatever new/improved mechanics will be added down the road, it should give a smaller group a meaningful reason to disrupt a larger group. The larger group would thus be meaningfully punished for not responding to the smaller incursion in a timely manner. Elise emphasized this last point and explained that time-sensitivity would both help keep the scale of the fights small and foster development of new FCs. Two step agreed that there should be an increased disruption as a function of time.

Alek drew comparisons between this type of system and the mining index, although he admitted the mining index was far from perfect. Since the mining index deteriorates quickly relative to the Military Index, a small force can disrupt a system and make a quasi-meaningful impact by destabilizing the space. Elise pointed out that where this type of issue fails currently is that the miners can just as easily go to another area of space that is equally as upgraded and "wait out" the threat.

Hans suggested that there should be options for players of all ages and skills. Elise strongly agreed. Greyscale added his opinion that every time a group wins a fight in enemy space, they should receive a tangible benefit. Two step suggested that there should be options to either destroy some type of infrastructure, or steal from it. Greyscale agreed that attackers should always have an incentive to do something, and Two step added that there should be a harsh disincentive to ignore the threat and questioned whether the disruption should be time-based. UAxDEATH was not impressed with this idea and claimed that this would cause veterans to quit. Fozzie interjected and stated that forcing veterans to shoot an IHUB was akin to "making them pull out their epeen and hit it with a hammer and whoever hits it the most times wins". He added that the goal should be to make the activity fun.

Soundwave asked the CSM about alliance management tools. UAxDEATH was keen to respond and suggested that he would like a tool to give out an official type of assignment. Soundwave recorded this as a tool for moving pieces on the map, to which Greyscale amended the ability to track the success of the various types of goals.

Two step stated that an important feature was to have alliance-level roles to formalize the structure. Alek suggested better intelligence sharing tools and emphasized the importance for an alliance to know when someone was penetrating their space. Elise stated the importance of alliance-level taxes and alliance ownership of starbases, stations, and various structures. Greene Lee agreed and argued that this would help to have better control over an alliance, which he argued was sorely needed.

Two step suggested that the CEO of an alliance should be able to kick members of corporations within the alliance. Elise strongly disagreed, while UAxDEATH strongly agreed with the idea. Greyscale stated that he was uncomfortable with the idea of an alliance having control over corporations and expressed his view that corporations should still stay sovereign entities.

Hans pointed out the need for an alliance level tax, while Two step pointed out that there should be a variable tax for different activities, and some way to tax non-monetary activities.

Soundwave wondered whether or not there should be alliance level rewards for sending out small gangs, and Two step suggested that guerilla roaming alliances should be able to tax that type of activity if they wanted. Alek agreed with the initial statement that killing players in space should provide some sort of reward, and Greene Lee pointed out that this could be accomplished if the bounty system could take into account standings. Greyscale interjected and stated that was only one level – reward – but wondered about the feasibility of taxing the roamers. There was no consensus, but Two step stated that there should be both a payment and a tax, but emphasized that the tax should be variable so some alliances can set the tax to zero and set the rewards high if they so choose to.

Moving the discussion over to an area that was overlooked, Elise raised the question of the importance of industry. Importing goods from Jita and exporting harvested materials to Jita, Elise argued, was a bad design. Greyscale agreed and questioned to what degree making assembly lines better would alleviate some of the null-sec industrial woes. Elise argued that the issue wasn't necessarily the building in null-sec, but rather the accumulation of resources to build. Alek added that he believed the building process itself was very important and that assembly lines in null-sec were a reason for industry being so lackluster. Two step suggested that perhaps a solution would be to have a more significant cost to building in Empire, whereas the cost would be less in player-built stations. Hans added that CCP should not be afraid to increase the cost of building in highsec.

Branching off from this idea, Soundwave explained that he believed there should be a linear scale between NPC stations and fully upgraded outposts. Taking the issue of refining, Soundwave stated his belief that there should never be a 100% refine rate, but the closest one could get would be at a fully-upgraded outpost. Hans noted that this could potentially be a disruptable type of activity and argued that a good refining system should be put in space so people would have to risk something to get the best refine. Elise countered that making an activity a logistical hassle would deter from the activity itself.

Greyscale asked the CSM if giving, say, infinite assembly lines at no cost would be sufficient to bolster null-sec industry. Elise did not agree, and Trebor sarcastically replied that it was "a good start". Greyscale wondered where the remaining problem resided, and UAxDEATH quickly responded that the issue was with acquiring the minerals. Elise agreed and added that while the build slots were an issue, the larger issue was getting the minerals.

Hans added that the null-sec belts did not include a useful distribution of minerals, so importing would always be an issue. Greyscale posed an extreme example of infinite Tritanium in null-sec and asked if people would mine it. UAxDEATH stated that people would mine it, while Alek argued that it would be pointless to mine so long as there was a more valuable resource, like Merc/Mega/Zyd, that could be mined, exported, traded in empire for Tritanium, and hauled back still at a profit. Alek suggested a solution would be to include minerals like Tritanium and Pyrite to the asteroids that yield the higher-end minerals, or even some sort of "super Veld" that yielded a similar ISK/hour to high ends through massive

amounts of Trit instead of Zyd/Mega. Getting in the last word, Elise suggested that another useful tweak would be to increase the speed of null-sec production slots, which UAxDEATH agreed was useful.

With time being an issue, the meeting concluded after the discussion of industry.

## Ship Balancing

Present: CCP Ytterbium, CCP Fozzie, CCP Tallest, CCP Greyscale

The meeting started by examining what the ship balance team was planning to work on next.

Ytterbium stated that 2013 would see work on the Battlecruisers, Battleships, adjusting skill requirements for T1, and then after all of that is accomplished, they would move on to T2.

Two step asked when the skill changes would be released. Ytterbium responded that it wouldn't be a long process, but it was required due to another team working on the skill tree. The sensible thing would be to introduce the skill tree at the same time as adjusting the skills, which is the reason for the skills being touched when they are.

After that Ytterbium suggested that the T2 ships in line would include Command Ships, Black Ops, and EAFs.

UAxDEATH asked about the balancing of faction ships, and Ytterbium responded that some of the faction ships are good but that others need some love in light of the changes made to cruisers. Fozzie preemptively addressed the question of a timeline and stated that the BCs were on schedule for the February expansion, while Battleships would be held back until the summer expansion. Fozzie added that because they were holding off on Battleships, there was a high probability of some T2 changes being released at the same time.

Alek asked CCP what direction they were thinking of going with T2 rebalancing. Fozzie explained that since the power level of cruisers went up for T1 that people were expecting T2 to increase proportionally, but emphasized that T2 would not be getting that treatment. Instead, T2 would be systematically looked at and given an effective role that is not necessarily better overall than T1, but certainly more specialized.

Alek asked for an example, and Ytterbium gave him the comparison between Assault Frigates and T1 Frigates, with Fozzie adding that the dynamic between those was about perfect.

Seleene brought up the issue of a cost difference, citing an example of the Thorax and Deimos. Since the Deimos is significantly more expensive, Seleene reasoned, shouldn't it be more powerful? Fozzie agreed to a point and said that the premium you pay for the Deimos should get something like a 20% bonus over T1. Greyscale added that ships are quasi-balanced on cost, but so that a linear increase in power correlates to an exponential increase in cost.

Fozzie added that the Deimos was one of the ships that needed a lot of work, and raised a more apt comparison like that between the Vagabond and Stabber. Fozzie explained that the Vagabond had better falloff and higher DPS, but that the speed difference was no longer as drastic. Fozzie also hinted at a change to armor ships, but added that due to the crowded pipeline it was still a very fresh, high-level idea that he couldn't make any promises about.

Greyscale asked the balance team if they were happy with any T2 ship now, compared to T1, and Fozzie responded that they were only happy with Assault Frigs. Greyscale then summed up the comparison between T1 and T2 by using the relationship between AFs and T1 frigs as the model.

Elise stated that the relationship between AFs and T1 was a good indicator, but added that people are a bit miffed now because often T1 is better than T2 – which just seems counter-intuitive. Ytterbium conceded that this was true, but that it wasn't going to be the case forever. Ytterbium added that T1 were not a finished product and noted that some small changes could be made to them in the future to ensure they are properly balanced.

Using the sniper Zealot as an example, Fozzie noted that part of the reason we don't see T2 used isn't necessarily that they are really bad, but simply a result of changes in the meta-game. In the case of sniper Zealots, Fozzie pointed out that tier 3 BCs assumed their role in the meta-game.

Alek added that he would be cautious about changing tier 3 BCs that much because the ships were largely fine, though he offered up a possible change of removing a turret if the balance team thought something needed to be done. Fozzie responded that removing turrets wasn't an issue, just maybe a slight tweak to agility and speed. Ytterbium emphasized that the change would be very small because he was largely happy with the role of tier 3 BCs.

Two step transitioned the discussion to Tech 3s and noted that many T3 pilots had concerns over Ytterbium's view of T3 from the previous summit. Ytterbium went on to describe his vision for the relationship between T1, T2, and T3. T1, Ytterbium explained, would be general, but usable. T2 would be more specialized in certain roles than T1 while not being universally better. T3 would then be more general than T2, but able to do several unique things that T2 cannot. Ytterbium conceded that this was no simple task, and that T3 was a long ways away. Fozzie gave an example of a dynamic that they thought was good and brought up ships like the Proteus and Loki using their ewar subsystem. The Proteus, as Fozzie explained, was able to have a point-range bonus that was not as powerful as the T2 specialized ship (Lachesis, Arazu), however the Proteus was able to combine that role with a very sturdy armor tank; something that the more specialized T2 ships cannot do.

Two step added that the ability to change is good, but that it was only good if the ship was able to do this while in combat. Fozzie explained their vision that they want T3 to be able to mix and match capabilities that don't otherwise exist. Using the Proteus he gave another example – combining the cloaking, high damage, and a comparatively bigger tank.

Two step explained that people in wormholes currently use T3s for heavy, reasonably high DPS platforms and that he thought this dynamic was good. Ytterbium disagreed completely and argued that T3s have a very high EHP, very good damage, and a good maneuverability. This combination, he continued, was simply too good. Greyscale pointed out Tengus, to which Two step replied that it was unwise to balance T3s based on Tengus. Two step argued that while Tengus are great for PvE, they weren't very common for wormhole PvP and as such it would be ill-advised to "throw out the Legion with the Tengu bathwater".

To further explain the vision between T1, T2, and T3, Ytterbium pulled up his Command Ship devblog. Ytterbium pointed out that command ships would be very specialized and would get the best bonuses, however they would be limited in their ability to fight and do other things. Ytterbium described that his vision for T3s would let T3s fit more diverse gang links, while being able to do other things – like fight, or use ewar – simultaneously.

Fozzie continued where Ytterbium left off and suggested that perhaps T3s would be able to have a fitting bonus to ganglinks to facilitate fitting more diverse links without having to gimp the ship. Elise asked if



there was any thought to pairing the Command Ship, and later T3, changes with changes to how bonuses are applied to fleet. Elise argued that the current Fleet-Wing-Squad system bonus system was bad and it really detracted from the role of links. Ytterbium and Fozzie both agreed that the current system was severely flawed.

Seleene brought up the topic of off-grid boosting, and Fozzie responded that technical limitations were the only reason it continued to exist. Fozzie could not comment on when this issue would be resolved and stated that “one day Veritas will come up to me and say ‘hey I fixed off-grid boosting’”, but he had no idea on a potential timeframe for this sort of miracle. Elise emphasized that while off-grid boosting was an issue, just the simple way that bonuses are applied in a fleet is flawed.

Seleene brought the discussion back to T1 and asked what the reason was for the slight delay in T1 BS balancing. Ytterbium added that neither the vision nor the timeframe for Battleships changed, and Fozzie hinted at “a surprise you will be happy with”. After light torture, Fozzie broke down and revealed the surprise was simply a new addition to the balance team.

Seleene then asked why we had to wait for Black Ops, and Fozzie responded that a minor BO change was imminent. The delay was caused by a QA bottleneck, and upon learning this Unifex promised Fozzie that he would do the QA testing himself to push the changes out early. Two step and Trebor both asked for clarification on the BO changes, and Fozzie and Ytterbium explained that it was simple: increase jump range to Titan levels, decrease fuel consumption by 25%, and increase fuel capacity by 25%. Both Ytterbium and Fozzie agreed that these were not the final changes to BO, but stated that a small stopgap change was necessary. Alek asked if there was any chance that they would look at bonuses on the Black Ops, and Fozzie responded that it would not happen with the first pass but that BO would be eventually changing. Trebor asked about the use of CovOps cynos on T3 ships. Fozzie responded that from a game design perspective there were no issues, but the hang-up was a technical limitation. Greyscale added that the technical limitation had to do with the way bonuses are applied to T3s from the subsystem, saying “it’s not because we don’t want to do it, it’s simply a technical limitation”. Trebor asked for the specifics, since the community was curious. Greyscale responded “because of magic!” Fozzie clarified that it was likely because of the bonuses to covops cynos work on a ship level as opposed to a module/subsystem level.

Ytterbium then asked the CSM if they had any questions about the upcoming skill changes (having a racial BC/Destroyer skill as opposed to a generic skill, and reducing the skills required to fly certain ships). Two step asked quite simply: why? Ytterbium responded that it was due to a matter of consistency and the current system makes little sense. Two step acknowledged that the idea was reasonable, but he had concerns on increasing the skillpoint gap between old players and new players. Ytterbium responded that becoming specialized in a single ship would now, in fact, be much easier after the skill change.

Two step was not satisfied, noting that older players were still getting a significant skill boost, in terms of skillpoints, over younger players. Fozzie stated that the change was far from ideal, though he argued that it was worth taking the small hit not instead of letting a bad system continue to exist. Greyscale added that in practical terms the skill gap would not be significantly wider. Two step suggested lowering the rank by one level of the racial skills, while Alek suggested simply refunding the relevant skillpoints to everyone with the affected skills. Fozzie, Ytterbium, and Greyscale were all against refunding skillpoints for various reasons, and Ytterbium believed that reducing the skill rank would not be worthwhile.

Seleene raised the issue of supercap balancing. Ytterbium informed the CSM that supercap rebalancing was not on the immediate horizon and that there was no concrete vision for changes to them. Fozzie added that, while they wouldn't promise to rebalance supercaps balance in 2013, they wouldn't exclude it either. Fozzie continued by saying that supercap balance was an issue, but that they believe other balance issues had a higher priority. Alek, Seleene, and Elise disagreed.

Greyscale stated that he would ideally like to tell people that they were planning on doing some sort of role change to supers, though not in the next six months. Two step questioned this idea, as he argued that vague information would be at best useless and at worst rage inducing, while Hans added "they'll roast you". Greyscale responded by stating he would rather absorb the rage and set expectations than blindside players who may be spending a significant amount of time to get a supercapital only to have it changed. Elise added that notion was not unreasonable.

While on the topic of supercaps UAxDEATH asked if CCP had given any more consideration to supercap scrambler that can fit on supercaps. Fozzie responded by saying he believed it wasn't a sensible issue and argued that supercap blobs can kill other supercap blobs. UAxDEATH strongly disagreed and stated that supercaps, accompanied by subcap support, can escape from harm's way. Fozzie responded that the best way to kill supercaps is to put them in more vulnerable positions. Alek responded that making supercaps easier to tackle was, in essence, the same as making them more vulnerable. Elise interjected and argued that the issue was one of survivability of dictors and hictors -- something that could be addressed when those ships are balanced; further, a supercap scrambler module that could only be fit by supercaps would marginalize the role of support fleets. Elise continued by adding that support fleets should be necessary anytime supercaps are deployed.

Moving back to the topic of subcaps, Elise asked if there was a specific timeline and order for T2 ships. Elise wanted to know if the order of frigates-to-battleships would be retained when doing T2 balance, or if other ships (like HACs) would be given a priority because they have the potential to be used more. Ytterbium explained that nothing for T2 was set in stone, but that he would like to tackle the highest priority ones first. On the top of his list were Command Ships, and maybe a closer look at Black Ops.

Ytterbium and Fozzie stated that their vision for a future BO revamp (after the initial jump range/fuel change) was that it would include two lines – a combat-oriented BO and a bridging/covert oriented one. Alek stated some reservations about having bridging-only Black Ops, arguing that simply bridging and flying around cloaked was a bit boring -- they should want and be able to fight. Two step suggested that maybe a price reduction would be a big help alongside making them more useful.

Trebor noted that his corp uses Black Ops in combat environments. Elise asked if he used Black Ops as "a hilarious gimmick" or because they were a sensible and useful ship. Trebor responded that he would prefer a single-line of Black Ops and accompany it with a combat-boost instead.

Nearing the end of the meeting, Two step brought up the issue of Dread blapping in wormhole space. This sparked an informal discussion to determine if the issue was the Dreads themselves, or just a byproduct of wormhole combat. No meaningful solution was devised in a short time, but Fozzie added that he would keep an eye on Dread blapping in wormhole space in particular. Since this topic was slightly shortened (by both the CSM and the ship balance team) to accommodate the added null-sec discussion, time ran out. Fozzie and Ytterbium added that many of the conversations could be discussed by more informal means – like the Skype chat and the forums – and the CSM praised the ship balance team for their communication to both the CSM and the community.

## Factional Warfare

Present: CCP Solomon, CCP Ytterbium, CCP Soundwave, CCP Fozzie

Note: this session took place before the "EVE Online - The Next Decade" session.

Xhagen: So how is Factional Warfare doing?

Hans: It's great.

Seleene: OK, so next meeting is...

Hans expressed that the feature is really close to a stable and exciting state, and asked if more resources were going to be devoted to it.

Solomon started by stating that nothing is planned but that can change if need be. As for what could be changed, it can be discussed until we're blue in the face. [For example,] space is not quite as desirable as it could be. It all goes to what the goals are, holding space or killing people -- he thinks it's the latter.

Soundwave added that Factional Warfare was grabbed because there was a need to go back and touch the feature. Currently, there isn't a need; anything done from here on will be a nice bonus, but there is no gaping hole.

Hans expressed that value of space (more system upgrades) should be considered. More value = more traffic = niches for piracy (for example).

This kicked off a discussion of FW improvements vs. doing something related to Low-sec as a whole. Soundwave felt that FW should be something you do in Low-sec, not the reason for going to Low-sec. Solomon noted that, regarding upgrades, the lack of solar system differentiation is an EVE-wide issue.

Hans noted that one area that could be improved was support for industrialists who do logistics, such as importing and pre-fitting ships. It would also be nice to be able to do Militia-wide contracting.

Solomon stated that one idea that been kicked around, to allow people to put up a contract for a fit ship -- "Give me 10 blaster thoraxes fit this way"

Two step inquired about activity trends in FW. Fozzie replied that after the farming nerf, enrollment was down 10-15% (mostly farmers leaving), but has been creeping up again, except for Caldari which has some demoralization issues. Soundwave noted that overall, things are stable, and Fozzie added that last week was the 3rd most active week in terms of PvP.

A discussion ensued about the payouts changes and their effects. Overall, CCP is happy; the two largest militias have shrunk and the two smaller ones have grown. Plexing volume is about where it was when the original FW changes were made (before they were aggressively farmed). Ytterbium would like to see the LP-generation balance between plexing, Missions and PvP shift more towards PvP but there are concerns about it being exploited, so CCP will be cautious here.

Hans noted that it's bad to have to choose between a Militia that offers more targets and one that offers more ISK per target. While he no longer believes that rewarding the underdog more is needed (in light of the trend towards equalization in militia size), he favors a LP-for-PvP payout calculation that is non-exploitable but equal for all sides.

Hans stated that people have pointed out that they don't like being penalized for chasing after more targets. That's why Hans wants to get that out of the way.

Alek (via Lync chat): I am 100% with Hans on this one.

Soundwave replied that he doesn't like special-casing. He wants people to do PvP because they like to do PvP.

Two step stated that if the most incentivized thing is orbiting a beacon, that's what people will do. If the objective of FW is accessible fighting, then CCP needs to incentivize that.

Soundwave responded that he didn't think people inherently choose the most profitable thing, they choose the best thing they can do that fits their play-style. People running the complexes aren't usually looking for a good fight.

Two step agreed, but asked if they should be paid more than people who are?

Alek affirmed the view (via Lync chat) that isn't about whether incentives for PvP exist, with FW and Bounties they do. The question is why not incentivize it at the highest level possible that doesn't invite abuse?

Solomon asked the CSM whether a FW killboard would help?

Hans responded that he was hesitant; those things already exist outside the game. He would prefer that CCP uses its resources to build things players can't.

Unifex reminded everyone not to lose sight of the broader perspective. CCP can say that it wants to encourage PvP, but if people have to be paid to do it, is that a good idea? So what is it that is to be achieved with FW? Unifex continued by repeating what Soundwave noted, it's in Low-sec but it's not all of Low-sec.

Hans was encouraged that CCP is looking at this in a broader context; a common Low-sec complaint is that CCP is only looking at FW.

Hans continued and said that another thing that was a little disappointing in Retribution was the risk-factor for Plexes; at the top of my list for iteration would be making the timer visible system-wide; it would really make it easier to find the fight.

Soundwave answered that one thing they've talked about before is that these intel tools aren't very sandboxy. Right now it's "here is the FW intel tool, here is the Bounty Hunting intel tool".

Fozzie added that they were looking at having upgrades to intel but it was dropped due to time constraints. The same applied with the timers visible in space. He stated that one thing that has made a big difference in the last couple of days is the change to the directional scanner [coupled with the tracking camera]. He admitted that he didn't even notice that CCP karkur had done that, but it's made finding people a lot easier. The other change that's made a big difference is moving the capture point in.

Two step added that some people would like the capture radius even smaller, especially on the smaller Plexes.

Fozzie replied that it had to be balanced so that younger players would feel they weren't going to get killed every time, and also so that long-range fits like a Rail Cormorant would be useful. If the ranges are reduced, everyone is forced into brawling fits.

Hans commended CCP: "I think you've hit the sweet-spot."

Soundwave mentioned that with FW, CCP wants it to be light-PvP, Sov-lite, and not the hard-core null-sec warfare. And that means that CCP does stuff that isn't intuitive. For example, one request often received is "why can't we kick obvious spies?" But if that is done, it becomes like null-sec alliances, where someone [has the power to say who's allowed to join].

Fozzie, going back to the distance issue, stated that there have been complaints that it's too far away, and that it's too close.

Two step replied that one problem is that with smaller plexes, when players are in faster ships, they can get away quicker.

Fozzie pointed out that the ship chasing is also quicker.

Hans interjected that he didn't see the need for it to be overly complicated.

Hans stated that with respect to plex timers, he believes that if you warp out, the timer should start resetting back to the middle. This might encourage people to stay and fight. Right now, continuously bouncing from plex to plex to plex is a viable strategy.

Fozzie answered that it was another one there wasn't time to complete it. For him, it was the element in the design that he was most disappointed that was dropped. It's not super-crucial but it would be a big benefit.

Fozzie and Ytterbium provided some details on how they hope to change NPC spawning in the near future; this is contingent on some rework on the back-end NPC code.

Hans asked for CCP's opinion on the state of the FW UI. Did they want to do more?

Fozzie replied that they wanted to get more into it, but it just came down to prioritization.

Ytterbium concurred that they'd like to improve the notifications.

Hans also noted that it would be nice if players could see the state of the other war, and if allied militia showed up as some color other than neutral grey.

Fozzie replied that (the allied color) got into Retribution unless it's broken. The "own" and "opposing" militia color tags have been extended.

Ytterbium asked if people were satisfied with the map changes. Hans indicated that they were.

Ytterbium also asked about the Loyalty Store offers. Hans said the big annoyance was tags, he would love to see them gone entirely -- "make it all LP, you'll be heroes". He suggested that as a shortcut, CCP should consider having a way to convert between the different types of tags.

Soundwave indicated that they had thought about having different prices (all ISK, all LP, LP+tags) but currently these would have to be 3 different offers, which is cumbersome. They would prefer to have one offer with various price options, but the LP store does not support this at present.

Two step noted that they could add offers that converted LP into tags, and LP+tags into different tags.

A discussion ensued about tag sources and farming.

Hans asked for Navy cap boosters to be expanded to fill the entire range of sizes. CCP indicated this would probably be a good thing to do.

Two step asked about the future of RP and datacores, now that FW may be able to support the market demand. Soundwave indicated he was unsure of how many accounts that would affect.

A short discussion ensued about the possible effects on Industry, and the utility of having alternate sources of supply for key materials. Two step and Alek argued that [instead of the current passive research agent path], an active system involving exploration and a fun hacking mechanic would be an improvement. Soundwave indicated that he would like to remove research agents but there needed to be a way for Industrialists to get datacores through non-conflict gameplay, and they needed to figure out what to do with the skills. All in all, it was "a bit of a can of worms" but one he has wanted to address for years.

Elise and Hans expressed the strong opinion that FW was really fun again, and recounted a story about a battle that lasted so long that people were looting ships during the fight to get more ammo. Militias need to have much more organized logistics chains now to support the battles.

Fozzie admitted that reading reports about that battle made him feel smug.

Ytterbium put forth the question of how the CSM felt about the I-HUB, when the system is flipped? Too quick, too slow? More or less HP?

Hans indicated that he thought the bleed rate might be a little on the slow side, and you don't see a lot of "we can't take the system so we're going to deprive you of the benefits"; once you put all your money in to upgrade it, it seems really stable. I might want to see a little more volatility but the current system is superior to the old one where we only put money in when we were spiking.

Elise noted that the current HP were about right, and that they encouraged larger battles with bigger ships.

Hans agreed, but pointed out that these were pretty much the only place that larger battles could exist since the spawn rates for the plex types were adjusted. Hans noted that he would have objected sooner had he realized that the old unrestricted plexes were the code basis for the new large plexes.

Fozzie concurred, explaining that the team will be investigating to see if they had the capability to tweak the spawn rates of the old unrestricted complexes. He acknowledged that all the other sizes of plex had even spawn rates except for the new larges, for which the spawn rate was considerably lower.

Soundwave stated that FW has gone from something they were a little ashamed of into something good (he has characters active in FW), and that he wanted to spend the last 15 minutes of the meeting discussing where the feature should go in the future.

Soundwave stated that he would like to have some way of making FW important to the Empire factions that they are fighting for, and used a sports teams/fans metaphor. Hans stated that he would love it if High-sec taxes were related to how well a faction was doing, but admitted this would be extremely controversial.

Some of the ideas Soundwave is toying with:

- \* Turning High-sec Faction Navy responsibilities over to the players.
- \* Providing paths for players to progress from High-sec to Low-sec.
- \* Methods where faction success lead to High-sec effects.
- \* Connecting features together instead of making them standalone islands as they often currently are (this is a more global goal).

Hans noted that one barrier to doing things with this is sec status; FW players often go full-pirate, so they don't go into High-sec. He indicated that "Tags-4-Sec" would help with this.

Hans further noted that while turning Faction Navy enforcement over to players was interesting, he would like to see more growth in FW first. He admitted however that he was less concerned about such a change diluting FW density in Low-sec than in the past.

There was a brief discussion of possible consequences of this, such as Jita gate camping.

Hans cautioned that if you are in FW, there must always be a difference between being in friendly and hostile High-sec.

Alek suggested that instead of just having NPCs spawn, they should patrol from system to system.

Soundwave replied that he would prefer to reduce NPC control and increase player control.

Alek countered that if it was done right, players could bring big enough fleets and take on NPC faction navy patrols; alternately, a small well-timed group could evade the NPC patrols, forcing player militias to fill the gap in the defenses.

Fozzie noted that patrolling is not within the capabilities of the current NPC AI, but it might be a possibility for the future.

Soundwave wondered if there might be a way to create a home field advantage that encouraged FW players to live in their home space. Hans replied that system upgrades would be an obvious way to do this, and particular mentioned POS fuel costs.

Two step suggested upgrades that act as low-power ganglinks. Hans disagreed with providing PvP bonuses.

Soundwave stated that he would like to provide opportunities for action; he gave the example of removing Customs NPCs, but giving FW members the ability to scan for contraband and trigger flags if they were discovered. He would like to see 4 or 5 such activities available to FW players. He later noted that this kind of player enforcement activity didn't have to be FW-only.

Fozzie painted the picture of a drone that's a robotic drug-sniffing dog.

The meeting ended with a brief discussion of the logistics of producing the minutes.



## Bounty Hunting

Present: CCP Unifex, CCP Soundwave, CCP Ripley, CCP Tuxford, CCP Punkturis, CCP SoniClover, CCP Manifest, CCP Solomon, CCP Paradox CCP Tallest

Note: this session took place before the “EVE Online - The Next Decade” session.

Soundwave opened by asking what the CSM's initial impressions are of the bounty hunting feature. Seleene immediately asked for a bounty button in the forums. Solomon confirmed it's on the backlog based on earlier sessions with the CSM, but can't guarantee when it will get done. Hans prompted for some introductions because he did not recognize everyone in the room. Solomon introduced himself as the technical producer for Team Super Friends, Team Game of Drones, and Team Five-0 which gives him oversight on many of the main features for the Retribution expansion. More introductions were made.

Diving into the substance of the meeting, Solomon opened with metrics that the number of active characters with bounties has quadrupled (doubled when including all characters) and there is now 8 trillion ISK in the bounty system one week after deployment, an increase by a factor of 80. CCP is waiting till excitement from the deployment dies down to find the baseline but they are pleased with the response. Soundwave noted that despite the high volume of use, there hasn't been big “breakage” yet. The general feeling is “so far, so good”.

Alek (via Lync) noted that bounty hunting is in a pretty good place and only minor tweaks are needed, like a slight increase of the payout percentage, bounty button on the forums, and expanding the things that can be bounties to structures and regions. Meissa Anunthiel (via Lync) stated that the only complaint he hears is about notification spam from killing people with an alliance level bounty and asks if that can be moved to the wallet.

Elise confirmed bounties were a big hit, and some bounty hunting corps have been formed to see if that play style is viable in low-sec. Elise made the suggestion that bounty payouts restricted by standing would be a nice touch, so people can control who can claim their bounties. Team Super Friends stated that more granularity in who can claim bounties has been in their backlog but they wanted to release small, which Elise agreed made sense. Two step was skeptical of the staying power of the feature once the novelty wears off and related a story of how his own corp put a bounty on him on patch day just for fun.

SoniClover mentioned there are a vocal minority of players who role play as “good guys” that are angry they now get a “wanted” label on them and asked the CSM if this is an issue. Two step said that Wanted should carry a little more meaning than just having a 100k ISK bounty, perhaps requiring a threshold of some kind. He went on to say that a corp or alliance bounty shouldn't result in Wanted status for a particular pilot in that corp or alliance.

Trebor said that CCP should tell those complaining that “If you can't roleplay that, you just don't have much imagination”, since “evil” people have clearly put out a contract on their lives for interfering with their nefarious plans. Punkturis related that some people have asked for a different “wanted” sign depending on their security status, which Trebor elaborated on. Two step pointed out that the current Wanted tag is very prominent in your portrait and that outrage might be lessened if it wasn't as invasive. Alek typed in that the backlash is likely a holdover from when you could only place a bounty on someone with negative sec status, and that the social meaning behind bounties would catch up to the new feature.

Soundwave clarified that he doesn't mind people being bothered by it, because no EVE player has the right to be shut off from the rest of the world. He sees bounty hunting as something that's impacting players playing EVE as a single player game in a way nothing they tried before, and was glad they were interacting with the community whether negatively or positively. He suspected most people complaining were annoyed because they were not used to being able to be "poked" by other players.

Alek praised this statement: AMEN SOUNDWAVE!

Solomon wanted to explore the effect of this on new players, conveying that after release there was someone in the Help channel putting bounties on anyone who came in complaining about the Bounty feature, which included quite a few people who had only been playing for a few days. He asked the CSM if that's something CCP should be managing, since it does provide a window beyond the isolation a lot of new players say they experience for several days when they're starting. Elise said he'd feel like a bad ass if he got a bounty on his first day playing, while Two step pointed out that one potential problem would be new players not understanding what a bounty means and doesn't mean. He suggested that bounties be covered in the tutorial or that the first bounty notification you get include a link for more information about the feature. Meissa added that it would fit in with the "get killed" part of the tutorial. The goal would be to ensure they understand that having a bounty doesn't make them attackable in highsec, which Solomon confirmed was a point of confusion on the forums even for experienced players. Trebor offered the idea that bounties put on a character that's less than 30 days old cannot be claimed until the 30 day milestone, which seemed to get support as a reasonable way to address concerns about harassment.

Unifex said he'd like to see numbers on this once the novelty wears off before taking action, which Solomon echoed because for all they knew interaction with the bounty system could be converting trial accounts to paying customers. Soundwave agreed and pointed out that he wouldn't want to overly insulate new players from the harshness of EVE and then "throw them off the cliff". Ripley chimed in that she had asked for a report on this from Customer Support and so far the number of people that have petitioned that the bounty system is harassment has been 40. The general feeling from CCP is that if bounties are not causing people to leave the game then they aren't likely to put resources on to a problem that doesn't exist.

Hans asked if there was a way to put a reason on a bounty placement, i.e. "bad poster" to add a level of richness to the feature. CCP seemed wary of an open text field for this but something like a drop down or a limited field of one line might be possible. Issler Dainze (via Lync) indicated support for bounties on NPC corps. Trebor mentioned that CCP should allow bounties to be placed on CCP staff characters, for ISK sink and hilarity purposes. Alek supported this as long as CCP characters were filtered off the Most Wanted list. Solomon indicated this was not a high priority.

Two step asked if the bounty payout information on kill reports and the Most Wanted list could be accessible through the API. Solomon agreed and said that had only been cut due to time constraints. Trebor would like the CSM to get more information on things that get cut or pushed back so they could provide feedback (within 48 hours) on prioritization and other planning concerns. Alek reiterates that bounty hunting is in a good place so since an obvious shortcoming does not need to be addressed the CSM could play a strong role in prioritizing. Solomon indicated that was possible.

Two step moved the conversation on to some topics the players had mentioned. One was corps being able to place bounties from their corp wallets. The other major issue was kill right shedding through

shuttles and newbie ships. Soundwave agreed that kill right shedding was an issue. Elise put forward one solution that a kill right and bounty placement should be at the same time such that the price of activating the kill right acted as a floor for what ship you'd activate it on. Soundwave would like to tie kill rights to the value of whatever was destroyed that created that kill right so they were usable up to the cap on that value. Tuxford raised concerns of edge case complexity under that system.

Alek commented that this was being over-thought, and that disallowing newbie frigates and shuttles would solve most of the issues. Two step countered that shedding would just progress to the next cheapest frigate, and that some floor was needed. He went on to say that pilots shouldn't be able to have their kill rights activated by people in their own corp or alliance so they are forced to at least use a neutral alt. Kelduum agreed with Alek and pointed out that EVE University had developed in-alliance applications for kill rights. Trebor voiced support for a simplified version of Soundwave's idea where the kill right was only used up if something of equivalent value was destroyed or 30 days had passed.

SoniClover pointed out that kill rights have already been made more severe and that a change allowing kill rights to potentially be used for several kills would go against the original "eye for an eye" concept. He said out that suicide gankers are already feeling pressure with the new changes and was worried further penalties could result in an unhealthy reduction in suicide ganking. He went on to affirm that suicide ganking is needed to make sure highsec is not completely safe, which elicited a nod from Soundwave.

Two step then asked why kill right-related suspect flags did not go away after the player loses a ship. SoniClover points out that is a Crimewatch issue. Trebor offered a hybrid of the kill right and bounties system as a middle ground, which he went on to describe. Solomon stated he was wary of constantly adding complexity for edge cases, pointing out that it's difficult to explain to new players as it is and such an approach would result in the feature becoming unwieldy and difficult to patch. Solomon relayed that prior to Retribution, only 1% of kill rights were ever used, and that if Retribution got that number to 5-10% he'd consider that successful. Soundwave pointed out that such numbers do not distinguish between legitimate use and players activating their own kill rights to escape justice. He reiterated his position that the mechanic in its current form is "not good enough" but that a good solution was needed before they changed anything.

SoniClover offered the idea of removing the public option, so that kill rights could only be transferred to a specific entity. Hans pointed out that selectivity over who can claim bounties and kill rights is essential to the long term success of the feature and is the most demanded iteration he hears from players. He pointed out that there's some resentment that a kill right can be bought or a target engaged by a player trying to be a "bounty hunter" but someone else wind up getting the bounty during the following fight. Hans called the current system a passive reward for PvP like Faction Warfare has and that some options for selectivity are needed to make it a profession. Solomon did not want to add artificial special mechanics for people "deciding they wanted to be Boba Fett". Hans agreed and believed that a viable profession could be developed by adding options for who can claim a bounty when its placed or moving kill rights away from Suspect Flags. SoniClover said that part of the issue is bounty payout is tied to the final blow, but that changes could be made so that it's paid out by highest damage or some other metric.

Trebor suggested the action item for this should be to get some numbers on how often people were shedding their kill rights. Solomon asked if this was really going on, which Alek and Two step confirmed. Solomon asked if this was something players would continue to do, and Two step replied that they certainly would, given how detrimental they were to have and easy to remove they were. Alek strongly suggested removing the public option as a way to stop this and support a bounty hunting profession. Two

step agreed but pointed out that if a player can only limit them to one entity then a large bounty hunting alliance will emerge as the only viable group to give your kill rights to. Soundwave liked that the bounty hunting and kill rights features were broad and accessible but thought that standings were an interesting restriction to pursue. Alek clarified that kill rights were being discussed and that there really isn't a problem with public bounties.

This transitioned the conversation into private bounties as a future iteration for the Bounty System. Hans expressed support for private bounties, saying they would facilitate an active profession that would last beyond post-release excitement.

Soundwave responded by asking if the end result wouldn't basically be mercenary contracts?

Alek indicated that this would be the case and Two step asked if there would be any downsides to that.

Soundwave pointed out that it'd be trying to shove a new system into the bounty system that's already working and a better approach would be to just create a proper mercenary contract system instead. Soundwave agreed that a mercenary system would be a good thing to have but that it should be "pigeonholed" into another feature. Two step stated that it wasn't much of a stretch to make. Alek pointed out that the 20% payout of the bounty system would not motivate a lot of mercs and that giving players issuing the bounty a way to adjust that would be both needed and adding a lot of complexity. Alek went on to support an increase of public bounty payouts to 25% to support the formation of a bounty hunting profession. Two step agrees that it's a paltry amount compared to damage inflicted. Soundwave points out the low amount of payout is the reason that the feature is not being abused.

Alek and Soundwave had an exchange about the cost effectiveness of pursuing bounty targets at the current rates in different scenarios, including war decs and soloing in null-sec. Tuxford pointed out that their design accounted for bonused bounty payouts being as high as 30% for the Most Wanted. Two step asked why the rates were at 20% if they could be as high as 30% and not break the feature. Someone from Team Super Friends responded that they needed to keep it lower initially so they had room to scale it up as a reward. Trebor points out the percentage restriction would not be needed for private bounty contracts if they were to introduce them, making the restriction a special case of a broader PvP contract system. Alek asked why the baseline could not be moved up to 25% which could then scale to 30%. Soundwave was reluctant to do so because it would increase the likelihood of players abusing the payout system as they did in Faction Warfare earlier that year.

Hans reinforced the need for private bounties so that payout rate could be safely unlocked, a step needed for an active bounty hunting profession. SoniClover pointed out that the two systems did not have to be mutually exclusive, with private and public bounty pools interacting to create stronger incentives for particular groups without completely limiting to them. Trebor and Elise mentioned that private bounties to one's own alliance already goes on informally. Alek explained the current payout landscape for mercenaries in the current informal market, with the payout being 20-50%. Kelduum pointed out (via Lync) that he'd love to have bounties on his war targets with a 100% payout accessible only to EVE-University pilots to reward his players for going out and hunting the corps that try to harass the Uni. Seleene echoed the need for an in-game ISK incentive mechanic for organizations. Alek emphasizes that an automated system like that would cut down on a lot of administrative overhead. Two step noted that a CREST API would allow players to create their own solutions for this.

Ripley raised the issue that she was unclear on where the distinction between bounty hunting and mercenary contracts was in this discussion. Seleene said that a blurring of lines was inevitable because the professions themselves are conceptually related. Tuxford said that the private option would be the distinction. Hans said that conceptually a distinction is important but that because the bounty hunting system was "80-90% there" it would make sense for CCP to add private bounties as a next step unless they were willing to commit resources to a separate mercenary system. Soundwave felt that the feature was good now because everyone could participate in it, and questioned if sectioning it off so a small number of people could make use of profession-oriented features was "worth it". Seleene said that regardless of what you call it, an incentive system is needed.

Hans pointed out that some players may not be placing bounties that otherwise would because they want more control over who can claim it, so rather than lose people by segmenting the system it's possible that more players would participate in it. Hans said there would be more sustained interest in bounties in the long run if players had more options and control. To cap this discussion off, Solomon articulated that one definite takeaway from this meeting was the desire for players to have more control over who kill rights and bounties are available to.

Solomon moved the discussion on toward intelligence tools, reminding the CSM that many options for work around intelligence tools were discussed during the planning for bounty hunting but were cut due to time constraints. Green Lee raised the idea that bounty hunters could perhaps raise their standing with locators through claiming bounties to get advantages like faster response times. Alek said he would love to see locator agents entirely replaced by players. Solomon said one idea discussed was having stargates keep track of who goes through them and then this could be queried by players. UAxDEATH said that ran the risk of making it too easy to find players. Two step points out that the current intelligence gathering techniques of analyzing killboards and tracking forum posts allows players to gain an advantage depending on their level of skill and that not everything needs to be in the client.

Trebor floated the idea of chat channels organized for hunting a particular character which players trying to find that person could get invited to. Hans expressed the desire for tools that enable information transaction, which Alek supported. Tuxford said one idea CCP was working with was making locator agents very slow but also would generate an option for players near the target player to click to provide more timely information. Hans, Alek, and Greene Lee expressed the desire for players to be able to provide increasing levels of detail (for increasing reward) in their information such as if they were docked in the same station together, ship scanner results, or how frequently a player docks and undocks.

Soundwave said one roadblock to these features in the Retribution development was that the Bounty and Faction Warfare teams wound up having very different intel tool needs and concepts, but that Soundwave feels any intel tools should be "sandboxy" and applicable to all of EVE. He also addressed Two step's point about out of client intel by saying his view was that the deeper the integration with the client the better.

Soundwave stated that if it's an activity and it's not done in a spaceship in space where other people are, it's not good. He'd much rather have players go through belts or whatever and get shot by other players than not interacting with others.

Two step reminded the room that locator agents are used for more than bounties, and that one of their primary uses is tracking down wormhole residents. He pointed out that increasing the delay on intelligence tools would greatly increase the difficulty of snooping out wormhole chains and the public

popup in local would alert the targets, both of which take away interesting gameplay. Hans said he wouldn't support removing or nerfing locator agents without having a player-replacement. Alek clarified his earlier idea was more of an information exchange board where people could put up requests for information that players actively looking to trade information could sort through and fill. He likened it to bounties for information.

Solomon asked how this information was currently acquired. Two step relayed that alliances have people who specialize in data mining killboards and spy networks that would be difficult to formalize. Alek pointed out that aside from killboard research a lot of location tracking is done through putting the results of dozens of locator agents into a Google doc, whereas he'd like to see it put into EVE somehow. Kelduum suggested adding a "Report Location" option to kill rights.

With time winding down, Soundwave asked the CSM how they felt about bounties on structures (i.e. POSes, Customs Offices).

Alek confirmed that they still felt like it's a good idea. Kelduum concurred.

Kelduum clarified that a structure bounty should payout 100%. Someone mentioned players being able to conquer customs offices in highsec which elicited a lot of interest in the room, both CCP and CSM. Kelduum raised the issue of being able to place bounties anonymously at additional cost. Two step pointed out that 3rd party bounty services are already being created to deal with this. Alek pointed out that the current mechanic is driving more alts and alt corps when it could be a potential ISK sink. Two step agreed the Bounty System should be a stronger ISK sink than it is, with bounties just going away when players with bounties go inactive instead of being refunded. Alek cautioned against this since bounties on inactive characters were one of the reasons players did not have faith in the old bounty system. Trebor emphasized even more control should be placed on when a bounty expires and that they should be fully refunded if it does, and instead have some kind of upfront fee to place a bounty if a sink is desired.

Soundwave made the point that CCP is basically "selling" the bounty feature, and that means it needs to be reliable. Two step pointed out that a CREST-based solution could see players competing over pricing. Soundwave said one of the great things about the new Bounty feature was how many people were using it and he didn't want to put barriers up that didn't need to be there. Alek agreed with Soundwave and did not think there should be barriers to using it. He went on to say that many people did want an anonymous option and that it should be available if players were willing to pay a little extra to "keep their name off the books". The room was divided on if people should know who is placing bounties on them but seemed to agree there should be more options.

Two step re-raised the idea of being able to include a visible reason for placing a bounty. Trebor pointed out that if that's done there should be a way for players to pay to have that bounty removed, which Hans mentioned could also deal with people unhappy about having a Wanted sign on their picture. Solomon said CCP would have to keep an eye out for this in the future so that a situation doesn't develop where the vast majority of the game has a small bounty on them and the feature loses its impact. As the meeting closed, Alek reiterated CCP should "really really really really" consider raising the bounty payout to 25% of the destroyed value.

Two step asked the closing question: whether there was any gameplay objection to a bounty button on the forums; none was forthcoming.

## Mercenaries, Wars and Crimewatch

Present: CCP Solomon, CCP Masterplan, CCP Greyscale, CCP Tallest, CCP SoniClover, CCP Punkturis,

Note: this session took place before the “EVE Online - The Next Decade” session.

Solomon opened by explaining that the session would be split into two components, a presentation on upcoming crimewatch changes, followed by a review of the state of the wardec system.

Masterplan began discussing the crimewatch iterations first, explaining some tweaks currently under testing: AI behavior against player drones, and the safety setting persistence. Also under development is a Dueling mechanic, which would replace can-flipping: players would be able to challenge another to a duel, which would create a Limited Engagement between the two players; existing Crimewatch mechanics would then handle everything else. Masterplan added that duel invitations would be blockable to avoid spam, and that this mechanic would only be available in highsec and low-sec.

Masterplan then announced plans to decouple Security Status from CONCORD standing, which would be mostly an invisible change except for the way it would affect the Sanctum constellation, where CONCORD are the NPC police. Two step asked how this decoupling would take place, Masterplan explained that they likely would transfer current sec-status over and simply reset CONCORD standing to zero until the addition of CONCORD agents or another NPC system that would affect standings. All other mechanics that interact with CONCORD standing (except the NPC response in Sanctum obviously) would be switched to hook in to Security Status, which would go up and down in the same way.

Next, Masterplan began to describe “Tags4Secs”, which would possibly be part of a May release. This feature would allow players to hunt rats in low-sec belts and exchange the looted tags for a security status gain. These tags would be tradeable on the market, allowing players to buy their way out of trouble as well as provide a new profession in low-sec. These tags would ONLY drop in low-sec belts, and would be a new tag type on a special new NPC. The balancing goal will be for the activity of farming for tags in low-sec to take a comparable amount of time as farming for sec-status in null-sec belts, (in terms of the amount of time it'll take to go from -10 to -2.0). The tags would be exchangeable at particular stations using a station panel interface and would require an ISK fee along with the tag in order to gain security status.

Alek expressed concern about the frequency of spawns, Masterplan and Greyscale explained that these would likely appear about as frequently as hauler spawns do currently.

Hans praised the Tags4Secs design, explaining that this would be one of many sorely-needed reasons for players to live and play in low-sec, as collecting and trading these tags would essentially be a new profession.

Solomon: We've been discussing this feature in depth, and that's the prime directive, in my mind. People think it's so pirates can repair their security status, but I totally think it's to get more people into low-sec.

Hans took a moment to remind the team that the removal of the DED Level 1 and 2 static complexes in low-sec was a huge loss for the PvP community, and said this may have the potential to bring back some of these fights via increased belt traffic.

Masterplan continued by explaining that these tags would be traded at station services, and would each have a security status percentage gain similar to killing a rat, and would also require an ISK cost paid to Concord for each tag turned in, as an ISK sink. This would also set a minimum ISK cost associated with a given degree of security status change. Lastly, there would be a hard limit on how much your security status could be improved using the tag trade-in system.

Alek asked why the turn-in needed to take place at a Concord station. Greyscale explained that by forcing players to head to a low-sec Concord station, they eliminated the possibility of someone ganking in a high-sec belt system endlessly without consequence, simply by docking up and buying / spending more tags. Seleene asked about the lore reasons behind why a bad guy would be buying his freedom by trading in tags from other bad guys, to which Trebor explained that it would be much like “buying plenary indulgences”.

Trebor also added that the number of stations where these could be turned in should be minimized, to create some interesting chokepoints for additional piracy. Alek questioned whether this would just be avoided with Stealth Bombers, much like mission pickups were in low-sec. Hans countered that another one of the pirate community’s great frustrations were the changes to agent quality, which rendered space more homogenous and gave fewer reasons to hang out in a particular system. Alek responded that turning in a tag was not the same gameplay as running a mission, and didn’t support PvP as effectively.

Meissa took a moment to question whether the economic benefits in the Tags4Sec system would be greater than those found in null-sec, and Greyscale asked how many hours it currently takes to correct bad sec-status back up to null-sec, and Elise indicated that in a highly-organized group it could be blitzed back up in about 8 hours. Masterplan mentioned that this could be something that might be dilutable to a degree during the transition to low-sec, to which Alek insisted that the amount of time it takes to replace lost sec-status not be increased in any way.

Elise asked if there was anything that could be done now to lessen the sec-status penalty for criminal PvP while players wait for the Tags4Secs feature to be implemented in summer. Greyscale cautioned that the Tags4sec system was far more lenient towards suicide gankers, and so they had to be careful about lessening the penalties for low-sec piracy, which might buff suicide ganking to an unacceptable degree. Two step asked if the sec-status penalty size was perhaps scalable based on the system’s security status, an idea that Masterplan agreed might be a possibility.

Greyscale asked if there were any more Crimewatch related changes, Two step inquired as to whether it would be possible to add wormhole polarity timers to the small circle timers that were added as part of the Crimewatch UI. It was decided that this was more of a general UI question than one for the Crimewatch team. Two step then asked whether or not the auto-reject function for chat conversations and duels would be separate or combined settings, and it was clarified that these would be separate settings.

Elise asked the team whether they were happy with the current status of gate-camping in low-sec, and whether they were concerned about its increase since Crimewatch was revamped. Greyscale said they would be monitoring this situation, but there wasn’t cause for concern at this time. Elise praised the team’s speed at addressing many of the frustrations players had experienced since Retribution, such as drone aggro and the persistence of the Safety setting.



Alek then asked if it was possible to create “limited engagement kill rights”, as opposed to simply suspect flagging the perpetrator when activated. Masterplan explained that code-wise, this was no problem, and that it was a matter for the design team to solve. Fozzie explained that the major drawback is that bounty hunters could no longer have a fleet assist them in a kill, and that this was a significant enough drawback he wasn’t sure if limited engagements were a good mechanic for activating kill rights. Fozzie added that it would be more useful to add the option to only allow a kill right to be activated by a certain person or a certain group.

Hans: What people resent is the fact that they go to buy a kill right, that they own this kill right, and that once they activate it someone else can come along and kill the suspect and collect the bounty.

Solomon replied that the solution here was to simply not activate the kill right when someone else could get in on the kill. Two step countered that the most likely place to find and activate a kill right is on a busy gate or outside a station where there wasn’t any way to avoid others having the option to collect the bounty from the mark you were hunting. Two step suggested that if a kill right was activated the money from the bounty at least go to the individual who activated the kill right regardless of who got the final blow on the kill. Solomon explained that they had another session to discuss kill rights and that he didn’t want to be bogged down in that discussion at this time.

Transitioning into a discussion of Wardecs, SoniClover began to explain the various changes in his backlog at the time. The first would be that upon surrender, the two entities involved would not be able to declare war on each other again for a two week period. SoniClover added that they were not going to chase every single loophole and special case, but that the goal was to make the surrender option a little more useful and attractive. Two step made two suggestions; that this time period should be extended somewhat (to which Kelduum agreed) and also that the surrendering party should be allowed to declare war in return during this cooldown period, even if it prevented the original attacking corp from repeatedly declaring war on them. This would essentially enable a revenge scenario, and the possibility for a wardec victim to go recruit some help and get involved in the war again. SoniClover pointed out that all these timers and variables were on the table for adjustment.

Next, SoniClover stated that he wanted to look into the parties involved with war management: the party declaring the war, the party paying the bill, and the party negotiating surrender. SoniClover noted that currently it was difficult even for GM’s to resolve petitions as it was so unclear as to who participated in which fashion to facilitate a wardec.

SoniClover continued by describing his interest in reducing the warm-up time before allies could be involved in a war to 12 hours, to make this a more valuable option for those that need to defend a POS (which he agreed wasn’t really possible under the current system). Two step and Kelduum both stated that it should be reduced even further as 12 hours was still a long time to wait when you are under attack and your tower is in reinforcement. SoniClover explained that sufficient time was necessary for the various server nodes to properly synchronize.

SoniClover then described another change he wanted to make to the ally system; adjusting the war report information to give a more clear breakdown of the exact contribution by each allied party, so corporations and alliances can keep track of each other’s worth in the context of the war. This would also allow each corp to maintain a record of how useful it has been as an ally to other wars, with greater success indicating they were worth investing in as allies.

Alek took this opportunity to explain that the current state of the war report history was essentially useless, cluttered with vast amounts of junk records left over from the Dec Shield debacle that affected almost everyone using the war feature since Inferno. Alek cautioned that any war report work must be accompanied by some tools to allow players to clean up the histories from these junk wars that never led to any real conflict or loss.

Alek: Even something simple like the option to filter wars by at least one kill, and to only have those display, would be incredibly valuable to bringing those reports back into relevancy.

SoniClover responded that there were a few user stories on their backlog with regard to war reports, the first being that active wars would be at the top of the list.

Alek emphasized again the need for filtering out junk wars, pointing out that almost everyone involved in a war in the last year was trapped by the Dec Shield at the moment and were suffering floods of daily refreshed wars that never actually led to any fighting.

Alek: Forget about active wars, we can't even find the last real war that we actually declared on somebody.

Two step made the suggestion of being able to "favorite" wars in the list. Punkturis indicated there was more work on the way in terms of war report sorting tools.

Alek took a moment to warn SoniClover once again that with (bad) state wardecs were in at the moment, they needed to be given development priority over anything else the team could be working on.

The issue was then raised of Bounty Hunting being prioritized over completion of the Wardec overhaul, but it was quickly decided that this was a management decision above the developers control, and not worth hashing out in detail during this session.

Kelduum suggested that the ally system be reworked to include a negative bounty-like payout system, as opposed to paying a corporation upfront for their contribution (or lack thereof.) SoniClover indicated that this would be certainly possible as a byproduct of reworking bounties to be able to set who can claim a bounty. Alek asked if some attention could be paid to the notifications that surround various changes in the wardec system, noting that most of them had not been updated to reflect the most current set of war conditions and rules. Hans added that if CCP Arrow was still planning on building a notification tool to house notifications, it only made sense for wardec stuff to end up here as well and just have one unified interface for all types of notifications.

Two step asked the team if they felt they'd accomplished all that they had set out to accomplish in overhauling the wardec system, as it appeared to him there appeared to be just as much random wardecceing and grief wardecceing as there was before the overhaul. Solomon joked that it would be so much easier to just remove the wardec system completely, to much laughter of the CSM. Then, more seriously, Solomon explained that the designers had been back and forth discussing this question, and that the general idea has always been to develop a toolset where two entities could participate in mutual combat even in highsec space.

Trebor: There is the important word you just said – *mutual* conflict. Just as you can have a mutual engagement between two players, you should be able to have a mutual engagement between two

groups. But the current system, it's a cursed mechanic, because most of the people who get involved want absolutely nothing to do with it.

Solomon noted that they were looking specifically into cases where one corp wardec'd another corp, and no losses occurred. Usually this means that a larger more powerful entity has wardec'd a smaller entity that wants nothing to do with the conflict and therefore does everything in its power to avoid being caught or killed. Solomon wagered that this was the case in 70-80% of wars.

Solomon: The strong prey on the weak, but the weak aren't responding, and nobody's getting particularly fun or nourishing gameplay out of this. Is that a failure?

Alek countered that this more often happened in the reverse – a smaller, say 5-man corp, will wardec a larger 50-man entity, who will just dock up and refuse to fight. Alek pointed out this has little to do with strength or capability, but simply willingness to engage in PvP.

Alek: As Stoffer [Soundwave] said earlier, you should not be able to play EVE in your own little world and not be affected by other players.

Alek explained that he has no problem with such a small group paying the price to be able to fight a larger group, and if the larger group refuses to participate, that's a decision they make for themselves. Meissa countered that Solomon was correct, most high-sec wardecs simply weren't being fought out. Meissa likened this to simply paying other players to stay docked up.

Kelduum agreed with Meissa, saying that everyone once in a while, a group will wardec EVE Uni that actually wants to fight, but once the EVE Uni fleet wipes them out, they just want to stay docked up, and it's no fun for either party.

Alek: But why do you care? You won! Why does it matter that they couldn't beat you, they fought, you kicked their ass, and that's EVE for you.

Trebor pointed out that this was a great example of a truly mutual war, where both parties wanted to fight and both parties actually participated in a fight.

Trebor: But as you said, 78% of wars are a bunch of people who basically want to grief a corp, a lot of times industrial corps, or corps that may be PvP corps, but they're not PvP corps in high-sec. They just use highsec for their logistics. Okay, so they get wardec'd, and what happens. It just interrupts their regular game play, it's a grieving mechanic.

Alek: God forbid you actually defend your high-sec logistics. Wow. That's soooo crazy.

Kelduum: Why would you put your high-sec logistics into your own corp anyways? Why are they not in an NPC corp? Why would you put logistics in a player corp? That's a stupid place to put them.

Solomon: Don't shut this conversation down, this is a good debate.

Fozzie: A wardec where only one side wants to be in it isn't any less legitimate than a bounty that only one side wants. We're not going to go to anyone and ask them if they'd like to accept the bounty placed on them.

Solomon: But at least with the bounty system, Concord is still there to protect you. In the wardec system, it's not.

SoniClover: The key thing here is that there is a legitimate reason to have a wardec system and that is to allow people to engage in a lethal fight in highsec. And that is important because it should be that the higher economic impact that you are having, the higher the chance that other people will be interacting with what you are doing. You should never be able to have a huge economic impact on the game and become completely immune by the game mechanics, to be completely safe from others.

Trebor: But you're not immune.

Meissa: You can always be out marketed, you can always be suicide ganked...

Alek: Meissa and Trebor – are you guys really saying that you would like to see suicide ganking as the only form of PvP in high-sec?

Hans: If I could jump in here... One of the values of high-sec warfare is that it's one of the few places where you can engage in PvP and control the size of an engagement to a certain degree. If you go out in null-sec, anyone can show up and hot-drop you any time. You go out to low-sec, you still have zero control over how many people show up. If you're engaging in PvP in highsec, you are then limited by the other people that are involved in that war, other than suicide gankers. There's a culture of players that really enjoy high-sec PvP and enjoy the fact that they can fight someone knowing that there's not going to be 27 other entities in that engagement. And to me, that's another value of the wardec system that needs to be preserved. I do not think that suicide ganking should be the only form of PvP in high-sec.

Solomon: Should it be limited to each party's ability to engage and fight, though? I mean that's what we're trying to zero in on: that consensual, high-sec engagement where its mutual, and both sides have the ability to participate and cause losses and cause damage, that's the kind of thing we want to be moving towards and encouraging.

Seleene: Wait a minute. Something just went off in my head here. You're literally advocating that the days of 'I am pissed off at these people and I don't care if they agree that I'm pissed off at them, I'm going to wardec them and rip their shit apart'. Is that what you're trying to get away from?

Solomon: I'm just stimulating conversation here. If we're going to balance the system, you need to understand what the primary goal is that you're trying to satisfy. And is that you want mutual high-sec engagements, or do I want a situation where one side is the complete aggressor, where the strong preys on the weak, and [the] weak [huddle in stations].

Tallest: The wardec system is about formalizing the aggression. Even though it's not consensual, and they don't want to fight you, you're still formalizing it and throwing the glove down saying 'we are going to attack you' The others can maybe get allies, or maybe pay to surrender, but this is about formalizing the act.

SoniClover: Maybe the solution is in giving players more choices in how to set up the risk they are putting themselves into. Right now you have two choices, you can be in an NPC corp, with taxes and lack of social identity, but it gives you immunity from wardecs. Or maybe you can form player corporations with all the economic advantages, and social interaction, but there's nothing in between. There are no other choices. Maybe I want to form a group with my friends, and enjoy that social interaction, but not be able to be eaten by every shark out there.

Hans: But that's what EVE is. Being eaten by every other shark out there.

Two step: The issue is that the sharks don't have real risk. If I'm wardeccing 5 man mission corps, and let's say they're the best 5 man mission corp in all the world, and they're really good and kick my ass, all I have to do is let the wardec lapse.

Alek: That's the same amount of risk that a weak corp has. If a strong guy attacks me, I can just avoid them. It goes both ways.

Two step: As an attacker, if I didn't do my research properly, maybe I chose the wrong guys, maybe they were actually secretly setting up a trap for me, if I wardec those people, I should pay.

Alek: The trap is that you lose ships.

Seleene took a moment to reiterate once again that this middle ground between the safety bubble of the NPC corp, and the rest of the hostile world, didn't make any sense. Seleene emphasized that there should be a clear choice between the two.

Hans: Sitting in a station and not undocking is a player choice. You're not locked into that. You can do anything you want.

Alek pointed out that the conversation should be about giving players more reasons to undock to begin with. Two step suggested that a collateral-based reward system for wars might give smaller groups an incentive to fight back.

Trebor: Realistically, in the context of the game, that shit just does not happen. 90% of the time, the corp that gets wardec'd just turtles up because they have absolutely no choice. They're outgunned and outmatched. Look at the wardec system, with all of the exceptions, and the rules for adding allies, and timers, and all that crap. What does that remind you of? What system that everybody agreed was awful did you just rip out of the game and radically simplify?

Tallest : What if instead of declaring war on you, they just didn't tell you and started suicide ganking you.

Trebor: At least then they lose their ships. In the case of a suicide gank, they lose their ships and they lose sec-status. There is a cost to them. If they declare war on you, and except for the ISK cost, they don't lose their ships and they don't lose their sec-status. There's no risk.

Alek: There's no risk except for the risk that they could engage in PvP. A risk that they could lose that fight.

Trebor: But they don't fight.

Alek: Why do you think 90% of the time the defender always loses?

Trebor: Because they're very good at picking on the weak, and they do.

Seleene: I understand where Trebor is coming from, but I don't want to run the risk of over-legislating this.

SoniClover: And it seems that some are clamoring a lot for the game system to protect them. And we're trying to minimize that as much as possible. EVE is never going to give you complete game system security. And we're never going to go that route.

Meissa: You're talking about being able to own POS's as one of the advantages to being in a player corp. How many of these corps that are deced have POS's. If its 10%, I'll buy you lots of things. But it's not that. The vast majority of the groups are small. They're poor.

Seleene: Well then maybe they need to get more friends and they need to learn to defend themselves better in a PvP game.

And with that, CCP Xhagen declared the session closed.

## EVE UI

Present: CCP Arrow, CCP Sharq, CCP Punkturis, CCP Optimal

Arrow welcomed the CSM to the EVE UI session, clarifying that it is the “User Interface”, not “Unified Inventory”. Arrow explained that one of the tasks they are currently working on is a ‘Style Guide’, a tool to ensure the UI is consistent across the client, which will also help teams work together better as well as be a repository for UI design guidelines and standards, and a training resource for new members.

Arrow then showed the CSM an internal wiki page which explained a number of different internal UI guidelines, the “Style Guide”. Also shown was a factional color palette (matching the existing factional color scheme in EVE) which is the basis for all factional UI elements, and has been approved by the Art team.

Next was a basic list of colors used in-game, and what they are used for. Also shown are how these colors appear to players with the two major types of color-blindness.

Also shown were a series of monochromatic revamped UI icons (some already seen in the new factional warfare and war declaration UIs), which are intentionally very different from in-game items, which are much more detailed and colored.

In order to better understand how players are using the UI, CCP is now tracking settings used by players, including graphical and user-interface settings, such as “off/on/default”. As an example, Arrow produced a quick graph report showing the obscure “Snap Distance” UI setting (the distance a window will “snap” to an edge when dragging windows). Several of the CSM were not sure that this existed, or where it was located, backed up by the statistic shown stating that over 96% of players have not changed the setting.

Arrow then went on to show a UI Settings Metrics screenshot with pie charts for each setting, and explained that many of the settings are far too advanced (so may be hidden by default), as they are never changed by the players, or changed and then changed back.

Kelduum then jokingly asked “Is there actually a metric that tells if anyone ever uses the jukebox?”. However, Sharq stated that collecting metrics of how much specific windows are getting used is planned to be added in the near future.

Arrow clarified that this is only client settings for now. Two step and Elise asked whether this may result in CCP changing the defaults, to what the majority of players change something to, such as “Auto Target Back”. Arrow then had a look through the spreadsheet to locate Auto Target Back but could not locate it (it was later confirmed that this metric was not being tracked, but would be added soon).

Arrow gave another example of the metrics; how the Unified Inventory is used with the “Always Show Full Inventory Tree” option. Sharq pointed out that the metrics show that in this case the majority of players leave the settings on its default (off), some have turned the option on, and some have then later turned it off again, allowing CCP to see if people ‘like’ a setting or not.

Kelduum jokingly pointed out another statistic on the screen, “that 18% of people have audio disabled: ‘EVE has sound?’. Two step asked if this also shows people who have turned the volume down to 0%,

and Kelduum pointed out that disabling the music was historically best done by just turning the volume to 0%.

Arrow went into more detail about how they want to add more detailed metrics in the future - how long a window is open, how much a particular feature such as listening to the jukebox is used, and so on, and mentioned that this should then be able to be used by more teams before changes are made, however in the case of the jukebox there is no setting to turn it off or on, so no setting that would be tracked at present.

Going back to color-blindness in the Style Guide, Trebor asked if there was any thought given to putting in a filter into the client which would remap the UI color schemes for color-blind users, as it would be a win for the community of color-blind players, as well as freeing CCP up to work on the UI without having to take color-blindness into consideration. Arrow replied that there would have to be some research done to determine if the work would be worth the time spent. Optimal mentioned that there has been some discussion about this in the past, but it has not been successfully done in other software. Trebor mentioned this is something that is often asked about by the players.

Hans pointed out that the more elegant solution would be for the UI to be designed universally in respect to color-blindness, rather than having to work with settings, simply use color in such a way that avoids the problem. Trebor pointed out that there are multiple forms of color-blindness, one of which is Red/Green, which are important colors for the rest of the population.

Punkturis mentioned that they don't only use colors - using icons or other elements is typical. Hans responded that this is what he was getting at - designing the UI so that it isn't reliant on color. Arrow confirmed that the usage of color is covered in the Style Guide, and that color should be used as a secondary emphasis, with the main emphasis being something else (shapes, icons, etc.). For example in the Unified Inventory, the access restriction UI shows different icons, not just the same icon in different colors.

Trebor pointed out that "Color is a low level indication of state. You don't have to parse the shape of the icon, you don't have to read the text. That's the reason why traffic lights are not just a white light with text... Someone who has normal color vision will notice something red and focus on it, where as someone who is color blind is at a significant disadvantage". Hans then pointed out that a traffic light is 3 separate lights, and therefore positioning is important independent of color. Trebor responded that there is more than a single 'traffic light' to watch in EVE, and requested that CCP are mindful of this, and Arrow confirmed that they do take this into account.

Arrow continued and said that the EVE UI Team and the UI designers have been focusing greatly on catering to accessibility of the UI in EVE in the last two years. Their research has shown that giving players a way to remap what colors are used for what is a nice feature in general, but the solution to the Color-blindness problem can never be related to colors, in order to make the UI more readable and accessible for Color-blind users, what is needed is to make color less of a key aspect of recognition and feedback.

Arrow: People with color-blindness have a much smaller spectrum available to them, so they might not have the same amount of colors to choose from as normal users so they can't simply remap colors to something else. For this reason we have been moving more into the direction of making primary gestures and feedback be color independent and using color only for second level emphasis.



Going back to the metrics, Arrow displayed stats that showed that less than 22% of players use the Captains Quarters over the Hangar view in stations, and that almost 12% of players have the "Ships And Items" docked into the Station Services panel.

Kelduum asked that as these are being sent to the server at present, is there was the possibility these settings could be stored server-side rather than on the client on an account or character basis. Arrow replied that they are always trying to move things over to the server.

Two step asked about a discrepancy in some of the numbers (some have more samples than others). This was explained as one of the settings are tracked when they are changed (CQ vs. hangar view), whereas some are tracked on logout (with most settings).

Arrow showed metrics about the Unified Inventory and how much filters, the inventory tree, quick filters and so on are being used. Two step asked if they have looked at how "discoverable" these settings are, as settings are in multiple locations. CCP responded that is a good point, and would be worth tracking how many people have opened the relevant setting window.

Punkturis mentioned that she thinks these numbers should be used to clean up the settings in the Escape menu, as it is hard to find settings which you do want in amongst the ones you never change. Two step suggested having an "advanced" setting window which was hidden away. Arrow mentioned that he feels it's better to have settings which affect the whole client separate from the specific options.

Arrow then showed the metrics for the session timer (less than 20% of users have it enabled). Two step mentioned that the 80% of users who aren't turning it on are probably not aware that they can turn it on. Kelduum and Alek both confirmed that new players don't know about this.

Next shown was the metric for the size of the Station Services buttons. Under 13% of players have these set to "small" other than the default "large", but less than 1.5% of players change it back again, suggesting that those that do change the setting prefer it that way. Arrow the stated that if they do change them, they should simply have them small by default.

Kelduum asked about a 'windowed' metric displayed, and if there was a metric for 'Fixed Window' versus simply 'Full Screen' and 'Windowed', and CCP was not sure if that was being tracked.

Arrow then moved on to the next presentation slide, which concerned the near future. Another one of their projects for next year is to help answer questions for users, specifically "What should I do now?". The first part of this is with information on the players Location via "Info Panels" (Such as system info, autopilot route, missions, Incursion info and FW info) and they plan to making them more visually and functionally consistent for the February release. Another part is "Progression", with a "Ship Tree", showing a progression path for different ships. Finally, they will be looking at improving the Star Map.

Arrow then showed some concept graphics of the info panels, showing them as small icons in a compact, 'folded up' state below the new timer icons introduced in Retribution. He then showed concept art of a selection of panels 'unfolded', complete with relevant tidying up to make them visually consistent. Next he showed a single-line 'compact' view. he then explained that even in the 'folded up' view, hovering the mouse over the icons will display the full panel allowing players to interact with them.

CCP is also excited about moving settings for things such as the autopilot into the info panels, so changing autopilot settings, adjusting a route and so on would not require you to go into the map.

Another planned change is to adjust the Incursion and Factional Warfare info panels to follow the new style guide, without changing the functionality. Also planned is to split the "Incursions" tab in the journal into a separate window and Neocom icon.

Also to be added is a new "Notifications" panel, which will replace the EVEmail 'Pop-up' when receiving an EVEmail, Notification, Contact Sign on/off, as well as EVE cluster shutdowns and other information. What CCP wants to do is to make one system for all of these events where a player can define what they get notified about and how. The CSM were quite positive about this.

Two step asked if the plan was to totally replace the notification tab in EVEmail. Arrow responded that the first step would be to provide better access to the existing system. The next step, later on, would then be to update the notification system and remove it from the EVEmail, and place it in its own window.

Two step then asked some questions about how notifications would be marked as "read", would they simply be based on have they been displayed, or would they need to be acknowledged. Arrow responded that it would only show the most recent few from each category.

Kelduum then gave an extreme example of the how the notifications are at present, as there can be many hundred "X has applied to your corporation" notices when logging in, which should ideally be split from the normal corporation votes and similar notices which can be more important. Arrow then showed a list of the notification categories, which they are looking into splitting down into finer groups, for example Factional Warfare should be its own group, and Corporation notices should be split into groups for people running the corporation, and those who are simply members.

Two step asked if these would then be able to be hidden or suppressed; for example he does not want to know about a POS running out of fuel, but would want to know about it being attacked. Arrow responded that the idea is to be able to set each of the categories individually, and define how to be notified about them. Hans asked that these settings (as there are so many, including the overview) all be exportable and shareable in some way - drag and dropping like a ship fitting into a channel or mail.

Alek pointed out that there is no notification generated for when a structure is put into reinforced mode, which should also list the time it comes out of reinforced, again being draggable, and this should apply to all structures, such as POSs, IHUBs and Stations.

Kelduum also mentioned the session change timer, and if there is a reason it's not displayed like the other new timers added in Retribution. Arrow responded that the initial idea was that it wasn't tied to gameplay (fiction) in the same way and the crimewatch timers were very focused, but he spoke to one of the game designers, who said it could be something like the camera drones onlining. Kelduum suggested "synchronizing with fluid routers" as a lore reason.

Two step also requested wormhole polarity timers (which prevent you from jumping through a wormhole too often), noting that these would probably not fit with the crimewatch timers as you can have more than one of them. Kelduum suggested it may be something which would need to be added to the wormhole itself in-space similar to a reinforcement/onlining timer.

Arrow then showed the CSM a 'navigation' info panel, listing the celestial items normally shown on the right-click menu. This appears when clicking the icon next to the system name, which Two step pointed out that is what is dragged into chat to show the players location. Arrow mentioned players will still be able to do that.

Kelduum asked if this would be something that you can interact with directly as it is in the overview, which Arrow confirmed you will be able to. Two step questioned the ordering of the items in the list (Belts, Planets, Gates, Stations). Hans mentioned he liked this as this is what he has a whole tab of the overview for, which then frees up an overview tab, but asked if this would be static points, or would it include things like factional warfare complexes, and Two step asked about bookmarks. Arrow said that everything that is in the right-click menu would be in this info panel. Alek also asked if it could be highlighted in some way when these items were in-range of a players' directional scanner. A short discussion was then had about how the UI would operate - would it be possible to reorder items, for example; Arrow liked the idea.

Kelduum pointed out with so much information on the screen that way, there may be cases when there is simply too much to display on a low-resolution screen in a system with many celestials, especially when the left side of the screen is typically used for chat channels. It was pointed out that these can all be folded up to save vertical space, so this should not be as much of a problem. Arrow then showed an example of how the notifications for folded-up panels would work.

Arrow then moved on to the "Ship Tree UI". This would be a tree of different ship types for each faction, showing a progression of ship types, similar to other MMOs and games with a "tech tree". Arrow then showed a mockup of, noting that nothing specific has yet been decided.

Trebor asked if this was going to be an ingame part of the UI, Arrow stated that this is a separate screen, the same way the map is shown, and Trebor asked why it was being done in the client, rather than on the web. After a bit of discussion, CCP mentioned that this may also be on the web as well as in the client. Arrow then went through some brainstorm information they have done on the subject, with the idea being that a player can see what each ship class does, what its bonuses are, and add the relevant skills to the skill queue.

Seleene asked if the EVEMon model was what CCP are aiming for (select ship, get training plan). Trebor pointed out that the skill queue is only 24 hours, so that would not work without something like EVEMon. Trebor went on to point out that this concept had been mentioned to the CSM previously, and that the CSM feels that it would be something better provided on the web where it could then be used to explain the depth of the game to prospective players.

There was then a discussion involving Arrow, Hans and Two step concerning how this is needed, as it doesn't translate well from other games, but is a usability feature, and is therefore important. Arrow then went over a few things like navigation methods, filtering by various methods, hull types, usage stats, module sizes and so on. Two step suggested being able to filter by "ships I can fly in a week" based on current skills. Arrow then mentioned player-added 'tags' for ships. Two step immediately pointed out this would need to be moderated.

Greene Lee closed the meeting by asking about the Drone UI and if there was any progress on the "Drones as modules" concept art shown at FanFest. Arrow mentioned that it is fairly complex as there are different drones with different purposes, but Two step asked for just a way to be able to attack/recall them with a button.

## Live Events

Present: CCP Goliath, CCP Falcon, CCP Manifest, CCP Gargant, CCP Eterne

Goliath opened by talking about how things had changed since the last summit, stating that approximately two months after the Spring Summit there was a reorganization that increased the official size of the Live Events team, known internally as Team Illuminati. Originally it was just Goliath and CCP Affinity, but now consists of approximately 9 people. The team is dedicated to the actual work of Live Events, and there is a company mailing list dedicated to casting “extra” roles in said events.

A big part of what the team wants to accomplish is to ensure a consistent and continuing theme with various events taking place. Seleene surmised that part of the overall theme is “murdering players” which was universally agreed upon, but “context is important”. Most of the actual events have started within the last three months. For the initial pirate incursions, using several different factions, the team has usually ~~has~~ had 6-10 dev volunteers / actors involved. They want to try to make these events bigger over time, but right now they are focused on doing things right and getting their feet wet. Response to these events has ranged anywhere from 50-200 players responding or getting involved. Smack talk, fleet chat and private chat channels, and interaction in local chat (in character) from the devs is common and encouraged.

Seleene asked if these events were making the news and what steps the team has taken to get the word out. Falcon stated that there are regular news articles and alerts being posted and that the team also has a Twitter feed. Hans pointed out that he’s been following the Twitter feed for a while now and it was well done. Falcon then started detailing some of the events the team has been running and noted that this effort is not limited to just in game actions. Some events have been triggered and new storylines opened up due to interactions on the forums with players. As Alek summed up, “Events emerging out of events is incredible and exciting”.

The goal is to try to make the entire process as emergent as possible and move away from just pure combat events as well. This includes things like escort missions for high profile NPCs (played by devs and attacked by other devs) and massive resource gathering or relief efforts on behalf of a particular NPC faction. To date, over 1.5 million cubic meters of trade goods have been traded over to event actors.

Seleene asked what kind of tools the team has for controlling multiple ships if needed for larger scale events. Falcon stated that they haven’t used the tools much because the size of the events they are running so far have been scaled to what human resources they have had available to them. He added that response from within CCP has been excellent and they are usually able to find a few extra people to help with the events. Goliath said that they “do have tools but they are not maintained” and that it was a big problem with NPC involvement. They can spawn NPCs but cannot control their actions very well. The old live events team had tools that would allow them to exercise more control over the NPCs (like how a player controls drones) but “the guy that made that tool is no longer around” and they don’t have any programmers on their team to get that fixed. It is, however, a priority to get these tools updated.

A big part of what Team Illuminati is doing is trying to get ‘buy in’ from within the company, which has been going well, in order to get resources to expand their capabilities so they can scale up the size of events. Part of that is getting people in the Atlanta office to help run events in the US time zone. Falcon indicated that he doesn’t sleep much and has run some events very late at night. The other devs chimed

in that this has happened quite a few times with them as well and that CCP has been very accommodating by letting the team members adjust their working hours to facilitate the process.

Seleene asked, in terms of resources, what exactly was the team missing in order to be able to 'live the dream'. Goliath responded by saying they need one good server programmer that understands the current dev tools and to help improve them. This wouldn't be something the team needs permanently, "just a couple of sprints, nothing major at all" and they would have everything they needed to run things well for "a few years". Goliath added that the team has already been directed to put together a 'wish list' for the coming year which is a big step forward in terms of their efforts being recognized by CCP. The more noise the CSM and community could make about how much they enjoyed all of this, the better.

Falcon emphasized that Team Illuminati is also focused on following posted, in-game news items and following up on them as quickly as possible by creating events in the game to enhance the level of player immersion. He said that the team "has the destructive nature of the players on our side" and that helps even small events escalate rather quickly.

Goliath made a point of stating that everything the team does is meticulously logged. All of the event accounts (roughly 30) were created by Internal Affairs so the possibility for abuse on the CCP end is high impossible.

Alek raised the question about what are the rules concerning how the events team engages players and how that ties in with current NPC events like Incursions. Seleene asked for clarification on why a fleet of Sansha Incursion Nightmares doesn't just camp Jita 4-4 one afternoon.

Two step wanted to make sure, "You don't shoot at random people, right?"

Goliath: Well it depends on who we are playing, not who we are playing against.

Two step: So in high sec, you'll shoot at people randomly?

Falcon: Well, it's all driven by the storyline. If we are role playing as the Caldari Navy, we aren't going to randomly shoot at people. But if we are role playing as the Serpents, fuck yeah, we're going to shoot everything we can!

Eterne: Well, in high sec we wouldn't because we are still subject to the CONCORD rules.

Alek wanted to know if it was possible to essentially have NPC's that were already involved in an Incursion to step up their murderous behavior in parallel to a storyline. Goliath stated that currently it wasn't possible and it would require a dev to literally be cloaked near the NPCs in order to stop them from constantly re-spawning and killing people over and over and over. It would also create a problem of players finding out about these 'special' NPCs and immediately trying to farm them for loot.

This did lead to Goliath stating that the Content part of the team is planning to author several specific NPC types (Officers, etc...) for use in Events that would not have tons of loot on them so that they could use certain types of named NPCs more liberally.

Two step once again raised the concern about these special NPC's shooting random players in high-sec. "I don't care but if I was moving my freighter around in high-sec, the expectation is one thing and if you guys are changing the rules..".

Falcon: You should never have that expectation! [Lots of general agreement around the table]

Two step raised the point that the difference is that if someone is a suicide ganker, they get punished by CONCORD; what punishment do these NPC's get if something like this is done? This point was seen as a valid one by CCP but that it didn't detract from the fact that NPC's have always 'bothered' players when they weren't necessarily wanted.

Hans: When you go and mine, NPC's attack you when you mine in High-sec.

Two step: But they don't attack my freighter. Right now there is an expectation that if you...

Seleene: Two step has lots of AFK freighters is what I'm hearing...

Two step reiterated that his issue was that players expect to have to deal with suicide gankers and that's part of the risk you take from dealing with other players; having to worry about NPC's behaving similarly was 'changing the game'. The discussion continued with Falcon responding anything that involved NPC's shooting people 'randomly' would involve them being part of a larger event which the Team Illuminati actors would have control over. In that context, it's entirely possible that 'random' people might be shot if they strayed into an active event area.

Two step raised the point that if you are a player that pays no attention to these kind of events and you are used to being able to auto-pilot your freighter or officer-fit mission Raven across high-sec due to old game design decisions that the Events team shouldn't be able to override that. Falcon responded, "Anyone that autopilots their officer fit Raven across high-sec deserves everything they get". This set off a chorus of agreement. Alek said, "Maybe that's a great way to introduce players to these events!"

Seleene stated that "There is a borderline between protecting ignorance and being ignorant. This is EVE and nowhere is ever safe".

The discussion about suicide ganking versus NPC's doing the ganking continued until Alek asked, "Two step, why do you hate fun?"

After the laughter finally abated, Seleene asked, "I want to know when the Sleepers are going to try to find out what's on the other side of the wormholes and poke around in low-sec?" Two step wanted to know when he would get to gank Sanshas passing through wormhole space on their way to an Incursion. Falcon replied that such things are certainly things they would enjoy experimenting with, but for the foreseeable future everything would center around the larger or emergent storylines Team Illuminati is developing.

Falcon then detailed a few specific storylines, giving examples of how they began and how player actions have determined everything from if that storyline continued to how much it intensified. He emphasized that the primary goal is to just "roll with it" when players get involved and do everything possible to make the experience truly emergent.

Elise said, "I just find all of this stuff amazing. I'm not big into the role play but I really enjoy the story. But there's no real way for someone like me to get involved". Gargant stated that it's certainly something they are aware of and eventually want to scale things up to where players of all levels can feel involved in some aspect of EVE's storyline. Falcon explained that some player corps have, as a result of the live events, declared loyalty to certain factions in the game and will be notified when something is going to happen in the future involving that faction. Goliath said, "It's pretty much a guarantee that during most live events there will be some kind of fight". Elise brought it back to the forum interaction aspect and, "I love the fact that I could influence the story of EVE just by posting wildly".

The discussion then turned to how the events are 'scripted'. Falcon explained that while there is a lot of preparation, the events themselves are largely dynamic and are not pre-ordained to end in a certain way. Eterne explained that there are a few specific Team Illuminati members that tend to have all of the 'speaking roles' when it comes to interacting with players.

Hans made the comment that this has to be one of the most fun jobs in the company, which everyone laughed about and agreed with. Falcon made the point that this whole project is also tightly intertwined with the Community team and that it was only going to get bigger over time. Elise agreed that, "The effect this has on the community is huge".

Falcon said that another thing they have done is create a specific list of NPC characters that you can eve mail from every faction in the game. These are posted on the forum. You can interact with these characters at any time and, depending on the subject matter, might kick off "something interesting". Hans indicated that to a lot of new players, they can't tell the difference in the official news between what is NPC news or player news and that was part of what drew him into the game. CCP added, "We want there to be no border between that players are doing in game and what the 'story' is".

Hans made the point that it was great to see that this effort was no longer just Goliath sitting at one end of the table like at the last summit. Falcon emphasized that the live events team has had "incredible buy in, all the way to upper management" in the past six months. Seleene reiterated how much he enjoyed the fact that after so many years there was finally an interest in doing the stuff that was only hinted at several years ago correctly. Falcon said part of the problem with the old "Aurora" events was that it was mostly volunteers (some of them even players) with minimal planning and oversight. Team Illuminati is a very focused and heavily supported group that is all in-house at CCP, with everything secured and audited.

Hans asked who the CSM needed to talk to in order to ensure things keep going well. Goliath said that while their PO is Zulu, the best people to push were Seagull and Unifex. Seleene said that, based on reactions in the room, Team Illuminati was bound to get a lot of "blah blah" from the CSM as things got rolling after New Year's.

Falcon opened up the next area of discussion by stating that the team would really like to start having a real impact "on the map" of EVE and eventually see things like standings in Factional Warfare actually matter. For example, if you are in enemy space and in the wrong militia, a Caldari station might say, "You're Gallente militia, you can't dock here, get fucked". Seleene said, "I'd personally just like to explain to Mordu's Legion that they ain't shit compared to PL. I'm still pissed at a Mordu's Admiral that smack talked me when I ran Mercenary Coalition. I want to take their stations".

Hans jumped in and asked if this sort of thing might actually be possible in the future. Seleene said he thought it was silly that you can spend all day murdering NPCs in Delve and still be able to dock in a Blood Raider NPC station. Falcon said it's certainly "the dream" but Xhagen made the point that such a thing would probably need to be passed through Game Design. Falcon said that it's all about buy in from other teams at CCP.

Elise took the reins back and steered the conversation toward actual events by asking about the Dev Caravans. "Do you like the frequency you are running them at right now?" Eterne said that they like them as a special event but not something that happens very often. Goliath thought it best to keep them to once or twice a year so it's still considered special. Elise agreed, especially if the rest of the team's plans came true. Seleene said he understands why people like the Dev Caravans but he'd rather see 50-100 devs as part of a massive factional boom boom. Goliath said he's confident as the Live Events stuff takes off that they will have no problem getting volunteers for big stuff.

Manifest commented that he loved the malleability of how Team Illuminati was interacting with the player base and asked if we thought players of larger alliances and corporations would be interested in getting involved in large scale, world shaping events in the EVE story. Alek said, "As long as there is a compelling reason, hell yeah".

Elise cautioned that such a thing would have to be very well thought out as it's a "slippery slope" if one alliance is perceived to be getting too much NPC 'attention'. Goliath acknowledged this, specifically how players like to troll other players about, "We got so much fat loot from this muhahahaha!" Hans agreed by stating that his worry would be certain alliances in the game which might intentionally try to break the immersion factor and ruin it for everyone.

Goliath said one of the things the team is working on is a portal that is specifically focused on Team Illuminati activities; this could be both CCP news items and in character player videos / battle reports. Goliath said a long term goal is that they want to do "proper news" that reports on what is going on in EVE's living universe between the players and NPCs.

Falcon expanded on this by explaining the first steps of this are simple ones such as the Live Events forum, in game channel and the Twitter feed he set up. One statistic he mentioned was that the first time he posted the link to the Twitter feed in the in game channel, thirty minutes later it had 500 followers. Eterne made the point that all of this isn't just about "role playing" because there are a lot of people that play EVE who may not role play but would enjoy being a part of the "story of EVE". Hans commented that he liked the potential of these events to be proper content drivers by making people hate each other properly.

The subject of live streaming the events came up, and the entire CSM said this needs to happen more often. The problem at the moment is having a dedicated 'camera guy' but it's certainly something they want to do more of.

Falcon wanted to emphasize that everything we have seen up until now is "just the beginning" and he's been amazed at the level of support the team has gotten within CCP. Elise said he was very happy to see how far things had come in just over half a year from one guy (Goliath) saying he had a dream to Live Events actually being a dedicated team with real resources. Goliath said that so long as CCP continues to hire real nerds and not laid back cool guys, things will continue to improve.



## CREST

Present: CCP QC, CCP Seagull, CCP Explorer, CCP Alice, CCP Delegate Zero, CCP illurkall

QC first went over the basics of [what CREST is](#). CREST allows CCP to expose nearly any functionality to 3rd parties, and which functionality to expose is mostly a game design decision. This was not true with the old API system, which had significant limitations in what could be exposed. Seagull also added that the CREST system actually has two major components, one is the system that provided access to game data and the other is an authentication system that 3rd party devs can use to allow people to log in with their EVE account info (though without those 3rd parties having access to the account username or password), in a manner similar to the way people can use Facebook accounts on many different websites. The system used for this is called OAuth.

CCP asked if any folks in the room had developed any applications that used the current API, and Two step, Trebor and Kelduum all raised their hands. Seagull then proposed 3 main topics for the session:

- 1) What should CCP expose in CREST?
- 2) How will CREST work for developers, including the developer license and developer site?
- 3) How will CREST work for users?

CCP said that they do have some concerns about rogue apps. For example, if an application that is as common as EVEMon was to get a malicious patch and start doing something destructive, they want the ability to disable it. Two step asked if CCP was planning on policing apps, and CCP initially said that they would be banning malicious apps.

Seagull stated that that sort of theft wasn't the same as scamming someone in game. Two step questioned if it really was any different, and asked if CCP was ready to police the grey areas that this sort of policy would create. Alek asked if the rules for this would be in the developer agreement, which the CSM has seen an early draft of. Kelduum suggested that as long as the authorization page clearly presented the access that an app would have, CCP wouldn't need to worry about scams. Alek suggested that applications shouldn't be allowed to transfer ISK unless it is initiated from a user action, but CCP pointed out that it isn't really possible to determine that.

Seagull suggested that possibly for ISK transfers, they might allow apps to create pending transactions that might need to be approved to actually take place. Two step said that that might work for some uses, but for others that might involve many transactions it wouldn't save that much time, and that it might be a big problem for apps that would want to automate things like bounties or Hulkageddon.

QC pointed out that ultimately it should be up to users to give wallet access, and if they didn't trust the app they shouldn't let it use their wallet. Trebor said that a simple allow/deny for wallet access wasn't enough granularity, and suggested adding a new wallet division for CREST access. Two step suggested for simplicity just only allowing automatic CREST transfers from a corporation wallet division. Seleene liked the idea of personal wallet divisions. QC requested that the discussion move on from focusing on the specifics of transferring ISK, but several members of the CSM wanted to mention a few more points. Hans liked the idea of a CREST wallet. QC pointed out that many of the same problems would come up once CREST allowed access to move around items, and said, "I hope you like that carrier, because suddenly it ain't there anymore". Two step pointed out that many of the apps that would need wallet

access would be internally developed apps, or would be open source. He suggested that the number of accounts that would have a CREST wallet app authorized for them would be in the hundreds at most, because the only time you would need to automate money transfers is when you do a lot of them. Kelduum said that one use that he saw would be to reimburse newbies for skill book purchases. Seagull mentioned that one of their primary goals with CREST is to help the enablers do their work.

The discussion then turned to the developer license.

The CSM had previously seen both a proposed devblog announcing the developer program and a preliminary version of the developer license, and had some minor questions on details of the license. Seagull went over the reasons that a separate developer license is needed, which include a need for accountability, rules around monetization and valid contact information. Alice said that her team is building a new developer website that will feature sign up information, documentation and possibly developer only forums. Initially, the only functionality will be the sign up section, with the rest added over time. Two step asked if CCP would be willing to host forums for community projects that are somewhat leaderless, especially the eve-dev killboard, which had a forum that was infected with malware for quite some time earlier this year.

Two step also raised the issue of the Static Data Export (SDE). Currently, the SDE is a side project at best for devs like PrismX, and often contains errors and lags releases. He suggested that the SDE should be part of the release process for expansions. He said that CCP is pissing off some of their most important supporters by not doing this. The entire room agreed with this, but Two step pointed out that this has come up before with the same response.

Seleene asked what the initial CREST release would include. QC said that it would be contact management, which he called “non-catastrophically risky”, though he pointed out that corp or alliance standings could result in some bad things if it went wrong. Alice said that it would also provide CCP a good chance to iron out any bugs in the developer site. Seleene asked about a timeline for when CREST will start to roll out. QC said that the first iteration would hopefully be part of the February release, though because DUST uses CREST, problems with DUST might delay the initial CREST release. Seagull promised that CREST would be a priority, and said that she saw it as “absolutely key to where we are going forward”. She also mentioned that CCP wanted to be especially careful with functionality that could greatly impact the shared EVE universe, and that CCP needs to be careful to not expose functionality that allows for easier botting. She said that CCP would look for opportunities to make player's lives easier, such as saved fitting access.

QC pointed out that all actions that are done by CREST are done as a specific character. This means that the server itself does the same checks as when a client tries to do something, and a 3rd party app never will have more access than a character normally would. Two step asked if that meant that the CREST login page would force people to choose a character as well as entering an EVE username and password. QC explained the flow of using a CREST enabled app as the following:

- 1) The user enters the app, and is redirected to the CREST authorization page on eveonline.com
- 2) The user enters their EVE username and password
- 3) The user is presented with a list of the characters on that account, and chooses one
- 4) The user is redirected back to the application, which is given a token it can use to access that character's CREST API

QC and Seagull noted that this means that, unlike the current API system, players would have to authorize a CREST app 3 times to give it access to all characters on a single account. They pointed out that this might be a problem for uses where applications want to see all characters on an account. Two step suggested having the ability to expose an account ID or a hashed version of an account ID. Kelduum agreed, and said that it is important to some corporations to know if someone is trying to authorize multiple times with the same account. CCP asked for some more info on this, and agreed to think about it.

Two step asked if users would be able to modify the permissions granted to a CREST app after it had been authorized, and Seagull said that people would only be able to de-authorize the app. Unlike in the current API system, the user doesn't control the permissions for an app, the app asks for certain permissions and the user can allow or deny it. If an app changes which permissions it wants, all users will have to re-authenticate with it.

Seleene asked about the timeframe for CREST deployment. CCP expects that the initial version should be deployed in February. It will initially be deployed on SiSi. Seleene then asked if there would be a public roadmap for which functionality would be available next. Seagull said they weren't sure yet what would be available, but that she wanted to make improved CREST functionality part of the summer release. She also pointed out that most CREST functionality would just require a server patch, so it might be able to be on a different schedule. Also, because DUST uses CREST, functionality that is needed by DUST will be less work to expose as a user-facing CREST API. She mentioned chatting as a good example of this, and Kelduum asked about a specific timeframe for exposing chat via CREST.

Two step said that if CCP wants to have a real 3rd party development community, it is very important to tell that community what is coming and when it should be available. Seagull agreed, and said that the new developer site would be a great place for CCP to speak to developers. She mentioned that currently they feel pressure to make devblogs more accessible to non-developers, which sometimes means they can't be as technical as they would like to be. She also mentioned the possibility of enabling developers to pass along feature requests and possibly even having a public bug tracking database. There was some discussion of the previous CREST devblog, which promised a private beta before the summer, but QC pointed out that it didn't say which summer.

Alice then showed the CSM some mockups of the developer site, and the signup process for developers. The site has 3 main areas: an introduction to CREST, CREST documentation, and developer signups. In order to be a registered developer, a user must have a valid account, a verified email address, and agree to the developer license. Two step asked about the restrictions on scamming with CREST that were discussed earlier, and asked where those rules would be written. QC said it would have to be in the developer license, but Two step pointed out that the CSM had already seen an early version of the developer license and that it didn't contain any rules in that area. Seagull said those policies would probably be in a separate document. Kelduum asked what would happen to people who wrote malicious CREST apps, other than the app being deauthorized. QC said this was a discussion that still needed to happen, but that his personal opinion is that the authors of "evil" apps should not be punished, since the user gave the apps permissions to do whatever they were able to do. He drew an analogy to giving someone the keys to your car and then being surprised when they drove away with it. Alice mentioned that part of the developer site (that will be on the EVE community section) would be an application directory where users could find and review applications. She feels that empowering the community to weed out unscrupulous applications is the right path. Two step asked about the grey area between malicious apps and apps that spy on users. He presented an example of an EVE mail application that

read and wrote EVE mails, but also copied the mails to the app author. He would expect that this sort of thing would be allowed in the EVE world.

Seagull said that there were several layers of defense against apps like this. The first layer is the ability of a user to revoke an app's access to their account. She said that a lot of weight will be on the user to use that capacity to control "bad" applications. She said that the next step would be to petition an app that was misrepresenting what it was doing. In that situation, CCP could investigate the application and possibly disable it entirely. Two step asked how CCP would be able to tell if an app was doing this. In his example eve mail stealing app, how would CCP know that it was sending the app author a copy of everyone's eve mails? QC said they wouldn't be able to determine this, and said that he thought there should be a distinction drawn between an app that is possibly doing damage to EVE as a whole, for example by making way too many requests, and apps that are scamming their users. Two step asked again if he would be punished for making the eve mail stealing application. QC said no, and Seagull said yes, though she suggested that the only punishment would be that the app would be disabled. Two step again said that such a punishment doesn't fit with the EVE world. Alek disagreed, and said that there was room to scam in game, but that extending that into out of EVE activates wasn't appropriate. Trebor said that he feels very strongly that there must be a higher level code of conduct for 3rd party developers, and said that "the consequences for not adhering to that should be dire. They should be banned, and be treated as exploiters". Seagull agreed that there should be a recommended code of conduct, but she said that CCP would not, at least initially, take the responsibility of making sure that developers adhere to it. She also said that CCP would not endorse, lend support to or sponsor any particular 3rd party application.

She said the situation was just like a Facebook or Twitter application, "If you authorize a Twitter application and it starts posting 'poo poo poo' to your account, that is not Twitter's problem". She said that if an application reached enough of an audience that it would be damaging to the community as a whole then maybe CCP would step in and shut it down.

Two step liked this approach, and pointed out the current example of eve-skunk.com, which some CCP employees were not aware of. He described how it works, and said that applications like it should continue to be allowed. Alek said that the Facebook/Twitter analogy was a flawed one, because for both of those the user could remove any posts that were made. He wants the protections to be there so that players can have faith in the system. Explorer made the point that when people are being scammed in game, they have to deliberately do something to enable the scam. Two step asked why that wouldn't be the case with a CREST app, as the user would have to deliberately give it access. Trebor compared scamming with a 3rd party app to installing malware on a player's computer. QC pointed out that a CREST app doesn't have to run on a user's PC. He also pointed out that existing apps that use the API could be scamming people right now. Two step pointed out that a double standard for CREST apps doesn't seem like a good thing, but he did say that he was a little conflicted when it came to the writable CREST API calls. For a malicious writable app, he was more OK with the app being revoked, though a ban might be too far. QC said that it would be impossible for CCP to police all the 3rd party applications. Seagull said that the difference between the old API system and CREST is that CCP actually knows who wrote the CREST apps, because the developer has to have a valid EVE account. Hans asked if there is a tie between the developer and the EVE player. Seagull said yes, but mostly because CCP didn't want to build a second account and authentication system. Kelduum pointed out that it is incredibly easy to acquire an EVE account from someone else and that people who wanted to scam would just use that account. Seagull said she was sure that someone would try to scam, but she felt the only real recourse was to kick a person out of the developer program and not go further.

Two step asked about what CCP would do to buggy apps that mistakenly made bad changes, or even apps with bad security that had their CREST tokens stolen. Would those developers be punished? He said that CCP would be opening a big can of worms by trying to enforce any codes of conduct at all, and QC agreed. QC said that CCP would more likely use the ability to disable apps as a means of damage control for a haywire application. Alek stated that GMs currently have the ability to reverse wallet transfers when an account is hacked, and wanted to know what the difference between hacking an account and having a CREST app transfer ISK without permission. QC pointed out that the user gave the app the right to transfer ISK. Hans said, "EVE is a game built around consent. It is built around explaining to intelligent adults, these are the rules, these are your responsibilities, these are your risks, and I don't see any reason not to approach this system in the same fashion". Alek said that it comes down to granularity, and that being able to authorize an app to take from a specific corporate wallet division is fine, but he didn't like that individual players would either be making an all or nothing choice. Trebor said that even knowing the EVE community, he feels that CCP has to at least try to foster a culture of responsibility in order to encourage developers and users to build and use CREST apps. He suggested that people consider ways to increase trust in apps, including source code disclosure.

Seagull said that she wanted the community to figure out how to do this on their own, at least at first. She doesn't want to "over-engineer a policing solution" before they understand what the risks are. She feels that the EVE community can manage this sort of thing itself. Two step pointed out that the community is already doing this, and brought up the example of the various wormhole mapping sites that people can use, and how there is some concern that some of the apps are sharing data that claims to be private. He suggested that CCP just stick to policing behavior that might break the CREST servers, such as requesting data too often, and leave the rest to the community. Hans pointed out that the most important thing to CCP to do is to make it clear exactly what they are allowing an app to do, and compared the system to the new safety in Crimewatch.

QC said that it would be "painfully clear what an app can do", and Two step said that it was super important to get that part right. He posed the example of an app that requested to do one thousand different things and buried "take all your money" somewhere in the middle. He suggested that the "dangerous" permissions be highlighted and always appear at the top of the list of permissions, and possibly require the user to confirm that they want to allow that access. QC said that this would be one of the big discussions that CCP would have once CREST was on SiSi, to make sure that the warning is clear. He also pointed out that when apps like EVEMon or EVEHQ were new, there was a lot of distrust of them, but that time had shown that they were trustworthy. Alek then went back to the app that could send EVE mails, and said that there should be a difference between an app that can send eve mails that the user writes and one that can send them on its own. QC pointed out that there was no way to differentiate between the two from the CREST API point of view. He said that the authentication page would (and could) only show what the EVE server will allow the app to do.

To wrap up, QC said that he had a couple of main points from the session:

- 1) CREST itself is liked by the CSM
- 2) The big problems are with authorization and policies

He promised in the coming weeks to work on a document outlining the limits and responsibilities of a 3rd party developer. He will share that document with the CSM and then with the community. He said that it was inevitable that something would go wrong with an app, and Two step said that he was sure people

would build apps in the beta period to test the limits, and even offered to write an app that would claim to synchronize standings but that would sometimes switch reds and blues.

## Out of Client

Present: CCP Alice, CCP Delegate Zero, CCP Explorer, CCP Unifex

The CSM noted that Hans was AWOL, and Dolan was dispatched to fetch him from the hotel.

Alice started out by showing the CSM a new version of the [community.eveonline.com](http://community.eveonline.com) site. Among the new features of the site is better support for resizing and for smaller screens, which should make it easier to read devblogs on phones or tablets. It also will have the old support site properly integrated so that API keys and petitions won't be on a separate website. The Community site will be the first site to use the new Single-Sign-On system as well.

Alice then moved on to the main topic, which is how to expand the EVE experience beyond just the client. She has a list of things that the web team is considering:

- 1) Showing more general data from within the client on the web, including statistics for your character.
- 2) Showing bounty hunting most wanted and top bounty hunters on the web.
- 3) A web based ship fitting tool. This would initially let you just build ship fits, but might be extended to allow players to save and load fittings from corp/personal fittings in game. This also might include making fits available to the public and some sort of voting system.
- 4) The character creator.
- 5) Chat.
- 6) Corp recruitment and management.
- 7) "Wallet stuff". The CSM asked what this meant, and Alice explained that it was more about contracts, being able to accept or issue contracts on the web.
- 8) The market.

Of those topics, CCP is leaning towards ship fitting, character creator and chat, followed by showing more general data about your character(s). Two step asked about the character creator, and if it would be just recustomization or if it would let people create their first character while the client is being downloaded. Alice showed the CSM an early prototype of shaping a character's face with WebGL, which looked pretty cool. Two step thought that the frame rate looked better than in the client.

Alice asked what the CSM thought about those topics. Trebor thought that the ideas were fine, but questioned why CCP would duplicate effort that the community is already doing. He suggested that CCP concentrate on building the tools to better enable the community to build some of the applications. Alice said that CCP wanted to focus on the mainstream tools that the players use. She did acknowledge that it was CCP playing catch up, but she said it was important for CCP to provide the major tools that people need. Trebor suggested that CCP start by building the tools that they would need to implement the applications, and then once they see what sorts of things people are building, they can decide if they

need to provide a CCP authored version. Alice said that actually that was the approach they would be using as far as tools to implement the applications, but CCP has a certain minimum set of basic mainstream functionality that they want to offer to their customers, while in tandem providing tools to better support 3rd party developers for special use cases.

Trebor said that given CCP's limited resources, he thought CCP should be hesitant to offer new versions of existing tools. Alice asked for an example of what sort of thing he was talking about. Two step said, "I think there are some things the community isn't going to build. The community isn't going to build that character creator". and that he likes that CCP is willing to build that, especially because the character creator has always been a popular thing for people to play with. He pointed out that EVE gate was actually pretty useful, and a good example of where CCP provided tools are a good idea, even if there were a CREST API for reading and sending EVE mail. He agreed that chat would be a useful thing to have on EVE gate, though it is important to also create a CREST API for it, so it can be present on different platforms. Alice agreed, and pointed to chat as something that CCP would definitely want integrated into EVE gate. She said that it was important to have an easy, visible way to access that sort of functionality so that players weren't required to go and seek out a 3rd party solution.

The discussion turned to the web based fitting tool. The CSM had already heard a little about this idea, which included that players in the game might be able to easily see the "top rated" fits for a given ship. Two step pointed out that it would be great if CCP was able to provide places like that where 3rd party apps could hook into the client. He said that given that the communication between CCP and 3rd parties is already a two way street, since when CCP was developing the new kill reports they looked at how existing killboards were displaying kill mails, he thinks the right direction to move in the future is enabling more two way communication, instead of just having 3rd party apps that are used without the client. As an example, he mentioned that CCP was unlikely to build a UI for corp management that would please everyone, but it would be great if in the client there was an area for CCP to link to 3rd party corp management apps that used CREST.

Trebor said that he thought building chat into EVE gate was a good use of CCP's time, but that CCP would be better off spending time elsewhere instead of doing a ship fitting tool. He said that if CCP feels that players are having trouble properly fitting their ships, he would rather CCP invest time in better ship fitting tutorials. He also said that, in general, CCP should try whenever possible to leverage the large EVE community, as there are a lot more players than there are devs, plus [he noted, looking around the room] players work for free.

Two step suggested that one very compelling thing that CCP could build would be a ship fitting display widget, so that people could embed it on their forums or websites. This would especially be nice because unlike current solutions, it would be automatically updated when a new patch is released that adds or changes modules or ships. CCP has already done this with their embeddable star map, and he suggested the continue to do things like that. Alice agreed, and said that as part of building a ship fitting site, they would have to build that sort of tool, and might be able to make it usable on its own. She also suggested that possibly CCP could provide data exposures for the item database, so that players might not need to rely on the Static Data Export, which is not always updated right after a patch.

Two step said that it sounded like CCP really wants to build a ship fitting tool, and he understood why they might want to do that, as they don't want to be dependent on 3rd party tools, which might stop getting further development. He also pointed out that CCP was actually in this situation right now with the eve-dev killboard, which is widely used. There are no (or very few) active developers on it, and he has



been writing patches to make it work with API changes. Two step said that part of the reason some of the developers are getting burned out is because they aren't getting much support from CCP, which has talked about CREST for a while with not much concrete information, as well as not followed up on tools like the embeddable star map. He said that CCP building tools to help them instead of trying to replace them might build up some of that goodwill.

Alice asked what the CSM thought about the other proposed options. Two step said that if CCP had some security concerns that might be a good place to build their own tools. His example was the market. If CCP opened up a CREST API to the market, players would quickly write bots to play the market. Instead of doing that, he suggested that CCP consider writing those tools themselves, so they would be able to better detect botting, or have limits on activity. Elise suggested restricting market activity to modifying existing orders. He said that a lot of market people like to sneak on during work, and being able to do so without having the full client would be nice. Elise also expressed some interest in being able to create, browse and accept contracts out of game. UAXDEATH agreed.

Two step mentioned that Unifex had said the previous day that if it were up to him at the time, he would have preferred to make PI playable on the iPad, and asked if the web team was looking at other similar somewhat self-contained areas of the game that might be able to be broken out into web/phone/tablet games. He brought up the example of the "Slay" game that is playable in the DUST PS3 home area, and asked if they have considered moving it to the web and maybe building a betting system around it.

Alice next asked, "What about killboards?" Seleene said that he hated the idea, and Two step said that despite what he said earlier, killboards are an area where a lot of people want to do things differently. He mentioned that while there aren't a lot of different killboards out there, there are a handful, and some people have a reason to want a different experience. Two step said the more valuable tool to build is some way for killboard developers to authenticate a kill, to avoid issues with fake kills. Two step also suggested that some sort of historical kill data feed would be extremely useful for people that want to do some analysis. Greene Lee said that the biggest problem his killboard developers have is that CCP keeps breaking killboards with just about every patch. This brought up the issue of the Static Data Export (SDE), which was covered more in the CREST session.

Two step said that CCP shouldn't release a patch without the SDE being available, preferably the day before the patch. He reminded CCP that a lot of people play EVE through killboards and EFT, and having those tools broken for a week or more is a bad thing. He said that it seemed like the SDE was a side project of devs like PrismX, and Explorer said that it is just a side project for him, and also pointed out that having a thriving 3rd party developer world was a huge competitive advantage for CCP, as future competitors would have trouble producing all the iOS and web apps that EVE players have already built. He said that CCP should care more that they might release a patch that will break all the killboards.

Two step also noted out that CCP doesn't even always do a good job of keeping their own tools working properly, and brought up the example of links in an EVE mail, which EVE gate doesn't always show properly. Kelduum mentioned that he recently built a tool that read EVE mails via the API, and found that links were represented in a strange way. Trebor mentioned that he had some experience with this during the CSM election when he sent a large number of EVE mails to potential voters, and found it difficult to craft an EVE mail that would look good both in client and on EVE gate. He helpfully offered to sell to any interested [and responsible] party the techniques he used.

Moving on, Elise said that there are some things he wouldn't want visible out of game. His first example was fleets, which at first seems like the sort of information that should be shown out of game, but he thought it might result in people only logging in when a fleet was active. Alice said that CCP wants to try to take more of the preparation-type activities out of game, but not the activity-type ones. She said, "What can I do on the train home, that will help me, so when I login I can just undock and go". Elise agreed with this. Two step mentioned one big pain point with existing fitting tools was fitting import and export, which might be able to be addressed with CREST. He said that one important role CCP could play with fitting is to properly support fitting synchronization between all the different tools, both 3rd party and CCP developed. Two step said that he would prefer that CCP not build a web based fitting tool, but if they wanted to do it he understood why. Elise was more in favor of CCP building one, because he considers it a core piece of EVE's gameplay. Two step also mentioned that fewer people with bad fits would be a good thing, as it is currently clear that some people don't understand the basics of ship fitting. He also pointed out that any sort of fitting voting or ranking system would be vulnerable to people falsely voting up bad fits. Elise and Two step asked if the fitting display in game for fits that people linked in chat or EVE mail might be looked at as well, as they don't show all the info like resists or DPS that people might want to see. Alek also asked for a way to adjust which resist profile is used when the in game display shows the EHP of a fit, like EFT can do. Alek also said that he didn't see as much value from a rating system for fits, but that allowing people to build hypothetical fits in game before buying all the parts would be very useful.

Alice was surprised that none of the CSM mentioned changing skills. Seleene said that most people had assumed CCP would never allow it, so there wasn't much point in bringing it up, but asked if Alice knew something that the CSM didn't. Two step said that he had assumed that would come with CREST. Hans asked Seleene why he thought it wouldn't be allowed, and Seleene said that in the past, CCP had always said no. Two step pointed out that the CCP people in the room were making faces that indicated they might no longer feel that way. Alice said that everything was on the table and open for discussion, and Seleene replied asking for a way to change his skills on the web, and Hans agreed. Two step pointed out that sometimes when people log on to change skills, they might get sucked into playing the game, though he did point out that if he was able to chat on the web that more of the socializing might happen there. Seleene said that in general, he thinks people should be able to play EVE anywhere, and that changing skills was part of that. Alice said that CCP's views had evolved over the past few years, and they wanted people able to play and instigate things from outside the client. There was a bunch of discussion about having chat available on the web, and if it would result in the same problem that Elise had mentioned before with being able to find fleets out of game. The general conclusion was that chat was something that was already happening over various out of game channels, including Jabber, IRC and Skype, and that better integrating with the in-client chat would be a good thing.

Two step also mentioned that CCP might be able to do a better job at broadcasting in game notifications on things like structures coming under attack to players. Alice thought this was a good point, and said that when she had talked to players at FanFest or other player gatherings they had asked to be able to know what was going on in their local view of EVE from out of game. Two step said that players were already building tools to do this, but that it might be something that CCP should do. He said that in general, the more CCP can do to draw people into the game, the better. Alek asked for better support for exporting and syncing the in game calendar with other calendar tools. Kelduum suggested that CCP look at the tools people are currently using, like Jabber or iCal, and build their systems to be compatible with them.

Alice asked if there was any other preparation type gameplay that the CSM thought might be exposed on the web. Seleene asked if CCP's plan was to make it so that he could sit on the train and buy and fit ships

that he could drop into a corp hangar, so that he could get home and jump right into fighting? Alice said, "That is the idea, yeah". Elise agreed that being able to do the stuff that isn't fun out of game would be a good thing. He also mentioned giving people the ability to reorganize their hangars would be nice, as sometimes he feels the urge to clean up. Two step mentioned giving people the ability to shop in Jita while not being in Jita would be nice, especially for new players without alts. Alek mentioned having a better way to track participation in sleeper sites or mining ops. Dovinian requested being able to do corp management tasks online and Alek expressed some interest in being able to kick people from corp on his phone.

Since the conversation was turning towards CREST functionality, Dovinian and Two step brought up sending ISK from players to corps and vice versa. Two step said that anything CCP can do to make life easier for what Seagull had termed instigators and enablers would be very welcome, as when those players burn out, they make the game less fun for large groups of people. Hans requested CCP look into enabling him to do Planetary Interaction from out of game, and Trebor agreed. It was noted that PI seemed like it would work quite well with a touchscreen interface. Trebor also requested that PI get looked at for some small iterations, as there are a couple of small things that could be changed to make it a lot more useful. Trebor mentioned that the workflow based nature of PI might be an example for how to fix industry, which brought Alice to ask about exposing industrial functionality on the web. Two step said that it might be of limited usefulness, because industry often needs materials and finished goods moved around. Trebor said that making industrial activity more visible outside of the game might be nice, but Two step pointed out that the existing API actually covers industry fairly well. Elise asked about maybe adding industry job status to EVE gate, because, "sometimes I forget, I'm not smart". Hans requested that quote make the minutes, and with that the session wrapped up.

## Player Experience

Present: CCP Sisyphus, CCP Sharq, CCP Fear

Team Pony Express Introduced themselves, giving a run-down of the items they worked on in Retribution, such as the new Corp Finder, New Icons, Camera Look, Damage Indicators, etc. The CSM was very positive about the new camera look option.

Sisyphus explained that for summer they will be prototyping a new radial menu system to replace the existing in-space version using mouse gestures, and eventually the right-click menus.

This will start with the in-space version of the menus, in an attempt to move the interaction in EVE to a 'left-click' like most other games/programs/web-pages.

Sharq asked how many of the CSM use the current radial menu system.

Two step voiced concern that the changes would likely result in "10x the volume of yelling".

Sisyphus pointed out that everything they do will result in people yelling, as they are purposefully trying to get rid of things that are not optimal, and the right-click menu is a very sub-optimal way of navigating.

Fear mentioned that studies show that a small right-click menu with a few items is okay, however nesting items loses usability quickly.

Trebor agreed that right-click menus that go 5 levels deep are bad, however he pointed out that while radial menus look good, they don't 'feel good', and studies have shown they are very hard to use them practically as it requires non-natural movements with a mouse. He went on to point out that this is OK with touchscreens, but it is not as good with a mouse.

Sharq mentioned he had been going through numerous studies, and they show that radial menus are easier to navigate. Trebor requested references to those studies. Sharq went on to say that while they are investigating this, if it is not an improvement they will not go ahead -- there are studies out there that conflict as they use different assumptions, so CCP is trying different things out.

Two step asked if this change would potentially be optional. Sharq replied that they will add metrics to the menus and see how much players use them during the transition.

Two step then pointed out that the radial menus could have some other issues as the mock up shown overlaps adjacent items. Fear stated that they are still concepting the system, so this is not final.

Sharq also mentioned they are investigating using distance from the center of the menu to set warp, orbit and keep-at-range ranges within the menu. Elise was positive about removing items from the right-click menu, and Two step pointed out that new players tend not to know about right-clicking items.

Sharq gave a number of examples illustrating that a new player does not know to right-click things and where left-clicking has no result or feedback, and that this is a plan to make the game more accessible to

new players while also providing a simpler way to interact with the game, using muscle memory across different menus.

Fear reiterated that they are prototyping this to ensure that it 'works' and 'feels' good; Two step noted that the existing radial menu does not work, and the new menus should always provide feedback. Sisyphus agreed that it should always indicate what is going to happen if you click.

Fear pointed out that other games change the mouse pointer depending on the click action, which EVE does not really do at the moment.

Hans pointed out that the use of icons on the radial menu removes localization issues and that he feels that this is a good move forward.

Two step suggested that use of color would also be good, citing sci-fi movies using colored icons in their UIs, and that the mock-up looked very plain, and suggested that the right-click menu should use the same icons to link the two systems.

Kelduum pointed out that with the mock up as shown, EVE currently uses different icons for similar groupings, with Z shown in the mock up, only being used on the wallet icon in the Neocom. Sharq responded that the current icons in EVE need to be revised to be more standardized.

Trebor requested that "the bridge icon and the jump icon be made almost identical so that more Titans blow up". Two step suggested just having one icon which randomly chooses. Trebor also pointed out that the Neocom isn't used much itself, and suggested adjusting it depending on what was selected, as there are only eight options on the mock up. Two step didn't like this idea, as having two locations - one to select the item, one to choose the action would result in a lot more mouse movement.

Team Pony Express then showed a mock-up of an improved tracking camera, which showed a zoomed view of the targeted ship, which would then show weapons hitting/missing, shield boosting and so on.

Two step suggested that the zoomed view should display or otherwise list the effects happening on the target, so he would have more useful information.

Hans agreed that looking closely at a ship is good, as for example you can see what weapons are fitted.

Trebor pointed out that "first it has to be useful, then it has to be pretty"; Sisyphus noted that transversal/radial velocity would be easier to see if you can see the ship itself.

Trebor responded that he would like to be able to hover over his weapons and see what ships were in range. Sisyphus pointed out that had been added for the overview and brackets. Two step then pointed out that activating a module which is out of range only results in an error message, suggesting that maybe there should be some other indicator that a module is in-range with the selected target. CCP agreed.

Trebor suggested that the zoomed view should provide information which is typically on the overview, and other tactical information. Sharq said they are considering changing the spinning chevrons depending on

whether the target is closing or not. Hans pointed out that one of the common complaints is that “EVE feels like playing a spreadsheet”, and this would help.

Sharq agreed that it would give you a general idea of what it going on, but not the specific numbers. Alek asked why the numbers could not be shown here also, as the overview can already show them. Sisyphus agreed that the information on the overview could be better presented.

Two step suggested that there be a quick way of hiding the zoomed view, and CCP agreed.

Trebor suggested some other ways of presenting the information to provide further information with the same chevrons. Alek pointed out that the information must be intuitive and that too much information should not be forced into one location. Sisyphus agreed about making it simple, and gave an example about new players not closing windows and being overloaded with information.

Alek agreed with something Trebor had said earlier about what effects are being applied to the target (web, neut, etc.). Kelduum suggested that the old overview effects, which show what is being done to you and has since been replaced with the effects bar, could be repurposed to show effects on each item in the overview. The goal would be something similar to what was shown in the Alliance Tournament and New Eden Open. Two step agreed it would be nice, but was concerned it would make things too easy. Sisyphus pointed out that the overview should not be a “Swiss army knife” showing all information, to which Kelduum agreed that it should be an actual “Overview” with basic information. Two step stated that he felt that three-dimensional information should not be in the overview.

Trebor pointed out that the 3D view is a “shuttered view” only showing what you are looking at (you can't see what's behind you), and the Overview should be a global view. Sisyphus asked if the Overview is then the best way of representing this information. Alek responded that the tactical Overlay already shows this but is underutilized and underdeveloped. Trebor then argued for multiple subset overviews, each with specific information in it, such as bomber, watchlist and targeting information without having to switch tabs or scroll.

Sharq pointed out that the overview started as a threat list, but is now also a navigation panel and various other things, so separating navigation information would be an improvement. Two step agreed that navigation would be good if it was separated, especially for different situations, and Alek pointed out that having bookmarks show in space would also be useful.

Sharq asked if players use people in the watchlist for warp-outs, Two step replied that its usually now a bookmark folder which has been pulled out.

Team Pony Express then moved to a slide on transitions, showing a pod destruction “storyboard”.

Sharq said that one of the tasks they have for summer is to replace the progress bars with more useful information on what is/has happened, smoothing the transitions, such as docking, undocking, jumping, dying and so on, and showing a notification on the screen as to what has actually occurred.

Alek pointed out that he likes the disorientation produced when being podded, and Trebor suggested that the cinematic shown when being podded showed a close-up of the effects of a human being exposed to a vacuum.

Two step said that he was okay with being podded taking a little longer than it does at the moment with a pause on showing the floating corpse.

Kelduum pointed out that “Real things that have actually been asked on the Uni mumble include such amazing lines as ‘My ship just flashed and now I am in an Egg, did I just level up?’”, and suggested making it very clear what had happened.

Sharq then said they want to add animations for docking and undocking, for example the ship turning toward the corridor when undocking before their screen fades to black, setting the mood better. Elise agreed that as long as it doesn't take any longer than the existing undock process, that would be nice. Sharq also mentioned that the Art team were excited about adding runway lights and other things when docking.

Sharq gave an example of when you jump through a gate that you then see the your ship fly off in the direction of the gate. He went on to include showing the gate flash on the destination to make it clear to the player they have arrived and have come through the gate. Kelduum suggested simply zooming the camera in and out to show the transition, showing wider views as you leave and enter the scene, and Sharq agreed that is what they are looking at doing rather than adding elaborate cut scenes.

Hans then pointed out he would still like to know how his Nagalfar fits through the stations dock. Sharq jokingly suggested they would make it fold up, shoot out of the dock and then unfold once it is clear. Explorer then pointed out that timing with undocking can be tricky due to a number of technical reasons including clients loading the scene. A short discussion then occurred where Selene jokingly suggested you would have to align your ship with the gate to use it, to which Kelduum replied that alternatively you would just end up somewhere else entirely.

Moving on, Two step suggested that someone in CCP should take a look at the client defaults such as the overview, as all the defaults are wrong, such as auto-target-back. Sisyphus replied that CCP are collecting metrics on what people use at present, so they can change the defaults to what people actually use.

Two step pointed out that some players likely have things like auto-target-back turned on as they don't know to turn it off, and that it would be an easy win to change that. Kelduum offered to provide a list of defaults which should be changed and Sisyphus asked them to be emailed to him.

Trebor suggested to improvements to the new tracking camera, listing items to keep on screen and allowing the client to work out how to do that, although Sisyphus suggested it would be much more complex than it sounds.

Two step went through a list of items collected from the community, such as the ability to turn off the free rookie ship when docking somewhere you do not have a ship (Trebor jokingly suggested that the CSM should get a special rookie ship), different colors for different mining laser crystals, the new Player Experience placing you in ships you cannot initially fly as a teaser of what you can do later, visible polarity timers for wormholes and an “annoying noise” when you forget to recall your drones when engaging warp.

Elise asked about the current drone interface, and it was agreed that the interface at present is not good, with Kelduum referring to it as “hilarious”, although Team Pony Express are not sure where this is in the pipeline.

Alek asked for an expansion to the list of activities in the recruitment UI, and the possibility for players to advertise themselves to corporations. Sisyphus mentioned that they have spent quite some time discussing how to expand that functionality. Two step asked if there was a link to the recruitment forum in the in-game UI, and Kelduum pointed out that in fact there is no link capability at all, either in the advertisement text or the fields, suggesting there should simply be a “URL” field in each advertisement which would open in the in-game browser with more information about the corporation. Sisyphus said this should be simple to add.

Greene Lee mentioned that many stations have collision meshes which do not correspond to the visible model.

Alek also suggested that the new recruitment UI should be swapped around so players can advertise themselves. Sisyphus suggested that would be the logical next step, making an EVE “Dating Service”. Fear suggested it should not be called a dating service, to which Kelduum and Alek disagreed strongly as “calling it a dating service would be awesome”.

Two step asked if CCP have any metrics on how people find corporations - is it randomly, via the Corp finder or otherwise. Sisyphus replied that they do have metrics on the use of the Corp finder, but not on how people find corporations via other means, stating that the Corp finder is massively used by new players. Kelduum confirmed this, stating that with the old pre-Retribution Corp finder, around 50% of all E-UNI applications were traced to it, and since the change this appears to have jumped to around 80%.

Sisyphus mentioned he is considering making improvements to the Science and Industry UI. Two step suggested he would gain a lot of beers next FanFest if he did.

Trebor mentioned he can provide a number of usability adjustments to the Planetary Interaction UI, Sisyphus mentioned they are focusing on navigation at the moment, but it that would not be impossible, and the CSM should email him relevant information directly.



## ART

Present: CCP BasementBen, CCP Huskarl, CCP Mannbjorn, CCP Seagull

CSM was presented with a report on Art's plans for 2013. These included:

- General 2013 planning - Art is using the downtime between the release of Retribution and the completion of planning for the next expansion to work on their overall plans for 2013 and beyond.
- V3 and "V3+" - in addition to the above, Art is continuing to work on updating all the models in the game to V3. In some cases, Art is not just updating the models in a technical sense (shaders, materials), but also improving them (textures, etc.); this is called V3+.
- Redesigns - Art is continuing to redesign ships and other models; this is done whenever they have extra time.
- Tech Work (pipeline, tools) - Art now has a very solid team working on things like effects, and is continuing to improve their internal tools.

Note: all the items listed below are works in progress, and development considerations may cause them to be delayed.

- Q1 2013 point releases - Art plans to deploy improvements to shaders, reflections, and glows. They will also do cleanup work in the client, removing old graphics code that is now obsolete.
- Summer 2013 - V3 conversion will expand to more than just ships (drones, gates, stations, interiors, etc.), as well as a lot of work done to support planned new features. There will also be more ship redesigns, as well as the continuing tech work effort.

Elise: I really like the PIP/Target View -- it lets you see the effects on a ship. That sort of visual information is very useful.

BasementBen: V3 is progressing; if all the artists were tasked to it, it could be completed in time for the next expansion. Of course, that isn't possible, but the intent is to put as many artists on V3 as possible.

Alek: Are there prospects for ship-skinning before V3 is completed?

BasementBen: That's a question for feature teams [who would have to create the player-facing interface]. It's technically possible for some ships already. But we have to create the skins.

In response to questions from the CSM, it was confirmed that skins for the NPC groups in the game (such as Khanids) are already done and in the client.

BasementBen: The short answer is if game design wants to do it, we can do it.

Alek: You heard it here first, "Art not the bottleneck".

CSM was shown a slide show of recent V3 work, showing before and after shots of various ships, and some of the new effects, such as animated decals being used to implement hangar/drone bay force fields.

Two step raised the question of Amarr ship colors being less vibrant. The response was that once everything is V3'd, it will be possible to include the effect of bounce light from the nebulae, which will make them more reflective. At the same time, they need to strike a balance because some areas of the game have bright nebulae, and some don't. The amount of bounce may be adjusted on a scene-by-scene basis to compensate for this.

Alek: People loved the look of the Amarr ships, regardless of whether it was intentional. It was a happy mistake, and I think people would appreciate, not a full move back, but a little understanding of what they love about that color palette.

Seleene: The EVE Art guys traditionally really listen to players about the colors of ships in the game.

[laughter]

CSM was impressed with the new V3 station interiors, in particular the one with the big fan with a light behind it.

Kelduum: The old scenes look like models, and the new ones look like the actual original thing.

Some members of the CSM noted that the Naglfar needs to be able to fold up to fit inside a station.

Conversation drifted back to the Amarr gold again; CCP noted that they hadn't struck the right balance yet.

Trebor: Just make one region have a nebula that's the right color so that the Amarr ships look like they used to, and then all the Amarr [expletive deleted] will go live there.

[Expressions of shock and horror that Trebor would be so crude]

BasementBen: And then you close the gates?

Trebor: Well, I wasn't going to say that.

CCP presented some of the new ship-redesigns, which were well received. Two step raised the issue of the new Amarr destroyer looking like the old one, and suggested the old one be redesigned to make it a bit more distinct.

Huskarl: When everyone tells me the same thing, then we fix it. Like with the frills.

Two step passed on a request that [strip] mining lasers should have different colors.

CSM asked questions related to the Art-related implementation issues of Modular POSes, including the possibility of repurposing existing assets, so that they could better understand the design constraints of the feature.

Seagull: We have 4 things that are interacting: the gameplay and design of the POS system, the role POSes play in achieving things in the game (its features), the technical layer (code) then manages all of this (which currently is old and needs refactoring), and art. Regarding art, there is the question of do you want to redo the art, do you want to show individual modules (as opposed to have things inside, like a station), and then you have technical issues, such as what does the rendering complexity of a scene do to client performance?

Seagull: The reason there's a "no" to doing [Modular POSes] right now is that it was affecting all of these areas in a way that was too big to do at once. What you're trying to do is try to find a way to get what you want, but what we need to do is go back and look at how we can separate all these layers, and figure out something reasonable, and then have Art do something that's immersive and amazing.

Seleene: To clarify our position, typically what happens when we get into discussions about this kind of future feature, first we hear from Art who says, "Game Design comes first". Then we hear from Game Design that "we can prototype it, but the artwork will take forever, so why prototype?" It is circular to the point of madness, and if we have this issue, you can imagine how the community feels.

Mannbjorn: We don't want to make expensive art assets unless the game requires it. Otherwise, we'll make stuff and then throw it away.

There was a short discussion about how to properly message things to the community to reduce these frustrations, and whose responsibility it was to do that. This evolved into a conversation about how Art interacts with game design, and CSM got a better understanding of the challenges they face.

Mannbjorn: We are at the end of the pipeline -- us and Audio.

Seleene: And sometimes things change towards the end, features get cut, and work Art has done never sees the light of day.

Alek: It sounds like you don't want to be burned and neither does Game Design.

Mannbjorn: We're not fighting each other. We just try and work out what is meaningful for an expansion. And a design might be great but hard to maintain in the long-term or might impact upcoming releases. Sometimes we're a bottleneck because we have to say "this will be very expensive".

BasementBen: But we are never the guys who say "no". We serve the other departments. Our own agenda [such as V3] are often priority "B". We come up with an estimate of what something will cost, and someone makes a decision.

UAxDEATH asked how many people work in the Art department. Staff in Iceland totals 23, plus 4 graphics programmers and 3 QA staff; all of them are working on EVE. Before the layoffs, it was 30. It was also noted that some art asset development could be (and has been) outsourced if needed.

Seleene asked if there were any plans to expand the in-house Art department in Iceland.

BasementBen: If someone from top management came to us and said "Go hire 20 more top guys", we wouldn't say no, though it would be a mistake to hire them all at once. The department was about 7 people when I arrived in 2006, and we slowly added a few people each year.

Seleene: So a tiny number of people did everything in the original game? When did they sleep?

BasementBen: Making an asset is much more complex and time-consuming today, they are much more complicated. Also, they had been working on the original assets since 2000.

Two step inquired when wormholes were going to get a nebula update.

BasementBen: They are super-expensive, it's a matter of money.

The meeting ended on a cordial note, with Art being thanked for their work.

Alek: Great work on the Corax!

## EVE Economy

Present: CCP Dr.EyjoG, CCP Seagull, CCP Hellmar

Dr.EyjoG presented his report on the state of the EVE Economy.

First up was an overview of the state of the economy. Gross User Product increased steadily during 2012 after a big jump -- largely in Manufacturing -- in late 2011. NPC Traded Goods, which are a sink, are steadily becoming less important as more and more of the economy moves into the hands of the players.

Taxes and fees would normally be a sink but CCP reports these categories with bounties and insurance -- and hence this category is a net faucet. This category and NPC loot have both remained stable in 2012. The largest share of the GUP is provided through player manufacturing.

Dr.EyjoG: We are running the worst insurance company in the world.

UAxDEATH: No, the worst is AIG.

In 2012, the Total Value of Final Production ("the stuff that people use"), per subscriber, was higher than in any previous year except in June, averaging about 160m ISK / subscriber / month.

Trebor: That's in ISK, and ISK is inflating.

Dr.EyjoG: This is in real terms, corrected for inflation using the EVE Consumer Price Index.

December is looking good. For example, compared to the weeks before Retribution was released, destroyer production is up about 10% and stargate jumps are up 20%.

Dr.EyjoG provided a short report on the health of mining. His largely blue graph clearly showed the effects of certain "player-driven interactions" earlier this year, and the dramatically positive effects of the changes that improved mining in August.

Trebor noted that the mining activity graph showed large peaks on the weekend, and smaller ones midweek during the hump days. He asked whether this represented a negative externality imposed upon the (real) world by EVE players goofing off at work.

Dr.EyjoG disagreed, saying that this was real work creating real value and national governments should include it in their GNP calculations.

Trebor conceded the point about GNP, but argued that (given how boring mining is) in terms of Gross National Happiness, perhaps it wasn't.

Dr.EyjoG: There's nothing as beautiful as blue mining lasers on a Sunday morning. It's soothing.

Turning to PvP, the kills per 1000 subscribers per day sharply increased after Escalation, going from 16 to 21, and grew modestly throughout 2012. The long-term historical value of this indicator is 20.

Inflation (CPI excluding PLEX) fluctuated quite widely during 2012, from a monthly low of 4% deflation to a high of 8% inflation. However, taken as a whole, inflation was modest, and stayed within CCP's target range of +/- 1%.

Two step questioned whether a CPI without PLEX was really a good indicator, given that PLEX were a store of "real" value.

Dr.EyjoG replied that inflation is the change in the amount of ISK you have to pay for stuff. The CPI is rebalanced every month to reflect actual purchasing behavior by players.

Dr.EyjoG: You can look at PLEX like gold. Inflation in the US is low, but gold prices are going up. Why do you think that is?

Two step: You don't see the terrible TV ads we see, trying to get people to buy gold. [laughter and applause]

A side-discussion of the reasons for gold price changes ensued, including conspiracy theories about market manipulation. The question was raised whether something similar is going on the PLEX market.

Dr.EyjoG: [Some people are trying to do it but] they are not quite as successful as they think they are.

Dr.EyjoG gave the CSM a short demo of some of the real-time queries they can now perform, providing statistics on some of the new ships and what modules were most likely to be fit on them.

Dr.EyjoG also provided CSM with a report on PLEX intervention(s) made by the EVE Central Bank since the last CSM Summit. The major intervention was related to a PLEX price spike triggered by a large FW payout, and PLEX prices have remained stable since that time. The CSM was satisfied that the ECB had acted appropriately and in line with the procedures previously described. Dr.EyjoG noted that he hopes to have a devblog out in January that discusses this topic in more detail.

Other PLEX-related tidbits: the liquidity of the PLEX market (the number of PLEXes on the market at any time) has been increasing steadily, while the price volatility is down. The inventory of PLEXes in the game has been steadily increasing, but so has monthly usage. The current inventory represents about 45 days' worth of usage, and on a typical day, there are about 4000 PLEX trades on the in-game market.

Dr.EyjoG also showed CSM information regarding FW LP stockpiles, which have smoothed out considerably since the changes in the LP payout patch. He also quickly scrolled through graphics indicating that FW PvP kills have increased since the patch.

He then opened the floor to questions from the CSM, and tried to answer them by directly querying his analytical tools. Some highlights:

\* In the past 2 years, the average active player's wallet has increased from 290M ISK to 620M ISK, and the total in these wallets exceeds 460T ISK. Two step expressed concern that this meant that, for example, ships were becoming cheaper relative to a player's wealth, and thus were not as meaningful -- and that the game was thus getting easier. Dr.EyjoG noted that this may be the case for older players, but

things were still as tough as ever for new players [without a rich uncle or using a PLEX]. Two step repeated his concern that, in particular for experienced players, losses were not as meaningful. Dr.EyjoG replied that such concerns were a balancing issue, not an economic one. Two step noted that while increases in wealth were a good RL metric for success, the same may not be the case for a game like EVE.

Hans: I want it in the minutes that I do care about losses.

Trebor: This demonstrates that you [Two step] have no concept of how the 47% live. You 1% space-rich bastards who think nothing of conspicuously consuming entire fleets...

Alek noted that battles happen that consume more ISK than he has made in his entire career, and people don't seem to feel the loss.

UAxDEATH: If you look at things from the perspective of a coalition, a trillion ISK is fucking pocket change. We don't even blink twice.

Two step: My concern isn't about the 1%, it's that the 1% is now the 10% or 15% or 20%, and next year it'll be 30% and you'll have even fewer people that care about losses.

This philosophical discussion continued for a few more minutes, until, much to the relief of Dr.EyjoG, the topic returned to a hard, quantifiable and exact science -- economics.

Dr.EyjoG repeated his statement from FanFest 2012 that the sinks and faucets in the game are not correct (which is relevant to the previous discussion) and pulled up a chart demonstrating this. By far the largest faucet in the game is NPC Bounty Prizes, at over 30T ISK/month. The biggest sink is Skill Books, at a mere 6T ISK/month.

Total ISK in the game totals about 600T, of which a little over 400T is held by active characters.

Two step: How much of that ISK is Seleene's?

Elise asked about income-generation in Null-sec, in particular how Alliances are making money. Were they making most of their money from Moon-goo, for example? Dr.EyjoG was unable to pull up the data required to answer this question, but said he would research it if the CSM believed it was important.

Trebor: We would definitely like to get some econometric data on passive vs. active income.

Alek noted that Technetium income was not a faucet, but did represent a transfer of wealth. Dr.EyjoG commented that this increases the velocity of money in the system. Alek reiterated that Tech is wildly unbalanced and needs to be addressed quickly.

UAxDEATH: Yes, but there must be something like farms-and-field [to replace it].

Dr.EyjoG: That's where I stop and Game Design takes over.

Trebor: Do you, as an economist, have a preference between passive and active sources of income?

Dr.EyjoG: Err... [long pause] It is difficult to split the Economist from the EVE player. As an EVE player, I want it to be active income. But looking at it holistically, you can't have a preference. Making people play 3 hours a day to [earn the money to] enjoy the game isn't right for everyone.

Trebor: OK, slice it a different way. Would you prefer individual income or income that goes to a group first [and then is distributed by the group]?

Dr.EyjoG: Anything that would encourage group activity would be preferable in my mind. [But what that is a balancing question]. I would want to reward people for grouping together to earn income.

Trebor: But my question is, is it preferable for the individuals to be getting their income by being part of the group, or the group to be getting income because it is the preference of the individuals to support the group?

Hellmar: This is not really an economic question, but the CCP philosophy would be to offer both, and let the preferred method be determined by the players in the game.

Two step: The question is, which is better: a point source of income [like a moon] or a number of individuals mining moon-goo and being taxed?

Hellmar: Our philosophy is to have no preference. If there is an imbalance in the game, then that would need to be fixed.

Hans: So if [the individual strategy is nonviable, then...]

Hellmar: If there is a single, obvious winning strategy, then [we would address it].

\* High-sec mining volume is almost 8x that of Null-sec, which is itself more than 10x that of W-Space.

\* Total PvP kills has increased significantly over the past 12 months.

\* High-sec and Low-sec account for slightly more than 50% of all PvP kills.

\* Kills of Capital Ships and Control Towers have sharply risen over the past 6 months, after a significant decline in the first half of 2012.

\* 2012 was a bad year to be a frigate pilot, which represented a significantly larger fraction of all explosions.

\* For reasons that are left as an exercise to the reader, Exhumers are now blowing up at historically low rates.

Dr.EyjoG ended the meeting by stating that from an economic perspective, in 2012 the economy demonstrated growth and stability, and CCP demonstrated that it has the tools to properly monitor it. In 2013, he looks forward to a robust economy with many new players -- which he affectionately referred to as "cannon fodder" -- upon which the veterans could feed.



## EVE Marketing

Present: CCP Ingo, CCP Manifest

Ingo introduced himself as the Global Brand Director of EVE Online and mentioned he'd be showing CSM some things he hasn't shown outside the company; Seleene encouraged him to "show us some things you haven't shown the company". Laughter ensued.

Ingo provided a short history of his involvement with CCP. For the pre-launch of EVE he was a "friend of the company" meaning he worked with a company that was closely related to CCP and knew people who worked there. He played the Massively Multiplayer Mining Simulator in 2003, and in 2005 wrote his Master Thesis about CCP and its customer equity. He officially started in CCP Marketing in early 2006 and after a few movements around the company, ended up in his current position October 2012.

His role is to acquire new users, retain current users, re-acquire lost users, and find added value.

Ingo showed CSM several graphs detailing how long users have played EVE, activities users engage with regularly and what features they have tried and their sentiments towards those features. Other graphs were thrown in as well – with specifics that cannot be made public. It should be noted that this portion was very detailed.

When talking about subscriber numbers, Ingo noted that one of his challenges was tying all of the features together with new subscribers as well as old ones. He's not just selling the game, he's also focusing on who current players are, how to retain them, and how to bring new players to the game as well. "It's a delicate balance".

Ingo opened the floor for questions at this point.

Greene Lee asked about the balance between sales and current players and whether new players are invited by older players. Ingo replied that such referrals are an important source of new players.

Greene Lee asked about the communication strategy about future features, criticizing CCP, saying that there isn't enough communication on their end. Ingo said that CCP absolutely needed to be working with their community, and in his view, the community is one of their core values. Greene Lee says that more focus on older players is necessary, saying that ignoring one of their best marketing tools is not a good thing.

Ingo replied that he agreed completely. They currently only plan 3-6 months ahead of time, and are working towards looking further into the future, implementing a similar philosophy to what Unifex and Seagull described in their recent devblog.

Greene Lee commented that CCP should give a discount to people paying a year at a time, but there's no discounts for anyone that has, say, 20 accounts. Ingo said that there are some ideas in the works but nothing is currently promised. CCP is working on the "master account" concept and may tie some discounts in with that.

Two step stated that some sort of "Power of Two" discount for reactivating an old account would be well received, rather than having to start a brand new account. Seleene emphasized the value of having discounts for accounts past the first. Ingo says that sort of thing CCP has to be very careful with since it could be easily abused, but they are looking into something along those lines.

Seleene: (looking hopeful) "So it'll be announced at FanFest?"

Ingo said that he wants to do a "Power of Two"-ish type of offer. He then asked what the CSM thinks about someone paying for 6 months of account time, and receiving 3 months of subscription and 3m SP; the CSM all said "No" very quickly, noting it would be perceived as "Pay to Win". UAxDEATH suggested having a month-long skill queue instead for alt accounts. Trebor said going to the community and asking (about any of these ideas) is required, so as not to start down a slippery slope.

UAxDEATH asked if CCP has statistics on how many alts each "solo" player has. Ingo said he could pull it from the raw data, but he doesn't have it handy. UAxDEATH said that solo players aren't a part of the community and narrative of EVE, and asked if CCP is actively trying to pull them into the social part of EVE. Ingo said it's a chicken and egg thing, but getting players into player corps goes a long way towards achieving that goal. UAxDEATH noted that pulling people into the social side generally equates into more accounts for CCP through the needs for alts.

Trebor asked for numbers on attrition rates broken down by character age and activity or milestones (e.g.: "has joined a player corp").

Ingo says that they have this and are watching those indicators but they are not useful on their own. It is also important to give players the right tools to mobilize and give them goals to work towards; then the "instigators" will start to generate their own content.

Two step asked if CCP monitors what percentages of players type into chat, send EVE Mails, post on the forums, and are active players as a method of being a bit more scientific in data collection. Ingo said they've looked into it. More informed metrics could paint a clearer picture into who is *actually* a social player doing solo activities.

Hans asked if seeing some activities that were often done but not enjoyed causes CCP to realize that people are being forced into doing things. Ingo stated that this could be taken as a message to make what they're doing more fun.

Seleene asked about what Ingo's thoughts are on rewarding long term players -- those who have played for 3, 5 or even more years. Manifest said that the Community team's job is a mix of letting people know what's going on in the game, player gatherings and other things that veteran players take part in. Manifest said they're accelerating player gatherings and putting more focus into increasing their exposure.

Alek suggested that finding more ways to market in game, and suggested that using billboards would be a good thing. Manifest said that there may be a technical issue with the billboard code, but they're looking into it. But Community understands it's an important aspect of marketing.

A brief discussion ensued about PLEX versus Aurum; PLEX crosses the in-game/out of game line very cleanly. It does one thing and it's very clear what it does. Aurum does not, it's very blurry and not well

understood why Aurum works the way it does and is bound to your character. A “Bounty Button” on the forums might also cross that boundary in an unclear way as well.

Two step went on to say that EVE tends to intrude into our real lives a lot more than other games as well. One of the things people want is better access to EVE from more devices, and better integration to make these interactions easier. Seleene said that CCP should really adopt the “EVE Offline” meme as a real thing.

Hans asked about the EVE expansion schedule of two major expansions a year, inquiring about possibly breaking it into more smaller releases, or one really large expansion a year with another smaller “Crucible style” expansion later. Ingo said this is a delicate balance, but he works with Game Design on releases and if they convince him sacrificing the short term is worth it for the long term, they’ll go ahead with it. Marketing and Game Design work together on planning out what is going to make it into expansions. Crucible focused more on retention whereas Apocrypha was more on acquisition.

Seleene raised the issue of the Battle Recorder, and did not miss the opportunity to attempt to inflict this Sisyphean labor upon the broad shoulders of Veritas. Two step agreed that players having the ability to tell their stories is “huge”. The CSM unanimously agrees that letting the players do a ton of marketing for CCP in this regard would be well worth it.

Ingo agreed completely, saying that he would really like a lot of his duties in marketing to be done “automatically” so that he can maybe focus on other things he’d like to do in the company.

Kelduum (via Lync) said that Planetside 2 has a button to upload to YouTube and stream to Twitch automatically, just built right in and they get tons of YouTube videos. [Editor's note: Kelduum is now part of the Planetside 2 team at Sony Online Entertainment]

Seleene said a built-in “Fraps” would be amazing, and Two step added that a way to remove the UI would be helpful.

Kelduum said that allowing players access to “Jessica” (the tool used to create EVE trailers) would be appreciated, because it is so powerful.

In closing, Seleene stated again that Ingo should absolutely have Veritas start on a Battle Recorder.

## Customer Loyalty

Present: CCP Gargant, CCP Alice, CCP Navigator

The meeting began with Xhagen introducing his little brother Gargant, who is bigger than he is. The CSM noted with sadness that Xhagen is no longer Iceland's largest land-mammal.

The CSM was then given an overview of the CCP Subscriber Reward Program, which is currently under development. It is important to remember that nothing is set in stone at this point.

The goal of the program is, of course, increased revenue, and the plan is to achieve this through four main opportunities; loyalty rewards, marketing chances, player engagement and continuous excitement. This is intended to be a continuous process.

Gargant noted that programs such as this involve many competing interests, such as new vs. old players, players with single accounts vs. multiple accounts, and so on. One of the most significant of these is the tension between providing exciting rewards and not introducing items that are overpowered.

The program will have two pillars: fixed milestone awards and flexible token awards. The fixed awards will be provided to all accounts based on account age, whereas the tokens will be awarded (including retroactively) at regular intervals, and then can be used to purchase unique items in a manner similar to the current ingame Loyalty Point system.

Examples of fixed milestones might be special badges or clothing items (hats!), whereas the tokens might be used to purchase special ships or ship variants. While milestones will be locked to specific accounts, the tokens, and the items they can buy, will be tradable in-game items.

UAxDEATH: Tattoos would be a good idea.

Alek: Forum badges should be awarded at 2 years of age or even more, otherwise they'll be too common.

Gargant: The time increments haven't been decided yet, but they will become exponentially more awesome.

Milestones are intended to be immaterial "bragging rights", and would be visible pretty much wherever account/character information is displayed. Players would always know what milestones they had achieved and what ones will be achieved in the near future. An Opt-in option will be provided, so that old players will be able to pose as newbies.

Trebor: On the other hand, if you don't provide that, old players who want to pretend to be noobs would have to pay you for another account...

Gargant: Some people would be very happy with that, others wouldn't. I know I wouldn't.

Trebor: Was that an implicit admission that you're a forum troll?

Navigator: He is the biggest.

Tiny: I am.

Alice: One possibility is that the account gets rewarded, but the visibility on a character is tied to the character's birthday.

Some more examples of milestones were provided. In-game: Portrait enhancement, fixed evolving medal system, billboard notifications, and a monument with character names. Out-of-game: Forum badges and website ticker. External: API and Newsletter. Real-Life perks: FanFest VIP access, EVE store items.

Hans expressed concern that if milestone monuments were implemented before a (community-proposed) monument to players who have passed on, it would not be well received. Navigator noted that if such a monument was placed in-game, it would not have player names on it, because it is very difficult to verify who should be on it.

Trebor: I like the billboard notification on birthdays. Also, if you get blown up on your birthday, the bounty payout should be double. "It's Elise's birthday. Show him that you care. Go kill him".

[laughter]

Alice: Perhaps on your character birthday, your forum portrait could have a birthday cake.

Moving to Token Rewards, these would be paid on a regular basis, perhaps monthly, to each account, be tradable in game, used for Loyalty items, and designed to benefit both veterans and new players.

Navigator: There are many things we could put in the store; what do you think should be in there?

Trebor: Are you thinking just vanity items, or items that would have special abilities?

Navigator: There's no restrictions on this.

Trebor: It occurs to me that there should be a difference between tokens I myself have earned on an account, and those I have obtained on the market. There should be some items that are only available using the earned tokens; I shouldn't be able to use tokens bought on the market for them. So there should be items such that, if you haven't been playing for 5 years, you simply can't get it.

Navigator: So, bound items?

Trebor: Yeah, I guess there would be problems with that, and such items being sold on the aftermarket. But maybe items that are only available if you saved up, and that can't be used if the character isn't old enough.

Gargant: That's sort of what we were going for with the Milestones vs. Tokens.

Trebor: Good point. But I still think there should be some items you can't get or use unless you're old enough.

Navigator: Personally, I'm not a fan of tradable tokens. I bring it up because I want it discussed, but I'm not a fan.

Gargant: I on the other hand, am strongly in favor of tokens.

The CSM was split over whether or not they were a good idea. Alek, for example, felt that non-tradable tokens would provide an incentive to continue playing the game. UAxDEATH disagreed, pointing out that the ability to sell the tokens provides value to long-term players and more options to new players.

UAxDEATH suggested a tangible benefit for players with multiple accounts would be discounts on subscription costs. He mentioned that at one time he had 90 accounts, but since becoming a CSM he has cut back to only 37, and asked "what would inspire me to [reactivate] those accounts?"

Alek: Why not give 5% off after 5 years?

Trebor: Why would you give a discount to hopelessly addicted crack-whores?

UAxDEATH: If they got a discount, they'd have more accounts.

Trebor: Most long-term players have 3-4 accounts, they're not strange people like you with 90 accounts.

Navigator: What discount would keep you playing?

Trebor: If you want to do something like that, it should be "if you're paying for 3 accounts, you get the 4th one free".

Gargant: This approach rewards people for having multiple accounts; if you have 5 accounts, you'd get 5 tokens per period.

Navigator: I would be OK with them being tradable between someone's accounts, just not to different people.

An extended discussion of various combinations of milestones, tokens, and items only usable by characters of a certain age ensued. It was clear that there were many possible combinations that might achieve the goals CCP wants for this program.

Navigator noted that the Loyalty program could be used to encourage desired player behavior; for example, players might get an extra token each month if they were a member of a player corporation. The CSM thought this was an interesting and good idea.

Alice raised the possibility of providing rewards based on in-game activity -- for example, getting tokens for reaching milestones in the game like a certain number of kills. The CSM encouraged CCP to consider these kind of activity-based rewards, such as an extra token in any month where the player had a the final blow on a killmail.

Navigator: Another possibility would be extra remaps for tokens, as long as the cost escalates every time you buy one.

Hans suggested another possibility would be skillpoint respects.

Navigator noted that it would be very important to ensure that the initial rollout of this program contains options that the players really want. We don't want it to be another NeX store.

Greene Lee asked if CCP had specific research that was driving this program, as opposed to just thinking it was a good idea.

Gargant stated that the idea was the result of a task-force inside the company working on ideas to reward players who had stuck with the game, but it soon expanded into something that would also provide benefits for newer players.

Navigator: And also, to reward people for engaging with the game as opposed to spinning their ship.

Xhagen: We do things to entice people back to the game, but we don't do anything for the people who have stuck with us.

Alice: You're not going to stay just because you get a token every month, but it's something we can do to build brand loyalty, which is invaluable. This is icing on the cake.

Alek suggested that the rewards be mostly targeted at medium- to long-term subscribers.

There was a short discussion of various ways this program might be exploited if it were not carefully designed, and then the meeting concluded with the CSM stating that they looked forward to taking another look at the program when it was more fleshed-out.

## The EVE / Dust 514 Link - Part 1

Present: CCP LeKjart, CCP Jian, CCP Nullarbor, CCP Unifex, Adam Khan, Alex Brewer

LeKjart started the session by providing a general overview of the state of the Dust 514 project. The bulk of recent work has focused on updating the technology infrastructure to allow Dust 514 to be moved onto Tranquility. Refactoring the Dust 514 code into Tranquility will allow the developers to do "pretty much whatever they want" in terms of feature development. LeKjart expressed that to him, the shared server and code infrastructure is itself the EVE / Dust 514 "link," and that now they can gradually begin building surface-level features that allow the two games to interact. He'd like to move away from the features themselves being described as "the EVE / Dust 514 link." The first of these features are the shared corporation and chat channels, as well as the orbital bombardment mechanism, both elements that are built into Chromosome, the latest Dust 514 build on Singularity.

LeKjart went on to explain that while the first implementation of planetary control effects in Factional Warfare may not be as robust as they would like, the challenge the team is currently working on is to help the Dust 514 players form a better understanding where they fit into the universe in terms of influence. LeKjart identified the current map as the primary issue, and said that work is being done to come up with a more functional map that better visually expresses how the Dust 514 mercs are contributing to the progress of EVE wars.

LeKjart: One question is, do we replicate the whole corporation functionality in Dust? Is it meaningful? Is it useful? For most Dust players, they will never have to interact with a lot of the systems in EVE, so why would we want to create the entire user interface for that on the console to try to manage that?

LeKjart went on to explain that the creation of the new map for Dust 514 will be the first building block for more meaningful interaction between the two games, with Factional Warfare bringing benefits to Dust players once the map is there to inform them.

Seleene: Alright, first question. What's your release road map?

Jian answered that Chromosome was about to be released onto Singularity, and contained the Orbital Bombardment system that LeKjart had referenced. CCP's release cadence was averaging once every three months for major build updates, with the capability of smaller content uploads that don't require Sony approval that add things like new maps and new weapons and new game modes to Singularity in between the major releases.

Two step and Seleene jointly asked if Chromosome was the open beta. Jian clarified that open beta will begin when CCP moves Chromosome from Singularity over onto Tranquility. This should take place in mid-late January.

Hans: So for a player like me that's in Faction Warfare, what game play can I expect? Is Chromosome going to enable the Dust 514 troops to affect planetary control? Right now those values are fixed, will they become not fixed as of Chromosome?

Nullarbor replied that the current Dust 514 build on Singularity allows Dust 514 corps to set up corp battles that end up governing the control of militia-owned districts in Faction Warfare systems.



Two step asked if turning on planetary control when Dust 514 migrates to Tranquility will require an EVE patch. Nullarbor explained that as the two began to integrate, there will be downtimes for one game that might be an update for the other, but that this particular switching-on of FW planet control shouldn't require an EVE-specific patch.

Unifex added that while there were certain things to be done to prepare for the migration to open beta, like the seeding of orbital bombardment items for EVE ships, the migration itself will not be hailed as the big launch of the two interconnected games. There will be a downtime, and a small client patch for EVE, but it won't be a Retribution-sized feature launch.

Hans: So if we're a month away from Dust mercenaries affecting our Faction Warfare zones, what I'm most curious about is the game play design itself. I wish I could tell you right now what the value of Dust troops is to Faction Warfare pilots. There's an understanding amongst the players I've spend time with in the beta that they are mercenaries, they are being paid to do stuff. Players are having a tough time adjusting to the real sense of loss (which I feel is one of the values of Dust as a game, that you lose your stuff when you die) but the big issue is that everyone is talking money. They want to know when EVE players will be paying for their tanks to fight, and how they will be paying.

What is your game play design for how we finance what players are calling mercenaries, because it's sounding more like they aren't mercenaries, but actually militia ground troops. I think the difference between a militia ground troop and a mercenary is really significant both from a sci-fi universe perspective but also from a game play design perspective. I haven't heard any concrete answers so far on how that has developed.

Nullarbor replied that when Dust 514 launches, there will be no economic link or ISK flow between the two games, and that this was a very carefully considered decision. He also explained that while Dust 514 players can influence Faction Warfare, they themselves would not be influenced by EVE players initially. EVE's Faction Warfare pilots are welcome to befriend Dust 514 groups and persuade them to fight for their side, but there will be no direct payment. As for the Dust 514 troops, they are mercenaries being paid by the militia NPC groups, who will be setting up the initial contracts. There won't be any way for EVE players to finance Dust 514 troops, but this was certainly one of the long-term goals in terms of the way the games influence each other.

Jian: We fully intend to open up the economic link between the two, it's just not part of this first step that we are taking. It's something that we're looking at more for the following release, having all the mechanisms in place for financial flow between the two of them.

Hans: And I can understand the safety thing, the piecemeal rollouts, but my question then becomes not how are WE paying the Dust mercs, but I want to know how are the NPC corporations are paying the Dust mercs. What does this mean for a Dust 514 merc? Why do I care? Why would I choose Minmatar vs. Amarr? How am I being paid?

LeKjart explained that for a Dust 514 merc, who may or may not know anything about Faction Warfare, from a game design point of view the payment model was essentially a betting system. One corporation lays down a million ISK, and challenges another to do the same. Winner takes all. "It's a zero sum game, in that sense."

Unifex: "The NPC's create contracts which represent battles in militia districts. And mercenary organizations can say, 'I'm going to put up this amount of money to take this contract'."

Nullarbor added that they can pick any side they wish, but that there was no financial incentive to pick one side or another.

Kelduum: OK, really quickly here, just so I have this straight in my head – there's no actual ISK flow between EVE players and Dust players....at all?

LeKjart clarified that in the end, the goal was to have complete ISK flow between the two games, including shared corporate wallets. Concerns exist about the initial "tsunami" of wealth from an economy with trillions of ISK. At one point during the beta, players figured out how to transfer money by accident and there was instantly billions of ISK flooding the Dust 514 economy. This created havoc for the game designers trying to watch the balancing unfold in the testing. The decision was made to close that pipeline initially, and open it up gradually through controlled wallet-to-wallet transfers that could be ratcheted up with time (or shut down in case of emergency). The issue, LeKjart explained, was not design opposition to having a unified economy but merely the problem-solving related to the rollout.

Hans: Do you have a game play design for how us as Faction Warfare pilots , or anyone in EVE really, pay Dust mercs? I mean you have gambling right now between two corps, you have two random entities gambling and affecting my universe, does this then become gambling between two EVE corps?

LeKjart replied that eventually EVE players will be able to place contracts that can be accepted by Dust mercs, using the collateral-as-payment betting system previously described.

Hans: So how than do you determine how often a match takes place? And where it takes place?

LeKjart explained that in the current implementation, an AI in the server essentially selects districts in Factional Warfare space that the contracts will be assigned to.

Hans: So it's random?

Nullarbor: It's semi-random. If you really want to, you can pick a particular area of space and keep asking for offers, and you'll probably get one. The design is sort of like you're going to the militia commander and saying 'what work do you have for this sort of price range?' so people can ask for different prices and it has to be matched on the other side. The logical progression from that as an NPC-controlled system, designed primarily from Dust's point of view, to one where EVE can be affected, is where EVE players can put up the contracts, perhaps with a pooling type system where you can put some more money in to up the bounty by winning a particular district on a particular planet.

Two step asked if Dust 514 corps enlist in a particular militia, and Nullarbor replied that they don't in fact pick sides. Two step followed by asking about the Dust 514 players that are part of a corp participating in Faction Warfare, and whether they could essentially fight for the other side.

Nullarbor: That's right.

Hans: Everything seems so arbitrary in the meantime. It's arbitrary for them to select a particular contract, it's an arbitrary decision for us to care [about a Dust battle].

Alek: Well why would they care? If they can take any side and aren't attached to anything, are they actually going to impact the warzone control thing? Where is that going?

Two step: Basically it's a dude in the corner, rolling a die. I could randomly choose who wins this match, and it would be affecting the militias in space.

Hans reiterated that he didn't understand why a Dust player would care about the outcome of a match, and that even as of the Chromosome release he questioned the value of any of this interaction to the Dust players.

Seleene: I'm more concerned about the value to an EVE player, at the moment.

Seleene asked further that while this was being rolled out initially in Faction Warfare, in some fashion, would the progression of talks that the CSM had earlier with CCP Soundwave suggest that Dust 514 would see a similar rollout of 0.0 – related features, so that 0.0 efforts were being made in tandem across both games?

Jian: This is a great question, I'll make a couple of comments here. This question of 'Why do I care?' In the beginning, we've been working on the systems, to make sure things are working well, so they don't cause calamity on TQ. All of these things you're extrapolating in terms of meaningful reward mechanisms and ways to affect them are all ideas that we have in place. The point is, we first want to deploy this and make sure everything works from a technical perspective and game play perspective, so that it all functions fine. Adding things that would then have a fairly significant impact between the two is not the hard part of this work, per se. It's really been about laying the foundations for this, and then layering that in, partially through these conversations with yourselves.

For example corporations, which we've baby-stepped into – we had a big conversation about it last [summit] with [the CSM], and we took the feedback from that conversation and implemented it pretty much precisely as we all met it out to – shared corporations, with different controls on the EVE side and the Dust side, so that it's not insane to try to manage a Dust corporation, as a Dust player. We're going to take a similar approach with this other stuff, as we layer in ways to specifically affect it.

Buy-in to a militia – and that was what Kjartan was explaining earlier with the star map, right now there is no real visualization of this faction owning this part of the universe or that faction owning that part of the universe, so the star map is being prioritized as a way to be the main way a Dust 514 player interacts with the universe. With having that system, then an affinity to a particular faction makes a lot of sense. Right now we've introduced all of the foundational systems that can affect these things. We have, as you know, removed stuff that creates intense reward impact, for you guys to engage with it.

It's a continuation of beta, just now on TQ. And then we're going to test that out, and have continued conversations with you about what rewards we're considering. We should absolutely commit to a conversation around that, because we do have some specific designs regarding rewards that we can discuss with you guys in terms of how we make this meaningful. And that's the approach we're taking with this. A lot of this comes from lessons we've learned in the closed beta to date.

Two step asked why the need was felt to go open beta at all at this point. Jian reiterated that they needed to get this onto Tranquility and make sure everything was working properly as soon as possible, which means postponing the type of gameplay decisions that could potentially break the EVE universe.

Nullarbor: It's worth remembering that this Tranquility release is not a big game play "link" release. We never intended it to be.

Jian added that it'll still have some notable features that are brand new to Tranquility if not to the beta community, such as Orbital bombardment and FW planetary control.

Nullarbor went on to explain that next up was finishing the map initiative, which is necessary so that Dust mercs can actually see the impact they're having, and after that the designs that are currently in place regarding low sec would start to be phased in. Nullarbor briefly touched on these designs, citing corporate ownership and "configuration" of planetary districts, some interaction with PI, and also mentioned a new resource - clones – which would then become a commodity item for EVE traders.

Nullarbor: A lot of this is going to grow organically, we're not necessarily designing very complicated systems of contracts and such to facilitate that. Just being able to have ISK flow, and to have that state of visualization on the state of the world, and to be able to influence the state of the world, than we'll finally be able to see the start of some of these more meaningful interactions between an EVE corp and a Dust corp. And that's slated for release once we're over this technical monster of the problem of getting it onto Tranquility. We're going to be extremely busy just making sure everything's not on fire first. Once that's sorted, our focus is going to be right back onto the game play element.

Unifex followed up Two step's question about why the need was felt to move to open beta, and Unifex explained that the NDA is simply impossible to enforce across the hundreds of thousands of EVE players that will be exposed to it once they begin laying these foundations on Tranquility. Thus the beta will be opened despite the lack of large scale media launch for the fully integrated universe of games, which would come later.

The CSM expressed concerns to CCP about the move of DUST to Tranquility and into Open Beta which cannot be detailed further at this time.

Jian responded by assuring again that the initial Chromosome migration to Tranquility did have substantial game play elements, citing the shared corporations and the orbital bombardment mechanism, as well as the slight effect on Faction Warfare warzone control mechanics. Emphasizing that the technical foundation must always precede changes in the surface game play, Jian explained that this would be the release pattern for all Tranquility updates moving forward. The underlying systems would be built into the server, and once performance was verified, game play would be deepened as the next step.

Two step quickly clarified that the concern here wasn't the lack of sufficient features for the initial rollout, but more so the fact that participation in the link felt very arbitrary for Dust players. Two step suggested that Dust corps be locked into accepting contracts from only one militia of their choice, and also suggested that Dust players benefit in some way from the Faction Warfare warzone control rewards, such as receiving higher pay for winning a contract. Hans strongly agreed, emphasizing that Dust 514 troops benefitting from territorial control would be "a fabulous idea".

Hans then made the Dust 514 team the offer to "drop everything in the next month" and focus on brainstorming and hammering out some of the design details over Skype meetings if the team was willing to open up more with the CSM and work together to solve these problems quickly and ensure that warzone status was actually relevant to Dust 514 players during the open beta period.

Nullarbor reiterated again that it wasn't about lack of designs in place for these reward mechanisms, it was about the need for the star map to help players visualize warzone control before they could be allowed or encouraged to affect it.

Hans: That is one of the smartest moves your team has made so far, prioritizing work on the star map.

LeKjart agreed that while it was indeed important for Dust 514 players to be able to see the warzone and choose a contract based on strategic value, he then asked if Hans would find it useful to have the option to designate (as an EVE player) where the next battle would take place.

Hans: Oh, yes, certainly!

LeKjart: That would be the simpler change.

Two step countered that while it did make EVE players feel more in control over the situation, it didn't solve the problem of the outcome of the match being a gamble essentially. EVE players could pick the system, but not finance the troops, and thus it still boiled down to a coin-flip victory scenario.

Jian then took a moment to explain that some possibilities existed to implement more of these deeper interactions between the two games earlier in the process, and that he'd be happy to schedule more meetings with the design team to follow up on these discussions in the days after the summit. He also offered his personal email address to the CSM to expedite communications moving forward.

Alekseyev Karrde once again expressed concern that waiting several months after the Tranquility release to implement the deeper connection between the two games was a risky course of action, and pointed out that while Jian and the team kept trying to reassure the CSM that the plans existed for more meaningful gameplay, they weren't being articulated very well during this session as many of the CSM members were still confused about the specifics. Nullarbor acknowledged the CSM's concerns about the initial Tranquility launch of Chromosome, but stated again that this was a transferal of the beta to a new server, and not the true Dust launch. Nullarbor also emphasized the free-to-play console sales model and the fact that Dust 514 has arguably the deepest customization system of any shooter on the market. And while the EVE link is one of the shiniest bullet points on the feature set, getting the beta working on Tranquility smoothly with a much larger audience simply had to be the team's priority at the moment.

Nullarbor also expressed appreciation for the feedback about marketing strategy, and acknowledged there was merit in sharing more information about the following expansion as close to the Tranquility transfer as possible, so that players were left with clear expectations about what would be coming to them and in what order.

Two step recommended that they just disable the link between the two games entirely upon transferring the beta onto Tranquility (and just allowing for normal matchmaker random sessions), and wait until they had something more substantial ready to deploy before enabling it. Seleene noted that this was Two step's opinion, but Alek countered that he didn't disagree with Two step's recommendation either.

CCP Manifest reassured the CSM again saying that it was a good thing the CSM was keenly focused on expectation management and explained that the marketing department had a strong handle on the game design roll out plans and would be taking the time to address this issue carefully, and encouraged the CSM to keep the honest feedback coming in throughout the launch of the open beta.

Alek warned again that marketing played a part in the Incarna situation too, trying to cover for the lack of game play by emphasizing the technical hurdles to be cleared with a limited-scope initial release of the

feature. Alekseyev Karrde noted that despite the promise of a phased release, it still didn't end up resonating with the players.

Seleene began wrapping up the session by stressing that the CSM planned to take Jian up on his offer for some in-depth follow up meetings regarding the unresolved game play questions. Hans noted that the CSM has established a reputation for 48-hour turnaround times in providing detailed feedback on anything CCP asked about, and that they would be happy to contribute to the Dust 514 design process in any way needed.

Hans: Look, this shit is super exciting and interesting to me, I want to know more. That's why I'm asking these questions - it's not just to be an angry dick, but because this is one of the most amazing things I've ever seen in video game design and we on the CSM simply want to be a part of these conversations.

Nullarbor mentioned that it might be worthwhile to set up a presentation where CCP can review its designs for the release following Chromosome, and Jian once again thanked the CSM for its honesty and offered to help facilitate more frequent and open communication in any way possible.

## The EVE / Dust 514 Link - Part 2

Present: CCP LeKjart, CCP Xhagen, CCP Manifest

As LeKjart shuffled through the slides, attempting to get the sharing feature working with the conferencing technology, Hans noted that it appeared the CSM was about to see exactly what they suspected may not exist as of the last meeting with the Dust team, and thanked LeKjart for being willing to take the time and come back and catch them up to speed.

LeKjart began the presentation by jumping right into an explanation of the current incarnation of the NPC contract system used to set up Dust 514 battles that will dictate the planetary control for Faction Warfare. Essentially the system is driven by NPC "militia commanders" that post up contracts for battles over various planetary districts. Dust 514 leaders will go into the contract marketplace and select a contract within their chosen price range. Contracts are either for attacking or defending a district, depending on which faction currently controls it. In either case, the corporations accepting the contract on behalf of the opposing militias would each put up collateral according to the contract cost, which is then awarded to the winner of the battle. Dust corporations would not be limited to a particular faction when accepting a contract.

Two step asked about the method used to generate contracts, LeKjart explained that it was an AI generating a pool of contracts, and then many contracts will go unanswered, allowing players to cherry-pick which systems they want to influence by accepting a particular contract. LeKjart acknowledged that the AI was a bit rudimentary and would likely need to be iterated on as things evolve.

Xhagen explained that these corporate contracts were not the only way Dust players can find matches, there is also an instant-match option for participating in random highsec battles.

Alek asked about the player corporations that are already participating in Faction Warfare within EVE, and how they work with these NPC contracts. LeKjart replied that he wasn't sure from memory whether or not a Faction Warfare corp would be forbidden from accepting a contract from the enemy militia. Hans, Two step, and Alek simultaneously urged LeKjart to look into this matter specifically and make sure such restrictions existed ahead of time. LeKjart explained again that it was strange to ask a player to join a particular faction, without having the mini-map ready that enabled players to see what that meant exactly, and so the decision was made to allow any dust corp to accept any contract for the time being.

LeKjart elaborated that Dust corps could sift through the contract offers until they found a system they were interested in attacking, and once a contract was accepted, there would be a timer (much like a POS or POCO timer) that would count down until the match begins, giving each corp an opportunity to prepare and seek help from EVE players via orbital bombardment.

Two step asked if players would be gaining skillpoints along with ISK during the corporation battles like they do during the random matches, LeKjart replied that no, they would not for the time being. ISK is the only reward currently. Alek remarked that this seemed like a strange design decision, to which LeKjart explained that there were a few situations identified where the system for earning skillpoints could be gamed. Alek quickly pointed out that this would be a major disadvantage to the corporate warfare system, which he assumed was the main selling point of the game.

LeKjart added that while actively accrued skillpoints were what presented the farming threat, the possibility existed to accrue passive skillpoints for each battle, but that the amount would be much lower. Alek again reiterated that it was very strange to incentivize random matches and not the organized, interactive corporate battles. Two step asked if there was a minimum collateral size for these NPC contracts, countering with the notion that if the ISK reward were sufficiently high enough, it would be effective enough at driving participation with or without an additional skill point reward.

Moving onto orbital bombardment, LeKjart began to explain that mechanism was relatively simple. EVE ships can lock onto districts just like they could any other object in space, and orbital strikes would be launched using special ammo that fit into the range of small turrets:

Tactical EMP S – projectile ammo that only deals damage to shields in a widespread area

Tactical Hybrid S – hybrid ammo that deals massive pinpoint damage

Tactical Laser S – frequency crystal that deals fairly precise continuous damage

Damage would be scaled according to the number of turrets on the ship firing as part of the orbital strike, so destroyers would make the ideal orbital bombardment platform since they can fit the full rack of 8 guns.

Alek asked if the districts could fire back at the EVE ships, LeKjart said not at this time. Alek cackled maniacally at this news.

Alek: Hahahahaha, I'm gonna toast them!

LeKjart went on to explain that there were two types of orbital bombardment – one that came from the war barge and was a fully NPC mechanism, and the more destructive version that would drop from EVE ships. There were also plans for an even more advanced iteration upon bombardment that would be worked on in the future.

Alek asked what the counter was to having an EVE player drop these strikes down on your head during the match.

LeKjart: The counter is to attack the ship in space.

Alek: With what?

Two step: Another EVE ship.

Elise Randolph: If you don't think that a ship sitting alongside a planet isn't going to get shot by other EVE ships...

Hans: That's the best part of all this, is a bunch of destroyers sitting next to planets trying to talk to Dust players distracted while trying to figure out comms and the like, I'm really looking forward to it.

Two step asked if Dust mercs were limited to how many bombardments they could fire, LeKjart confirmed that they were limited and purchased using accrued victory points. Hans explained that during a match, everyone on the team accumulates points based on various accomplishments like the seizing of objectives, and that these points unlocked the strikes to be called down by the squad leader, "like a killstreak reward in other FPSes, but shared".



LeKjart then proceeded to throw up a slideshow on the projector, which outlined the development plans for the Dust 514 build to follow Chromosome.

Further future information cannot be disclosed at this time.

LeKjart clarified that an important distinction between EVE and Dust 514 is that in Dust, items are generated as they are needed, rather than bought and stocked as they are in EVE Online. Thus, there isn't an actual hangar of items to be moved around, it is presumed that some sort of nano-tech on the warbarge builds items as they are needed to be dropped down to the planet. Thus, even if you've "purchased" items in preparation for a battle, they aren't actually instanced on the server until necessary for a match.

The NDA strikes again and disallows the details of the discussion to be made public.

In light of the added (but NDA-ed) information, Xhagen asked the group to step back for a moment and look at the overall picture, and asked if this was looking more concrete and meaningful than they had thought originally. Seleene responded by saying it was good and fine, but that he wanted to know when these ideas would be wrapped up in some form of document for public consumption. LeKjart replied that this probably wouldn't happen until the design was concrete and under production, so it would be unlikely to be released before the open beta was out and running for a while. Seleene pressed again, asking why this information needed to be kept from the public. Seleene noted that while it may be subject to change, right now the public has no idea that there is any kind of plan for the feature set to go into Dust 514 at all, and stressed the importance of expectation management.

LeKjart pointed out that on consoles, there isn't an expectation of a seed game being built upon using iterative expansions over time as CCP has with EVE's development. Two step urged LeKjart to start messaging this production model to the Dust community as soon as possible. Manifest added that everyone's fear of "If the release doesn't have this particular amount of features, it'll flop" may be overblown seeing as how Dust isn't like other console games where it will be expected to be 100% complete at the time it is declared "released". The community should look forward to each release and grow with time, as EVE Online has. Seleene took a moment to caution that these systems were complex and intricate enough that supporting documentation (preferably instructions in advance of release) would be critical – noting that when he first got a siege module, he had no idea it required Strontium to operate because it was so poorly discussed by the designers with the public.

Xhagen asked again if the CSM was still feeling that Dust 514 was vaporware despite the information shared in the session by LeKjart. Alek responded to Xhagen by explaining that despite all the CSM's hard-nosed questions, he was still left wondering how the two games were truly interacting. Alek emphasized that the development team needed an answer for how the FW corporations would be interacting with the FW contracts. They needed an answer for how the markets would be involved. They also needed an answer for the resources that would be spawning out of nowhere.

Alek: I guess what I'm wondering is that why, conceptually, are so many resources being spent on a map and stuff like that when these fundamental design questions feel to me like they have not been tackled?

Hans: They need the map, first and foremost, Greg [Alek]. No Dust player is going to have any concept of victory, success, progress, or any sense of accomplishment whatsoever, unless he can see a color go

from red to blue on a map. I will defend their decision to work on the map first. If you can't even see why your battle meant something that you actually did something, why would you care?

Alek responded that even if they can track their progress, that progress was still meaningless to them in the first place, given the feature set the CSM has been presented with so far. Hans responded that this is why the Dust 514 mercs enrolled in FW need to start gleaning benefits from warzone control as soon as possible. If Dust mercs see an immediate benefit to their wallet for fighting matches, they will be as interested in helping to advance territory as the EVE militias have been. Hans urged LeKjart to prioritize the design of benefits for Dust mercs based on FW warzone control, to be released either concurrently with or soon after the revamped map. Hans stated again that this whole system needs to be built on more than gambling by the time CCP makes its major marketing push with Dust 514. Alek heartily supported Hans's call for Dust 514 troop perks based on warzone control, adding that there needed to be incentives to participate in corporate warfare beyond just Faction Warfare.

## **Community Website Exercise**

Present: CCP Delegate Zero

Delegate Zero asked CSM to participate in a research exercise related to the structure and layout of a proposed new community website, focusing on top-level menu design.

## **Marketing Feedback Session**

Present: CCP Spitfire, CCP Doom, Lisa Bell-Cabrera

The CSM was asked to provide feedback about some proposed marketing initiatives. The contents of this session are covered under NDA.

## **Prototype Feedback Session**

Present: CCP Veritas, CCP Bayesian

The CSM was given the opportunity to test several early prototypes of a possible revision of existing gameplay mechanics. The contents of this session are covered under NDA.

## Summit Minutes Production Credits

### Initial Session Drafts

EVE Online in the next Decade	Hans Jagerblitzen
CSM as Stakeholder	Trebor Daehdoow
CSM Whitepaper & Election Systems	Trebor Daehdoow
Null-sec: Part 1	Elise Randolph
Null-sec: Part 2	Elise Randolph
Ship Balancing	Elise Randolph
Factional Warfare	Trebor Daehdoow
Bounty Hunting	Alekseyev Karrde
Mercenaries, Wars and Crimewatch	Hans Jagerblitzen
EVE UI	Kelduum Revaan
Live Events	Seleene
CREST	Two step
Out of Client	Two step
Player Experience	Kelduum Revaan
ART	Trebor Daehdoow
EVE Economy	Trebor Daehdoow
EVE Marketing	Dovinian
Customer Loyalty	Trebor Daehdoow
The EVE / Dust 514 Link - Part 1	Hans Jagerblitzen
The EVE / Dust 514 Link - Part 2	Hans Jagerblitzen

Note: EVE / Dust 514 sessions will be published separately at a later date.

### Session Editing

Trebor Daehdoow, Alekseyev Karrde, Hans Jagerblitzen, Two step, Seleene, Kelduum Revaan

### Final Minutes Assembly, Conformation and Proofreading

Trebor Daehdoow, Two step, Alekseyev Karrde, CCP Xhagen, CCP Manifest