

Meeting Minutes: 2009/12/20 18:18

## **Present**

*ElvenLord, Alekseyev Karrde, Zastrow, TeaDaze, Mrs Trzzbk, Korvin, Z0D, Song Li, Sokratesz, Helen Highwater (alt), T'Amber (alt)*

## **Absent**

*Farscape Hw (alt), Meissa Anunthiel (alt), Serenity Steele (alt)*

## **Discussion**

*ElvenLord* opened the meeting with a recap of the agenda.

- 1 Alliance Logos
- 2 Tradable Ban Lists
- 3 Black Ops Improvements, Part 2
- 4 FW complex NPCs and standings (Part 2)
- 5 FW Complex Spawning Issues Part 2
- 6 T2 sentry drone skill inconsistency
- 7 Docking games fix
- 8 Alter targeted ECM effect
- 9 Titan bridge range
- 10 Direct scan improvement
- 11 Bring Logistics Warp Speed In-Line with T2 Ships
- 12 Modular Starbase
- 13 Shared Corporation Bookmarks
- 14 Watch list & broadcasts
- 15 Broadcast "In position" improvement
- 16 Balance self-destruction

There was also a further list of topics earmarked for the next meeting that would be discussed if time allowed, but in the end they were not discussed.

### **1. Alliance Logos**

There was discussion over this being discussed again having already been raised by previous CSMs, however it was felt the lack of response from CCP required it to be looked at again. There were no objections to the topic.

**Passed 9/0**

## **2. Tradable Ban Lists**

There was a brief discussion about what a ban list was (ignored player list) and if this proposal was detailed enough as it stood.

*Zastrow* raised an objection about making it easy to ignore a whole alliance. *Alekseyev Karrde* agreed with *Zastrow* that if it becomes an alliance level animosity thing mass groups could be blocking other mass groups and just making the game a very unfriendly nasty place.

**Failed 6/3** (*ZOD, Song Li, Sokratesz*).

## **3. Black Ops Improvements, Part 2**

After a brief discussion it was agreed that blackops ships needed a serious buff to fulfil their primary role.

**Passed 9/0**

## **4. FW complex NPCs and standings (Part 2)**

It was agreed that it is an exploit that faction militia can be avoided (ignored) by players with high standings and that the NPCs they should use the militia flag instead.

**Passed 9/0**

## **5. FW Complex Spawning Issues Part 2**

It was agreed that the proposal promoted more fairness. *Korvin* raised an objection to the min and max number of plexs in system part of the proposal.

**Passed 9/0**

## **6. T2 sentry drone skill inconsistency**

*Sokratesz* made it clear the proposal have been edited to clarify the buff to T2 sentries since the first

iteration. The idea was to either give them the outright damage bonus from the T2 skill or make it apply some other relevant bonus like range, tracking or something else.

*ElvenLord* agreed with racial specialisations influencing T2 sentry drones *Helen Highwater* disagreed saying it seems like a change for change sake, adding that whilst not against rebalancing all drones just adjusting sentries while leaving other drones untouched doesn't make sense. *Alekseyev Karrde* agreed with the proposal stating the difficulty of use for non cap ship players which makes them niche. He felt a slight buff with a slight increase or at least redistribution of skills is a good thing.

*Korvin* stated that sentry drones were good enough with no need to boost them. *Sokratesz* stated sentry DPS is low compared to heavies and they cannot move obviously which is a rather harsh penalty, so that would be up for discussion. *Korvin* countered that they have instant DPS with no need to chase the target.

*TeaDaze* stated that the change cannot be taken in isolation; for example sentries are the only drones with a damage increasing rig. Also adding that to give extra benefit could upset their balance and changing their base damage downwards just so the skill can bring it back up is silly and that there are more important issues to be dealt with.

*Mrs Trzsbk* said they understood the concept, but didn't know if it's really necessary since T2 sentries already own pretty hard. Plus, the skill disparity between them and T2 heavies isn't like T2 guns VS T2 missiles.

*Helen Highwater* asked where is the evidence is that sentries are underpowered, stated that this proposal isn't based on statistics but on a preconception of 'tidiness' and agreed with *TeaDaze*. *Sokratesz* stated the difficulty with directly comparing heavies VS sentries and that there will be no hard numbers to support this either way due to them being different in essence.

*Alekseyev Karrde* interjected that he'd be comfortable with a tracking or range or XXX bonus if not a straight DPS one. He added that in the end, it's up to CCP to find the right balance and the CSM are just saying the direction they need to be looking in.

*Helen Highwater* said it was actually really easy to compare them by plotting a damage/time graph VS various target types, adding that comparing DPS VS DPS is not like trying to balance ewar drones with combat drones.

*Mrs Trzsbk* noted that everybody had an opinion on sentries, but that the proposal is too narrow. *Sokratesz* proposed to shorten this a bit to make the resolution: 'make the skills apply, but let CCP decide what kind of bonus they should get'.

*ElvenLord* called a vote on the changed proposal: "Make drone specializations apply but CCP decide on bonus"

**Proposal failed 5/4** (*ElvenLord*, *Alekseyev Karrde*, *ZOD*, *Sokratesz*)

The general feeling was the proposal was too narrow and a full review of drones would be better.

## 7. Docking games fix

*TeaDaze* suggested there was a better proposal raised which said that aggression would be held while people were shooting at the target.

*Korvin* agreed with the issue being discussed but disagreed with the the solution proposed stating it sounds like a boost to that undocking game, not fix. undock points are not the place for fights.

*Alekseyev Karrde* commented that the current station sizes, aggression timer, and neutral rr are \*brutally f\*\*king PVP over in every level of security space\* and that it needed to be fixed. He also disagreed with *Korvin* about undock games not being appropriate for PVP due to the space for PVP in eve already being too small.

*TeaDaze* pointed out that making docking ranges smaller promotes lazy bubblecamping of 0.0 stations

*Alekseyev Karrde* said he didn't care if its a timer based on mass but it needs to be extended to some degree and that the neutral remote rep issue needs to be address. He also stated that the docking ranges are making around station PVP (which would diversify undock point fights) impractical as was the stealth nerf to stealth ships which means they cant cloak right.

*ElvenLord* said docking ranges in 0.0 are a bit different (outpost to be exact). *TeaDaze* said that ranges are different for the different station models, outpost or not. That some stations are "kick out" giving a bonus to lazy bubblecamping and others are so big it is impossible to bump anyone fighting off it, agreeing that it needs to be looked at. *Zastrow* stated his opinion that kick out stations are awful and that csm3 passed a motion to look at outpost docking radii.

*Alekseyev Karrde* stated he would like to make known to CCP we want the direction this goes to be shrinking the docking range to match the model not expanding docking ranges on the kickout stations.

*ZOD* agreed with *TeaDaze* and *Zastrow*. *Alekseyev Karrde* said maybe some kick out, maybe not, maybe CCP has to redesign some models to get the balance where they want but it's tarded as is.

*Mrs Trzrbk* thought that docking games and station PVP certainly need a looking at, but was happier with a more general resolution that we would then talk out (a lot) at the actual meeting. *TeaDaze* agreed with *Mrs Trzrbk* that CSM needed a more general proposal and couldn't support the specific items in this one.

*ElvenLord* decided to vote on this as an "discussion to have with CCP on how to fix it". *Alekseyev Karrde* agreed but only if it was listed as top priority when the list was made.

The vote was on "Discussion to have with CCP on how to fix DOCKING GAMES"

**Amended proposal Passed 9/0**

## 8. Alter targeted ECM effect

*Alekseyev Karrde* made the case that ECM is a much needed game mechanic with a very un-fun

effect. The proposal was to alter the effect to keep the role but make it a little less soul crushing

*TeaDaze* wanted to point out that reducing the cycle time to 10seconds would actually be a very large buff if the target takes longer than 10 seconds to target back because you would be able to miss a jam cycle or 2 before they could get a lock. *Sokratesz* also pointed out the negative effects because for large ships, being jammed has the side effect of spending a lot of time re-locking and that will only be made worse.

*Alekseyev Karrde* stated this was intended, that ECCM on caps and serious BS is common now a days and you should get a nice payoff if you manage to jam a carrier or pimped out BS. *Alekseyev* also said it would make non eccmed ones be less likely to be perma jammed (bs in particular) and pointed out that carriers have triage, dreads siege, mothers and titans are immune and that it will be a change for the better all considered.

*Helen Highwater* also agreed that reducing the cycle time is a huge buff even if the target locks pretty quickly as it lets you retry a failed jam attempt much faster. *Zastrow* stated that ecm already got nerfed this year it doesn't need more nerfs. *TeaDaze* suggested if eccm was looked at instead more people would fit it or maybe add an effect to reduce the jam time by a bit.

*T'Amber* indicated, as a user of electronic warfare, agreement with both *Helen* and *TeaDaze* and that ecm had been nerfed enough already.

*Alekseyev Karrde* stated that the issue isn't whether ecm is effective or not its that when you do get jammed you are OUT for twenty seconds which is forever in eve. Then going on to say that 10s would increase jam result variety and keep people in the game, even if its only for bits and pieces. He also used the fact that as the CSM couldn't agree if its a buff or a nerf to suggest it was probably not going to change ecm use among the player base but that in his opinion it would increase enjoyment.

*Mrs Trzzbek* pointed out that changing the cycle time to 10s would mean more server calls and less ability to actually do anything in lag etc. They also couldn't think of anything you could change on ECCM that wouldn't make it either useless or overpowered.

*Korvin* said reducing the cycle is a boost, and you can use arazu to help. *Alekseyev Karrde* joked god forbid there's a reason to use arazus.

*TeaDaze* agreed with *Mrs Trzzbek* and stated that if there wasn't agreement on it being a nerf or buff or if the effect would actually improve being jammed or more likely to end in perma jamming then change isn't needed.

**Failed 8/1** (*Alekseyev Karrde*)

## **Titan bridge range**

*Sokratesz* said this was a rather relevant issue because just a few minutes ago got bumped 60m/s in a titan when bridging a fleet. *ElvenLord* stated he had the same thing happen while bridging at the same time to nearby system.

*TeaDaze* was unsure how it would stop people hitting approach and bumping the titan anyway.

*Alekseyev Karrde* wanted the proposal expanded to Covert Jump Bridges as well.

*Mrs Trzsbk* absolutely agreed with an increase in activation range, but to be a pedant wanted to change the proposal's title to "Titan Bridge Activation Range" just to remove any confusion.

*ElvenLord* and *Sokratesz* agreed that fleet members would be able to hit 'orbit at 5km' instead of approach to make sure they land in range, so whilst it will not banish all bumping it would fix a large majority of it. *ZOD* considered with the size of the ships in perspective that 2500 meters sounds ridiculously small and it should definitely be increased. *TeaDaze* supported increasing the range to 5km but wanted to point out they could have hit orbit 2500 in the first place or just keep at range 2000. *ElvenLord* said orbiting 2500m from titan bumps it and that keep at range 2000m with 150 people on you is even worse. *Sokratesz* repeated that orbit at 2500 lands you between 2500 and 3000 depending on ship type so that doesn't work and that anything approaching it that close is a risk so requested the distance be increased to 10 km. *ZOD* agreed that with 150 ships orbiting at 2500m it sounded like serious chances of orbiting collisions.

*Korvin* asked why not just make bridging ships static and non-bumpable instead?

*TeaDaze* again supported a change to 5km but objected to 10km because people would ask why they can't jump at a Stargate (some of which are bigger than titan models) that far out.

*Alekseyev Karrde* asked if anyone objected to modding the proposal to covering all fitted jump bridge and covert jump bridge modules? He also stated that 2500 is needlessly small for both and that 5km is probably about right. *Sokratesz* answered a few questions, restated the current issues being a pain to titan pilots and supporting *Alekseyev's* modification.

*Korvin* suggested a hand brake button but *Sokratesz* stated that even hitting ctrl space continuously doesn't help.

*Zastrow* commented that he was a titan pilot and supported the proposal "with every fiber of my space being".

**The proposal for a 5km range passed 8/1 (*Korvin*)**

*ZOD* said as *Korvin* had suggested some sort of handbrake or prepare to bridge for titan so it cannot be bumped would be good, but *Sokratesz* said such a feature would be abused and that it might not be possible technically.

## **10. Direct scan improvement**

There was agreement on this providing it was only a change to the client side button.

**Passed 9/0**

*Sokratesz* wanted to amend the proposal so narrow scans took less time which *ElvenLord* agreed to add to the proposal. There was a brief discussion on if the current scanning to fast error was client side or server side.

## **11. Bring Logistics Warp Speed In-Line with T2 Ships**

There were no objections and the proposal went straight to a vote.

**Passed 9/0**

## **12. Modular Starbase**

*Song Li* brought this up because of the level of completeness in discussion and the amount that it seems that the vocal community likes the idea adding they would like to see the whole POS thing redone, specifically the interface and that it would be a huge project. *Sokratesz* agreed to a revamp into a modular approach but didn't want to talk specifics in this meeting.

*Alekseyev Karrde* didn't think the con in the proposal was much of a con and agreed with *Sokratesz* that CSM should talk to CCP about it in Iceland and get something awesome together. *T'Amber* thanked the delegates for bringing this topic up even though it's been discussed with CCP before. *Z0D* agreed it obviously needs a major revamp and the subject affects multiple areas of gameplay. *ElvenLord* stated that it affects supercaps and POS production etc. but it is something to discuss a lot with the devs.

*TeaDaze* pointed out there are lots of pos topics among them this group of threads, the promised fuel pellets etc. and supported bringing them to CCP as one of the bigger picture issues.

**Passed 9/0**

## **13. Shared Corporation Bookmarks**

*Song Li* had nothing to add past what was in the proposal and thread.

*Z0D* stated this as a straight forward issue, and that it would be very practical to have for corp members.

*Helen Highwater* thought bookmarks as a whole should be overhauled, because of the poor implementation at the moment and didn't want CCP to tweak the system when they should instead be redoing it completely. *T'Amber* and *Z0D* concurred.

*Korvin* didn't think there was anything new in the additional proposals apart from align to.

*Alekseyev Karrde* agreed with the proposal stating Wormholers would be happy, small gang warfare would be happy and fleet warfare would be happy. He also suggested the approach taken with the corp fittings window and an "add bookmark" hotkey function.

*TeaDaze* agreed that it would be preferable to have an overhaul of the bookmarks system, mentioning the issue of bookmark folders being client side in the event of a settings reset. Tea also agreed that a similar system to corp fittings would be awesome.

*ElvenLord* agreed that the bookmark system needed an overhaul and pointed out that adding corp bookmarks would decrease the number of items in the DB as all members would use for example 1 BM for JB or a POS instead of every member having them. *Korvin* disagreed that there would be less items in the DB however *Alekseyev Karrde* agreed with *Elven* and *TeaDaze* pointed out that reducing the number of items was listed on the proposal. *T'Amber* stated this as a good sales point for the idea when passed to CCP.

*Song Li* wanted to amend the proposal to add a discussion of a complete overhaul of the BM system to the Iceland agenda where more details could be hammered out. *ElvenLord* and *TeaDaze* agreed.

*Helen Highwater* restated their position that if small incremental improvements are made to the system that CCP will use that as an excuse to not revisit it as a whole. Their preferred solution being a new BM system that's easier to use, has less server overhead and is more expandable to be implemented. *Alekseyev Karrde* didn't think the bookmark system was something CSM wanted CCP to rebuild from scratch considering the other issues, restating that the proposed change would be excellent and improve game enjoyment.

*Korvin* counted that corp bookmarks were not good because people were in alliances and that alliance bookmarks would be no good because of coalitions and friendly fleets. He went on to say that it makes no sense and would increase the database.

*TeaDaze* stated that a small Quality of life feature is worth putting in fairly quickly rather than waiting for a huge change to get built and tested which on current form could take years. Tea also disagreed with *Korvin's* assessment that it would increase database size if corps used shared bookmarks instead of copying them to hundreds of people individually.

*Song Li* agreed with *Helen* about pushing for complete redesigns, but that if pressed to choose between a specific improvement of an old system or no new system for years they preferred the incremental improvement option assuming the work load is minor and the functionality is greatly improved.

*Alekseyev Karrde* took exception to *Korvin's* view, questioning if POS or saved corp fittings or X mechanic should not have been implemented purely because alliances might have to exchange a bookmark or a password or drag a fit so the other group has them?

*Sokratesz* suggested for things like control towers and jump bridges, there should be a default 'warp to' option if your corp or alliance has one in a system which would remove the need for those to be bookmarked at all.

*Korvin* continued to argue that it would cause more entries in the database because he for example had 10 bookmarks in every system he lives and in case of leaving corp would want a personal copy of all bookmarks.

*Mrs Trzsbk* suggested instead of discussing minutiae instead making the proposal more general so it could be voted on and move on.

*TeaDaze* maintained that the overall balance will be less bookmarks because while some people would choose to have hundreds of bookmarks in systems other people would have none.

*Alekseyev Karrde* advised against doing nothing but general proposals.

*ElvenLord* suggested making the proposal into an overhaul of the bookmarking system in general.

*Helen Highwater* agreed with *Alekseyev* but also stated the opinion that suggesting incremental improvements to fundamentally flawed systems to be counter productive. *Sokratesz* supported an overhaul of bookmarking system with inclusion of this proposal and maybe the suggestion about warping to corp assets as a discussion point for Iceland. *Alekseyev Karrde* wanted to split the vote into two parts, this proposal as it stands and then a new vote to look at the entire bookmark system from the ground up.

*ZOD* pointed out that in this space age it makes no sense to require trading of bookmarks and that you should be able to just radio broadcast a location to warp to etc.

*ElvenLord* called for a vote on "overhaul of the bookmarking system with inclusion of this proposal"

**Passed 8/1 (*Korvin*)**

*T'Amber* offered some mockups and diagrams for this topic.

## **14. Watch list & broadcasts**

*ElvenLord* considered merging this with item 15, but it was decided to vote on them separately and merge them later if needed

*Sokratesz* had nothing to add to the proposal, just wanting to restate it would improve gangs greatly and be more fun.

*Alekseyev Karrde* wanted the option to show capacitor status bars. *TeaDaze* agreed in principle providing it didn't add too much additional lag

**Passed 9/0**

## **15. Broadcast "In position" improvement**

*Alekseyev Karrde* wanted to clarify that this proposal would allow a persistent icon of in position to be visible to your fleet so you can better coordinate cloaked ships. *ZOD* agreed that it would make sense for a cloaked fleet to see their own gang properly. *Korvin* confirmed that the proposal was to show an icon to your fleet when you press the in position button. *Helen Highwater* asked where this icon would be shown.

*TeaDaze* pointed out as per *Helen's* comment about bookmarks that CSM need to get CCP to actually fix the cloaked ships decloaking each other "bug" rather than introduce new functionality to attempt to avoid it.

*Korvin* stated that the icon would be in space

*Mrs Trzzbk* thought that it would lead to some hilarious incidents when spies call out locations but overall thought it was kind of useless going on to suggest that the In Position button may as well just be removed.

*ZOD* suggested it could cause a colour haze to know where they are cloaked, green for corp, blue alliance and purple just gang etc.

*Alekseyev Karrde* said that cloaked ships decloaking other cloaked ships is fine, but there needed to be a way for stealth gangs to see one another. *TeaDaze* argued that it was originally classed as a bug when the stealth bomber changes were put in and wasn't sure if it has now been classed as working as intended. *Tea* stated that it is totally stupid that a covert gang can't gang warp without decloaking each other in flight

*Helen Highwater* said that other MMOs with stealth typically show friendly stealthers as translucent shadows and suggested a system like that for ships in the same gang only (not just friendlies) including the bracket for the ship as well as the model. *Mrs Trzzbk* claimed without seeing each other on overview it's useless and you would not be picking out semi-transparent shadows in space.

*ElvenLord* called a vote on the proposal with *Helen's* addition of translucent shadows and appropriate brackets for cloaked ships in gang.

**Passed 7/2** (*Zastrow, Mrs Trzzbk*)

## **16. Balance self-destruction**

*Alekseyev Karrde* had nothing to add to the proposal.

*TeaDaze* disagreed with the proposal that self destruct should give a killmail instead suggesting no insurance payout at all, not even default amount which would retain the option to deny a killmail but at far higher cost.

*Helen Highwater* spotted that the general blurb mentions insurance fraud but the actual proposal doesn't say anything about denying insurance.

*Korvin* claimed the lack of killmails being the main reason someone self-destructs their ship.

*Alekseyev Karrde* apologised for missing out the insurance part and suggested it be added back.

*ElvenLord* agreed that self-destruct is and should be left as an option in eve but agreed with the need for some down side to it, like no insurance payout.

*Zastrow* wanted self-destruct removed completely so they could be tackled and jam/neuted while people go afk.

*ElvenLord* suggested changing this proposal to deny insurance on any kind of self destruct or CONCORD kills.

*TeaDaze* restated support for different self destruct timers based on ship class, no insurance payout

on self destruct and no killmail. *Alekseyev Karrde* wanted a mechanic that would allow the attackers to get a killmail via fighting (in the event that none would be generated on self destruct) via extending the timer or adding steadily rising heat levels and thus module damage. His position was No killmail, no loot? Pay for it.

*Helen Highwater* objected to changing the proposal to include no payout on Concord kills because it was outside the scope of this topic and has a lot of repercussions on suicide ganking and pirating.

*TeaDaze* and *Alekseyev Karrde* agreed there was already an issue raised as a separate topic and should be treated as such.

*ZOD* agreed that self destructing should give killmail as well as damages inflicted and also specifying final blow as self inflicted as well as no insurance for it.

*Song Li* suggested *Alekseyev's* main thing with the Killmail is that as a merc he wants numbers on what they've done. Song was of two minds, if it were to generate a KM it should say Self Destruct in it or it shouldn't and let it be asset denial. *TeaDaze* felt strongly that people needed to have the option to deny a killmail if they want to pay the price (no insurance). *Alekseyev Karrde* repeated it should be a valid tactic for denying loot not obscuring the record of it ever happening.

*TeaDaze* pointed out that awarding a killmail it will only go to the victim and to the killing blow, which is also the victim.

*ElvenLord* said that adding a killmail means insurance should stay.

*Alekseyev Karrde* said the killmail would show up on corp feeds for the victims group and that Insurance shouldn't stay because it creates the situation where people can self destruct a ship for more than they bought it or could sell it for which adversely affects traders and miners.

*Korvin's* opinion was self-destruction is the way to avoid to be stuck in game by hostile ships, nothing more and that Killmails and insurance shouldn't be affected by it.

*TeaDaze* decided they couldn't support the proposal if killmail generation was going to stay but that insurance payout should be denied because self-destruction is a deliberate act. *Alekseyev Karrde* advised against removing the killmail generation on Self Destruction, but if that was decided he wanted the heat disadvantage and extended timer so the target had a higher chance of being killed and thus generating a mail through combat.

*Sokratesz* supported either it giving a mail or denying insurance and that both would be too much IMO. Sok also suggested on the topic of timers about warp scrambling cancelling self destruct, or aggression timer preventing the initiation of it.

*TeaDaze* pointed out that a self destruct would be a far higher loss than just being blown up so would be happy to see a target doing so knowing that their wallet took a bigger hit. Tea also disagreed with blocking Self destruct because it would lead to griefing. *Helen Highwater* agreed with *TeaDaze* that the killmail is irrelevant unless the victim has them syndicated via API because the only person who's going to see it is the victim even if it is generated. *Alekseyev Karrde* countered that the CEO and directors will too. *Song Li* agreed with *TeaDaze* on the killmail creation since it would be generated to the "victim" but also suggested dealing with the insurance as part of the overall insurance issue.

*Mrs Trzrbk* suggested that the killmail system could be the same as used for when you kill a ratter

where it just goes to the first player involved. *TeaDaze* pointed out it goes to the highest damage dealer, which may well be the victim in this case. *Mrs Trzzbek* suggested to change it so it goes to the first non-victim.

*Alekseyev Karrde* agreed with *Song Li* that insurgency is an overall issue which needs to be addressed and that *Trzzbek's* suggestion about using the killed by NPC solution would be fine.

*Mrs Trzzbek* was of the opinion that CSM were again discussing minutiae.

*TeaDaze* wanted confirmation that if the proposal on insurance was going to be done on another topic that this one would only be related to KM generation.

*ElvenLord* stated that after reading many Dev posts CCP recognize self-destruct as a viable mechanic of denying a killmail and thus optioned that it wouldn't pass but he agreed with the insurance part.

*Alekseyev Karrde* suggested modifying the proposal to be no insurance, increase timer to 5 minutes and add in heat effects. *Korvin* disagreed with loss of insurance and adding heat effects. *TeaDaze* wanted the timer to be tied to ship size, not a one size fits all 5 mins.

*Mrs Trzzbek* asked for confirmation on the heat part of the proposal.

*Korvin* disagreed with the timer changes.

*Alekseyev Karrde* explained that the heat proposal would be a gradually increased amount of heat over the course of the timer at a rate CCP decided which could damage and potentially break modules. He disagreed with *TeaDaze* on the timer being tied to ship size claiming it might be more of a pain to implement than benefit.

*Sokratesz* suggested the timer be based on mass (or capacitor size) with some function so it doesn't scale too badly and balanced so that caps and super-caps land at around 5 mins and frigates at like 60s.

*Korvin* wanted a 300 DPS 5km range explosion after the ship self-destructs.

*TeaDaze* pointed out the heat idea was just another way to force a killmail when combined with the increase of timer. *Tea* restated that if this is was to be the proposal they would vote no and would wait till the insurance issue.

*Korvin* suggested voting separately for the each change which *Alekseyev Karrde* agreed with.

*Mrs Trzzbek* thought that pods should be able to bypass the countdown as long as they're not under aggression to avoid having to wait 2 mins to pod jump.

*ElvenLord* called for 4 votes

Self Destruct should revoke insurance

**Passed 7/2** (*Mrs Trzzbek, Korvin*)

Self-destruct should generate killmail

**Passed 7/2** (*TeaDaze, Song Li*)

Self-destruct should "overheat" all modules

**Failed 7/2** (*Alekseyev Karrde, Sokratesz*)

Self-destruct timer depends on ship size

**Passed 8/1** (*Korvin*)

## Other Business

There was a brief vote on extending the Agenda to start on items earmarked for next meeting, but *TeaDaze* objected due to the current Agenda having been completed and the meeting having run for over 3 hours already.

*Zastrow* pointed out the game isn't going to change between this meeting and the next and everything to get on the agenda will get there, people always get real exciting and pack the first meeting

There was a debate but it was decided to set the next meeting date at 14:00 eve time on Jan 3rd 2010

Meeting closed at 21:28