CSM 4 meeting 005, Sun 24th Jan - Meeting Minutes

Present

ElvenLord, Alekseyev Karrde, TeaDaze, Korvin, Song Li, Helen Highwater (alt), *T'Amber* (alt)

Apologies

Sokratesz, Z0D

Absent

Zastrow, Mrs Trzzbk, Farscape Hw (alt), *Meissa Anunthiel* (alt), *Serenity Steele* (alt)

Discussion

Meeting started at 14:22

ElvenLord confirmed the minimum of 7 delegates were present and set out the agenda.

1 Shield bonuses
2 Drone rigs and implants
3 T3 refitting subsystems at POS / carrier
4 ORE Faction Control Tower
5 Tradable and Subscribable BlockLists (Version #2]
6 Scan probes of all types - an addable option to overview profiles
7 CCP/CSM meeting - issues list

[1. Shield bonuses](#)

Helen Highwater stated that he proposal hadn't been updated and as *Sokratesz* wasn't in the meeting to explain that they wanted the proposal taken off the agenda until it was updated, adding that until then it was wasting more discussion time.
TeaDaze formally objected to a proposal being re-raised with just a minor edit after being clearly rejected previously. *TeaDaze* pointed out the previous proposal was not put back for rework but voted on and rejected. *Helen Highwater* agreed.
TeaDaze also thought the proposal lacked substance and hadn't addressed concerns from last time. *Song Li* agreed.

ElvenLord accepted the complaints and decided to reject the issue until further notice. *T'Amber* agreed

TeaDaze was happy to work with whoever on this issue, but thought it would be better for the issues with capitals to be kept separate from gang bonuses in general. *T'Amber* agreed. *ElvenLord* repeated that the issue was rejected and everyone was welcome to consult with *Sokratesz* to make a new proposal.

Alekseyev Karrde asked *TeaDaze* to restate which objections were not met.

TeaDaze stated that every post detailing this issue uses capital ships to highlight the problem and furthermore the amendment was a nerf to regen tanking (which Tea admitted isn't a worry to capitals). *TeaDaze* also pointed out that trying to put this proposal forward with the reason "because armour tanking does it this way" ignores the other factors in play.

ElvenLord wanted to move on.

Proposal rejected until further details included

2. Drone rigs and implants

TeaDaze agreed in principle but wanted guidance on the proposal about how the rigs would work giving the example of large rigs only working on large drones. *ElvenLord* saw it that there could be drone speed rigs, control range rigs, HP boost rigs etc. and the same for implants. *ElvenLord* suggested implants should be added in Gallente LP store as drones are their weapon.

Alekseyev Karrde thought there was a fine amount of drone rigs out there compared to other weapon systems with no need to add more. Aleks suggested a need for highslot modules instead but agreed there should be an implant line for drones.

Helen Highwater stated that this was a typical *Sokratesz* proposal with no actual work beyond wishing for rainbows and ponies. Helen added they would like to see more depth to drones but this was a pretty lazy proposal with no analysis, no description of a solution and no real substance. *Helen Highwater* continued that no case had been made for the proposal beyond "it would be cool if.." with no demonstration of an actual balance issue and nothing to suggest that one exists.

TeaDaze hoped that as implants for guns/missiles are sized that would be the same idea for drones too, but as *Helen* said it hadn't been addressed on the proposal. *T'Amber* agreed that Tea's issue was legitimate and wondered what size drone rigs would work on which drones, or would the effect be for all drone types. *T'Amber* also thought implants would definitely be a good idea, but this proposal needed more work and CSM would go in circles.

Alekseyev Karrde thought that the balance issue was that every weapon system has implants and drones don't which seemed a bit obvious. He added that the size issue is a fair one, since all the other weapon systems have implants doled out like that.

Helen Highwater requested that the proposal be rejected until it meet a basic level of quality in the hope that *Sokratesz* might finally begin to understand how this is supposed to work and stop just putting everything that occurs to him up as a vote without doing any work. *Helen Highwater* also added in reply to *Aleks* that just missing implants in itself isn't a balance issue and it was the job of the proposal to demonstrate that drones suffer as a result. Helen argued they probably don't after all they are a secondary weapon system for most ships and if you can have drone implants and gunnery/missile implants how would that affect balance with dedicated drone boats vs things like Ravens or Apocalypses for example.

TeaDaze pondered that drone boat bonuses usually apply to all drones yet the only drone damage rig is very specific to sentries.

Song Li said as a drone boat pilot they believed there was a definite lack of depth on the drone support rigs and implants so would love to pass something for them. However they didn't think an

empty proposal will do it so I thought CSM should vote on this one and move on.

Helen Highwater repeated the call to reject the issue until someone brings up an actual proposal and not just an empty suggestion. *T'Amber* wanted to vote on leaving this issue and have it brought up again once it had been refined and defined.

ElvenLord decided the issue was to be put on hold because of missing any specific proposal and that it could be raised again once it was updated properly with more substance. *TeaDaze* and *T'Amber* agreed.

Proposal rejected until further details included

3. T3 refitting subsystems at pos / carrier

T'Amber supported the proposal.

TeaDaze explained that there were two options in this proposal which CCP would have to decide between, adding that only they can say how much self sufficiency they want w-space to have. *TeaDaze* hoped the concept was sound.

Helen Highwater agreed with refitting at a Ship Maintenance Array but wondered about balance issues if people could refit subsystems at something more mobile like a ship. *Helen Highwater* suspected that T3 ships might be too good in that case and too easy to refit for a specific threat with no real downside and that a POS at least limits the opportunity without making them worthless in W-space.

Song Li thought the additional change was superfluous since it was possible to import fittings from an external source, so there would always be a fitting setup available but it would just require out of game work each time. Song thought it might as well not be part of the proposal.

Alekseyev Karrde thought the versatility of T3 would be better realized by having pos and Ship Maintenance Array functionality as a modular ship is only cool if you can actually adapt it easily, otherwise it was more of a headache than feature.

TeaDaze clarified that the additional issue was that at a carrier fitting service or POS that the load fittings button doesn't work (clicking it does nothing) and that if you allow swapping subsystems it would make the process much longer if you can't simply load the saved fit. *Song Li* realised this was in addition to manual swapping and not instead of apologising for a sleep deprived addled brain. *TeaDaze* confirmed it was in addition to either option 1 or 2 as proposed. *TeaDaze* suspected it was technically a bug but it would be rather nice to have when changing subsystems in space. *Song Li* was happy to move to vote.

Alekseyev Karrde wondered if there might be a graphics issue with the proposal as t3 subsystems change the ship model and wondered how would that work?

Helen Highwater only wanted to support the proposal if it was limited to POS only and didn't include ship based arrays.

TeaDaze believed graphically it should be no different to as in the hanger. *Song Li* thought if there was a graphical issue with changes that CCP would comment on it and asked if there was any

specific reason to restrict it to POS only.

ElvenLord agreed with *Helen* about limiting refitting to POSs only. *TeaDaze* suggested splitting the vote into refitting at a POS and a second vote for at a ship. *ElvenLord* was happy to split the vote.

Helen Highwater replied to *Song Li* that the objection to ship based refitting of subsystems was that it would give far too much flexibility in the field for a T3 ship being able to radically change the role of the ship on the fly. Helen agreed that they should be able to do so at a static structure but being able to reconfigure at a friendly carrier is too much in their opinion. *Alekseyev Karrde* pointed out the carrier would be putting itself at risk so didn't think it was OP at all.

T'Amber wasn't sure how many pilots fly T3 ships in 0.0, but thought this would get more flown in the long run which CCP wanted. *Song Li* agreed with *Aleks* and *T'Amber*.

ElvenLord called for two votes

Allow T3 subsystems to be refitted at a POS
Passed 7 for

Allow T3 subsystems to be refitted at ship fitting services
Passed 5 for, 2 against (*ElvenLord*, *Helen Highwater*)

4. ORE Faction Control Tower

ElvenLord felt this was a nice initiative to add more versatility to POS. *T'Amber* liked the idea but wasn't sure living in W-space should be that easy and a penalty to using one of these in W-space would be cool.

Song Li suggested this could be rolled into the modular POS proposal. *T'Amber* agreed.

Helen Highwater suspected the lower refinery efficiency at a POS was deliberate and intended to ensure that a POS can't be too self sufficient and that was to encourage the moving of materials around the galaxy. Helen continued that currently you trade efficiency for convenience/safety which seems fair and that if you want perfect refines then you need to move your ore to a station. Helen thought this just seemed to be an attempt to make everything the same for the sake of it which couldn't be supported as it stood.

Korvin thought that removing the importance of outposts in 0.0 space was a bad idea and that CCP wanted players to build them and if there were no benefits, they wouldn't bother. *Korvin* also pointed out that 0.0 alliances collect taxes from refining at outposts so would probably prohibit these POS in their space or would make more troubles in alliances economy.

TeaDaze wondered what % yield you currently got from a POS array vs outposts. Tea also thought the idea that people wouldn't build outposts because this tower was available was a bit of a stretch considering that outposts have docking, repair, clone facilities etc. and if anything it would allow smaller entities build into 0.0. Tea finished that if you didn't want people putting these in your space then you have the chance to shoot them. *T'Amber* agreed.

Song Li replied that the yield from a POS refinery was 75%. *ElvenLord* thought any bonus should be lower than the Outpost refining bonus. *Alekseyev Karrde* and *TeaDaze* agreed. *ElvenLord*

suggested if the current POS provided 75% then the ORE tower should not go above 85%.

T'Amber thought if it was *Extreme*ly time consuming and the costs were high then this could balance some of these issues. *T'Amber* gave an example of using items that are cheap but take up lots of cargo space as required fuel for the POS which wouldn't add much more cost but would require lots of time spent moving them which could balance the POS towers vs outposts.

TeaDaze agreed that a dedicated outpost should be more efficient so thought the idea of an 85% limit could work adding that 10% better is still a buff and is in line with other faction items.

ElvenLord called for a vote on an amended proposal with limiting the bonus to be lower than an outpost.

Passed 6 for, 1 against (*Korvin*)

5. Tradable and Subscribable BlockLists (Version #2]

T'Amber was happy with the proposal. *TeaDaze* thought the amendments addressed the concerns from last time.

Alekseyev Karrde restated his objection that massive blocklist trading would be bad for the community side of Eve.

Helen Highwater wondered about the performance impact of a syndicated service and asked if it would be simpler and better to simply have them as exportable files that could be applied to a client and distributed in the normal way (forums, file hosts etc.). *Helen Highwater* thought that way you would still be able to apply a blocklist easily across multiple accounts/clients and share it with others.

T'Amber pointed out there were two parts to the proposal, one being the function to import and export block lists with a conflict resolution function and the second part being lists as tradable items in game. *T'Amber* replied to *Aleks* objection suggesting the blocklist libraries could have a maximum amount of entries.

ElvenLord wondered if a vote could be taken but debate continued.

T'Amber believed that performance wouldn't be an issue because they thought all blocks were client side. *Helen Highwater* disagreed with the performance assessment stating the issue being a syndicated service needed to check for updates which would add to the overheads. *Helen Highwater* continued that this was why they were wondering about it absolutely having to be centrally distributed like a version control system.

Song Li though performance issues should be left for CCP to comment on the specifics.

T'Amber thought that if the items were tradable then you could buy the updated blocklist library item, or just import a new list from file if they weren't able to be traded. *T'Amber* also noted there was a difference from Blocklist Library and personal Block List so whilst your block list hides people completely the Blocklist library people are just less viable, but still be on your screen.

Helen Highwater quoted the specific part which was the source of concern "When a blocklist

library is edited by the original maker the blocklist is updated to all subscribers". *Helen Highwater* didn't think that would fly but that as tradable items it would be fine. *T'Amber* agreed with this point.

T'Amber wanted to vote on the proposal as is and leave the rest up to CCP if passed. *ElvenLord* agreed to the request.

Song Li suggested a manual update option to click if need be for data updated and agreed to move to vote.

ElvenLord called for the vote.

Proposal failed 4 against, 3 for (*TeaDaze*, *Song Li*, *T'Amber*)

6. Scan probes of all types - an addable option to overview profiles

Alekseyev Karrde thought this was simple and wanted to vote. *T'Amber* agreed.

TeaDaze stated a preference for different scan "profiles" to be included on the directional scanner, but agreed this proposal would fix the stated issue with probes.

ElvenLord called for a vote

Passed 7 for

7. CCP/CSM meeting issues list (alphabetic)

ElvenLord set out the list

General discussion
Dominion discussion
Unfinished expansions
Customer support
CSM

Major issues
2 Account Security Enhancements
3 Battle recorder
4 Balance self-destruction
5 Black Ops Improvements Part 2
6 Boost warfare links and revisit information warfare
7 Destroyer Improvements
8 Docking games fix
9 Forum Censorship
10 Factional Warfare - CCP Inaction Towards Bugs/Exploits
11 Factional Warfare - Lack of Development Part 2
12 Modular Starbase
13 Overhaul of roles and grantable roles system

14 Suicide ganking discussion
15 Shared Corporation Bookmarks

Minor issues
1 Alliance Logos, CSM Intervention Requested
2 Alliance action confirmation windows
3 Bring Logistics Warp Speed In-Line with T2 Ships
4 Broadcast "In position" improvement
5 Directscan improvement
6 FW Complex NPCs and Standings
7 Factional Warfare - Complex Spawning Part 2
8 Fix kill mails
9 Ingame Events Menu
10 Mining crystals change colour of mining laser beam
11 ORE Faction Control Tower
12 Put more faction items on market
13 Scan-able wrecks&containers for the salvager profession(1.2)
14 Scan probes of all types - an addable option to overview profiles
15 Titan bridge range
16 Tracking for fighters lost in combat
17 T3 refitting subsystems at POS / carrier
18 Visible Aggression Indicator in 0.0 Space
19 Watch list and broadcasts

Song Li pointed out the lack of Issue 1 under major.

Alekseyev Karrde liked the list adding lots got done in time for the meeting.
TeaDaze pointed out now it was time to get CCP to agree. *Helen Highwater* requested at least an explanation on why they disagree.

T'Amber wondered why battlerecorder was a major issue. and if there was a vote on the order of issues. *ElvenLord* said the categorisation was up for discussion and that the list was in alphabetical order as stated.

Korvin thought battlerecorder was a minor issue. *Song Li*, *T'Amber* and *Helen Highwater* agreed. *Korvin* added it was low priority as well. *ElvenLord* pointed out it couldn't be a minor thing if there was some discussion involved. *Alekseyev Karrde* pointed out that whilst there was some heavy discussion when battlerecorder came up in council he personally thought it was related to technical issues so there wasn't a lot to really discuss adding that "will xxx cause lag?" would be a yes no question when CCP is sitting across the table.

ElvenLord agreed to add low priority on some Major issues.

T'Amber asked if the meeting was over. *ElvenLord* said CSM needed to vote on agreement of the list and to schedule the next meeting.

Korvin wanted to discuss gun balance somewhere in the meeting with CCP. *TeaDaze* pointed out there wasn't an agenda item for that (Editor's note. the proposal in question (hybrids) was rejected during a previous meeting and has not yet been resubmitted let alone passed).
Alekseyev Karrde suggested *Korvin* bring up the issue informally if it really meant that much.
TeaDaze objected to informal issues being put on the table because there were plenty of issues that

had been vetted and passed and asked why should things sidestep the process. *T'Amber* agreed.

ElvenLord asked if everyone agreed with the list adding that the order will be decided by CCP depending on availability of employees.

List Passed 7 for

Other Business

After some discussion the next meeting was set for Sunday 7th February at 15:00

Meeting closed at 15:51