

WHO THE HELL *IS* HANS JAGERBLITZEN?



(Good question. You deserve to know.)

CONTENTS

A DISCLAIMER

3

THE EMPIRE CORE

4

THE BORDERLANDS

12

THE GREAT BEYOND

19

THE MAN BEHIND THE KEYBOARD

20

LAST BUT NOT LEAST....

21

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

22

A DISCLAIMER

These ideas are by no means all my own. They simply represent a small cross section of the issues strangling the unique game play in each of EvE's various regions, along with some solutions that I believe have strong merit. I truly wish I could say I invented every one of them, but there is no point in lying because good ideas are good ideas – and should be pushed at the highest level by a responsible CSM whether they come from the candidates themselves or not.

Expert advice has *not* always been sought in the past, but my primary concern is seeing that is done so in the future. The existing council demonstrated effectiveness but not integrity - and made some critical mistakes that have rightfully caused players to become disenfranchised with its ability to protect the greatest diversity of game play interests.

My mission is to see it that those mistakes are not made again. Should I win a CSM7 seat, I will urge the other council members to demonstrate the same level of humility and defer to expert opinions even when they exist outside the council itself.

That being said, if you recognize a concept in here as your own, take it as a strong compliment. I will attempt to give credit where I can identify the source. I have no shame in borrowing effective ideas, that is the entire point and process of being a representative voice for the players.

One thing you should know about me – I really hate to write down a scripted campaign platform, though it is expected of me and I hope you find it useful. In real life I strive to elect leaders based on character and capability, because if I can't trust them to be responsible, I don't care if they agree with me down to every single issue. I hope this season's voters feel the same way.

Platforms make for fun, fiery debates, and campaign promises are a dime a dozen – but the reality is that it all changes once you're elected and in the office with CCP, because the CSM doesn't dictate the agenda nor does it always have all the details of development work until they get there.

You are all not going to agree with everything I have to say here. That's fine. You may think some ideas are stupid. That's fine. I will certainly face criticism and scrutiny in the days to come - all I ask is that you get to know each of us candidates for our values, our understanding of the realities of game play (not what we *think* goes on somewhere), and our willingness to admit that sometimes we just don't have the answers.

THE EMPIRE CORE

We've all seen it day, after day - pilots that dwell in high security space chastised for being "carebears", noobs, or risk-adverse cowards that are supposedly hell-bent on converting the innermost portion of empire space into a PvP-free haven. Let's face it: that description really only applies to a small, yet vocal minority of high sec players. The old mentality of high sec being primarily a starting zone in no way reflects the reality of who lives and works there anymore, as high sec is now home to both end-game market PvP surrounding the trade hubs, and beloved end-game PvE content in the form of incursions.

It's time to shape high sec iterations with these realities in mind, rather than continuing to treat it as a starter zone to push players out of like baby birds from the nest. Most of us who spend extensive time in high sec find this characterization insulting.

Plenty of veteran EvE players simply enjoy PvE, mining, industry, and trade, and have chosen to live and play in empire space simply because we prefer the bustle of the populated trade hubs to the cold, harsh, and often *boring* reality of null sec. The appeal for high sec players is often the casual, unrestricted way one can enjoy EvE's activities at a rapid pace. You can log on, mine or mission with friends, without having to take the time to scan down systems, pause and hide from pirates, or make long detours to avoid gate camps.

The balancing measure, of course, should always be that this safety comes at a cost – and arguably should offer lower reward than low sec or null sec equivalent activities. I don't think that concept is too hard for most high sec players to stomach, no matter how they end up being stereotyped on the forums.

The problem I see with high sec is its arbitrary, static, and mostly homogenous nature. Sure, there are lower concord response times the further out you go, and some better mission payouts, but these are trivial differences in what is supposed to be a sandbox game. I strongly advocate for iterating on high sec to sharpen the contrast between safety and danger – allowing those to seek *increased* protection to do so, at the sacrifice of profit, and those that seek greater returns for their time be willing to accept greater risks.

A tiered safety gradient system that truly adds depth to high sec

This is as good a time as any to share one of the best proposals I've personally seen regarding the subject of risk and reward – I have used the words of the original author, [Mal Darkrunner](#).

- In a 0.5 system the faction navy (rather than Concord) would respond in force to criminal acts - sufficiently prepared ships could tank or avoid them for a short period, but would eventually be overwhelmed (the navy might call in Concord reinforcements if they were unable to handle the situation). All hi-sec systems would have powerful gate and station guns.
- In a 0.6 system Concord would respond to criminal acts, but their response time would be slower than in higher security systems.
- In a 0.7 system the Concord response time would be quicker, and there would be a very small chance of faction navy patrols appearing at gates and stations (tankable/avoidable if prepared).
- In a 0.8 system the Concord response time would be quicker and in greater numbers, and there would be a small to medium chance of faction navy patrols at gates and stations (still tankable/avoidable).
- In a 0.9 system the Concord response time would be quicker still, and there would be a medium to high chance of faction navy patrolling gates and stations, and a small chance of them patrolling asteroid belts.
- In a 1.0 system the Concord response would be almost instant, there would be constant faction navy patrols at stations and gates, and there would be a good chance of the navy patrolling the belts too.

By Mal's own admission, this is only a start, and there are certainly a lot of details here to be hammered out balancing-wise. I use this proposal only to illustrate the goal we should be reaching for from a game design perspective. The sandbox solution should be to empower high sec players to develop their own supplementary security, rather than increasing the reliance on NPC's, such as the CONCORD buff CCP CEO Hilmar has hinted at.

I believe in creating more options for players and respecting their differences in risk *preference*, because non-consensual PvP should exist everywhere in EvE, to one degree or another. I still believe the vast majority of players, even those in high sec, understand this. If you don't, I'm probably not your candidate.

Wait, what?? You support the gankers? You monster!!

"Well, I am not a Goon. I have earned every kill I have got."

Unlike the current Chairman, I derive no pleasure in preying on those that wish to avoid combat and pursue industrial activities in secure space. It's not challenging, and therefore isn't satisfying.

There are a lot of miners who knowingly make risky decisions during ganking campaigns, and complain nonetheless. These pilots give others who have taken the time to learn situational awareness a bad name. But for each stubborn pilot who plays the victim card too often, there are many more that play by the rules and accept gank risks and refuse to blame anyone but themselves if mining during Hulkageddon. I'd like to think that's the majority of you.

One of the primary ideological differences between the current council and myself is that Seleene, Trebor Daehdoow, and The Mittani have all repeatedly argued that the ability to gank anyone, anywhere is one of the features that *defines* EvE as a game (along with its single-shard nature, of course).

Instead of defending them on a matter of principle, I instead view suicide ganking merely as a symptom of broken warfare mechanics and bored pilots. This is evident in the final words of Mitten's recent speech in Branch, where he admits the Gallente Ice Interdiction is more or less a time killer. In the long run, I believe that the barometer of sandbox success should be that we see fewer events like Hulkageddon, and more videos like Clarion Call.

The ability to entertain Goon troops is directly tied to The Mittani's ability to command their attention. In the absence of an engaging challenge in 0.0 space, he has exploited the most base way to keep them entertained – through preying on the weak and relishing in the anguish of another. This is the essence of tear collecting. This is not a judgment upon The Mittani, as every story needs a villain. It is a simply statement of the extents to which he and I will go in the name of fun.

I own multiple Mackinaw pilots on separate accounts, I mine ice to fuel my POS and capital ships, and I don't use a bot program. I have no shame in admitting its a pain in the ass to have days where the frequency of attacks make safety measures such as alignment and scanning insufficient protection to get anything done. Nobody is “fixing the game” by not letting me do my work, nor are they teaching me anything about the cold, harsh reality of EvE. I'm perfectly aware of where I can be ganked.

There's really no messianic "Jesus Features" needed here, just keeping some goals in mind when revising some systems CCP already acknowledged are long overdue – crime-watch, bounties, and mining mechanics.



"Breaking up" mining monotony

I recently observed much talk by one of the "leading" high sec candidates in this race that the problem with mining is that its boring, easy to bot, and needs new mechanical controls to make it demand more focus. I think we can do far simpler.

Perhaps its my ADHD, but one of the most boring aspects of mining to me is the lack of motion involved. As far as I know (and please correct me if I'm wrong) real asteroids drift and move about, colliding with one another, I see no reason why EvE 'roids can't be a little more lively. By dynamically re-spawning the asteroids on a frequent basis and having barges move a little from roid to roid, you resist botting attempts. Moving targets also provide an increased challenge (without artificial barriers) to would-be aggressors.

Flame away, I'm not a career miner, I'm just trying to think outside the box here. Moving asteroids will probably expose my bias as a combat pilot, but lets be honest, there's already a base similarity between shooting rocks and say, shooting a POS. Why not make things a little more interesting? Somewhere, I imagine, a CCP programmer is cursing my name right now. I honestly have no clue how difficult something like that is to model, but it makes sense to me.

A player-driven security economy would supersede CONCORD in power

The perpetually tardy yet lethally-armed mall cops that we call CONCORD "security" are ultimately useless in the long run – they only fine suicide attackers the cost of their ship *after* the crime is committed. Ship loss becomes only a small fee to be paid by those who want to engage in

ganking as often as they want.

Meanwhile, one of the archetypal professions in science fiction gathers dust from years of neglect in the EvE universe. Bounty hunting needs to be put back in the game, seriously, and soon. Give the players the ability to take exchange their kill rights to create a bounty contract upon their attacker, and we'll see a new profession grow and provide PvP opportunities for players to live on the *other* side of the law. Grievers should be always be grievable in return, plain and simple. They deserve to be wanted men and be hunted down for profit.

If we are going to protect Mittens' right to wear the black hat, than let's give other players the option to wear the white hat. It's only fair.

Revenge is sweet, but the devil is in the details. (Thank you [Malcanis](#), for your contributions)

Any hope of a player-driven security solution is DOA while we are hampered by archaic kill right and bounty mechanics. The problem with each is simple. Kill rights are only useable by the victim, and bounties are only redeemable on pods.

It doesn't matter how old your toon is, or how rich you are, or whether you're strong enough to engage in PvP, CONCORD currently says that only *you* can take care of your issues. That's bullshit. This is EvE, its a sandbox, being able to pay someone else to take out a revenge hit just makes sense, no matter where you live.

When Mittens catches one of my Mackinaw pilots with their pants down, fapping away while mining a belt, he won't hesitate to blast it into oblivion, tech 2 rigs and all. I deserve the right to make him pay, but my Mackinaw pilot will never be able to enact the revenge herself.

I should be able to head to the nearest CONCORD office, pony up 100 million isk, and relinquish my kill rights to create a bounty upon his *property*. Nope, not upon his pod – no one's going to catch that in empire space, without the assistance of bubbles. And he'd simply pod himself to take my isk, which would be completely wasted.

Until the kill right period has expired, the 100 million isk placed on the contract should be paid out in the form of bounties equal to a fixed percentage of the values of the ships and modules Mittens loses to those that accept the contract. This prevents exploitation. If a partial bounty is only worth 75% of the property destroyed, there's zero economic incentive to deliver on your own contract, unless you just want it off your back. Some pilots may WANT to do this, because lifting a bounty will mean they won't be actively hunted anymore. That freedom shouldn't come cheap though, you'll still have to incur a stack of loss mails.

CONCORD should also provide me the option of exactly *who* I can offer the bounty contract to. For example, I could pay an individual to take on the task (such as a professional, skilled assassin) – or pay my own corp-mates to assist in retribution. I just don't want *anyone* being able to accept the contract, otherwise The Mittani might just take care of it himself.

Bounty contracts should also be able to be used to transfer kill rights to the general public, but we could limit this to a subset of licensed bounty hunters who would be authorized to accept such a public contract. Remember those Navy Comets with the police skins? Let's give em back to players so they can punch those blinky lights and yell "WHOO WHOO" to their hearts content while they chase down the bad guys. Of course, any publicly licensed bounty hunter would have to have a high security status to pass CONCORD's background check and be accepted into the program. That just makes sense!

Yes, my sympathy for a more scaled risk/reward level throughout high sec does leave a few areas of high sec more vulnerable to gank attacks. The tradeoff is that it should be made even *safer* in others. In the end, I can live with EvE still being called a sandbox no matter how unfriendly it becomes for the Goons and their imitators – as long as it is the *players* that are providing the additional security and not an arbitrary, broken NPC system.

Wardecs. We have them.

No serious candidate in this race is going to get a free pass from talking about this issue, no matter how incendiary it may be. I'll just get this over with and rip the band-aid off.

If you enlist in a player corp in EvE, I believe you should be vulnerable to a war declaration. There isn't much to debate here, it's always how it's been, and always how it will be. I believe players that can't stomach being wardec'd should have the option to choose the NPC corp of their choice (for role play reasons) though the price of security should be a noticeable tax rate (CONCORD security ain't cheap).

Let's face it – swapping corp names and other paperwork tricks to avoid a wardec is just plain silly, and breaks immersion. It pains me to see people giving up creative names and racking up huge corp histories bouncing around all the time. However, corporations not consenting to open warfare still need a few more tools in their arsenal to defend themselves.

I'm going to give you my honest opinion here, though it will undoubtedly piss a few people off. I consider predatory high sec war declarations to be one of the *cheapest* forms of PvP available in the game. Truly hardcore PvP pilots move to low sec or null sec and seek out armed, skilled

opponents who present a genuine challenge in return. Picking on a weaker corp and attacking them when you know they cannot fight back is some pretty unimpressive business. It's not worth glorifying, and I refuse to call this kind of non-consensual PvP one of the "defining features of EvE" because there's just so many cooler things you can do in the sandbox.

Those that have been crying on the forums because weaker corps are evading their attempts to attack them are equally guilty of loss aversion. Instead of facing a talented foe in more dangerous space, many pilots continue to complain because they can't freely engage PvP targets that they know present no real danger to their own safety.

I personally am tired of all the childish bickering on both sides of the argument. Lets provide some simple disincentives for predatory war declarations, while in the process closing back up the current Alliance war shielding loophole that was rightfully deemed an exploit for so many years.

I was wardec'd often when belonged to a fledgling player corporation, and our typical strategy was to simply blue-ball the aggressor. This is a legitimate defense against war declarations. No one should be obligated to lose ships, ever. It's everyone's choice to undock no matter how bored you get. Kill-mail denial is a strategy that works in the long term as a deterrent, it just should be a little more effective and not take as long to kick in. It's all about risk/reward, after all! Players choosing the least risky form of PvP should be suffering a hit to their wallet in the mean time, just as if you chose the least risky form of PvE.

I have heard several, straightforward approaches to solving this issue, all of which have merit and are worth serious consideration. One approach would be to enable victimized corporations to simply bribe CONCORD, driving up the cost of war to the declaring corp. This would give true carebear corporations the opportunity to spend the wealth they accumulate to make bothering them much more costly. War fees could also simply rise each week if not declared mutual, making prolonged predatory harassment economically unsustainable.

No doubt we will have plenty to discuss regarding the matter in the days to come, but I believe there are a lot of small ways proposed by the players that can dramatically increase the cost of predatory high sec war declarations while still preserving the existence of this form of non-consensual PvP within the empire core.

Nailing the coffin in the victim mentality

[Seamus Donahue](#) once shared an idea that completely changed my perspective on the NPC balance in EvE. He posited that one of the broken elements of PvE and PvP balancing is the "rock-paper-scissors" effect between PvE fittings, PvP fittings, and NPC entities. This creates the

scenario where "difficult" missioning involves a massive tank and a room full of enemies, a PvP fit can easily disarm the missioner, and yet a PvP fit is suboptimal for taking on rats.

The result is that PvE pilots are trained away from learning skills that could help them defend themselves, when part of developing a pilots training through the mission system could help them fit and fly their ships against NPC's that behave similarly to PvP activity.

The code is already there – CCP has demonstrated great success in implementing advanced AI including target switching, logistical use, Ewar, kiting, and other tricks that pilots will no doubt facing other targets. The more of this, the better.

Even career missioners are not defending "tank the room" game play as particularly compelling. Despite all the kerfluffle over payouts on incursions, what often gets lost in the flame wars is that most pilots agree that Incursions are the most fun you can have in EvE PvE, hands down.

The closer we merge NPC AI with player behavior, the more enjoyment we feed our PvE fans, as well as ease the transition into low sec or null sec game play, should they decide to explore outwards. The thought of "incidental" PvP becomes much less odorous when soloing if you are prepared with a fit capable of defending itself.

I have no interest in coddling anyone. Nobody gets more enjoyment out of EvE in the long run when you go that route. Instead I want to *empower* high sec residents – providing greater learning opportunities, more game play variety, and most of all – more ways to defend and avenge when a determined hooligan inevitably tracks you down.



THE BORDERLANDS

Low sec will always have a special place in my heart, there is no denying my love for this much-maligned sector of EvE space. Regardless of the historic lack of iterated mechanics, low sec is beginning to see attention again. The small gang warfare that thrives in the absence of true Sovereignty Warfare and an entrenched supercap presence has seen some recent injections of fun in the form of POCO's, sub capital ship balancing, the fixing of Faction Warfare plex spawning, as well as lucrative new deadspace loot drops.

Despite some of the recent developments that have begun to address long-overdue issue facing low sec, there is still a tremendous amount of work to be done to make low sec the small-gang PvP orgy it used to be when I first began playing. Since Apocrypha there have been four other expansions that all failed to substantially address the core issues affecting the game play that *should* be thriving in this area of space.

Luckily for CCP, enhancing low sec is a pretty straightforward task. The old paradigm has been that the primary issue facing low sec is lack of scalability in risk / reward . Supposedly there just isn't a great enough economic incentive in low sec to properly attract a resident population capable of arming Faction Warfare pilots and providing pirate corporations the steady stream of targets they crave in their pursuit of endless PvP. Trebor Daehdoow recently wrote about low sec needing to be valuable enough to entice high sec candidates, but unattractive enough that 0.0 alliances wouldn't simply move in instead.

Frankly, I don't think he understands lowsec at all. The primary appeal to lowsec has never been the sum total of its resources. **Low sec is FIGHT CLUB.** It is the home to the “arenas” and “battlegrounds” that everyone perpetually complains are missing from the game. What the past CSM hasn't realized is that *those arenas are already here*. They just need a little work.

Low fruit in low sec.

I'd like to start with two easy fixes I've come across that would greatly enhance the game play we all came for when we chose to live in low sec space.

The first relates to crime-watch. I understand that CCP is already working on this system, and I concede that many of the ideas discussed in this document may be a moot point by the time I take office. I share them nonetheless as a demonstration of the how many great idea the players themselves are producing whether or not they are being heard by the developers, and to give voters a chance to understand that I favor elegant, transformational fixes as supposed to “massive

overhauls” whenever they aren't really needed. In some areas of gameplay, they certainly are, but should be avoided whenever possible.

GCC is currently a pain-in-the-ass time killer. Most of us that fight in lowsec are like roaming packs of dogs. We're a bunch of pit bulls off the leash, and we go crazy waiting around to do something because the gate gun mechanics make half our fleet DOA. GCC has its purpose, and is a reasonable mechanic, but 15 minutes is just too much thumb-twiddling for a lot of PvP pilots to find tolerable. Much drinking ensues, shit gets talked, but the quality of the fights just all goes down after that. Just nerf it to 10 minutes. That is plenty of time for someone looking to avoid fights (miners, missionaries, explorer, haulers) to make an escape, but not so much that you dramatically reduce the amount of fights you allow your PvP junkies to entertain themselves with in a given night. Common sense stuff here.

The second fix is equally simple – Rats in low sec space should be the only ones capable of granting security status increases. CONCORD is not present in 0.0. It makes little conceptual sense that we would all take jaunts into 0.0 to raise our security status, when it is the *low sec* pirate rats that truly threaten the citizens of the empires. This has the added benefit of keeping low sec PvP pilots around in low sec every night, elevating the overall activity. Perhaps balancing would need to be done as to the rate of sec status increases, but I'm not a numbers expert and I won't pretend to be. However, I do think there's a much *better* way to confront the issue of sec status in terms of how it negatively impacts small gang PvP.

What happens in Amamake, stays in Amamake.

That's right, the honor of my next shameless lift of a brilliant plan goes to [Jack Dant](#), whose proposal on the Assembly Hall is probably the best solution for enhancing low sec game play I've seen since beginning the game. Jack Dant understood that the reason we all are here, whether its for Faction Warfare or for Piracy, is to get fights. That's it. We want to kill each other, in every ship in EvE. (except Supercarriers, of course. Death to all Supercaps!) I will urge CCP to strongly consider some version of his basic proposal, should I be elected as a CSM council member.

Jack shrewdly pointed out that if low sec really means “lowered security” it should mean that we are held less responsible for our aggressive behavior, especially when its mutual. CONCORD should not be paying close attention to the activity out here, and should limit all ship-to-ship and ship-to-structure combat security hits to only lowering a pilot to -2.0 status. Additionally, *any* ship that has *any* negative sec status, would always be fair game to shoot without incurring gate or station fire. This effectively enables a much larger pool of pilots to engage in casual low sec PvP frequently without losing the ability to return to high sec. As long as those pilots choose to behave themselves in high sec, there's no reason to cripple small gang warfare culture by having

GCC apply in so many situations where both pilots clearly just want to have fun and kill each other.

Many continue to argue that the ability to gank high sec industrialists and mission runners remains one of the pinnacles of EvE gameplay. If that's the case, I see no reason why we shouldn't require pilots that engage in the most egregious activities to also be willing to walk the more challenging path. I believe the pilots that define themselves as a truly non-consensual PvP-er, by either pod-killing of neutrals in low sec, or by suicide ganking ships in high sec, should pay the price for threatening overall safety by suffering the attention of *whatever* security exist along each low sec system. The security threshold of -2.0 will help to distinguish between weekend warriors like myself, and career criminals like The Mittani. Dropping below -2.0 security rating will classify you as the most unlawful class of PvP pilot, and require you to face greater challenge when loitering near the secure travel lanes. In essence, I believe its possible to redesign low sec sentry fire to actually discriminate between pilots that want a more casual PvP experience, and those that are willing to work a little harder for the "honor" of collecting tears.

While we're on the subject of gate guns, I think there's a few options we have to make them more interesting and break up the monotony of engagements as well. Part of the reason PvP is dampened in lowsec is because the combined strength of sentry fire and ease of falling below -5.0 security rating kills the use of fundamental small gang ships like fast tackle. I *despise* any mechanic limiting the variety of ships viable for gang warfare that exist in the very region that should be *promoting* gang warfare.

This should look familiar, its the other half of Mal Darkrunner's set of scalable sec status consequences, and deserves exposure and recognition:

- In a 0.1 system there might not be any station/gate guns, but bubbles would not be anchorable.
- In a 0.2 system there would be station guns but no gate guns.
- In a 0.3 system there would be both station guns and gate guns, but they would not be as powerful as those in a 0.4
- In a 0.4 system there would be more powerful station guns and gate guns, and there would be a small chance of faction navy or pirate navy NPCs spawning when a criminal act takes place

Remember – these gate gun consequences are really only being applied to those who commit to non-consensual high sec PvP, and have ended up with lower than -2.0 security rating. Normal ship-to-ship combat in low sec could still be done freely as long as the aggressed holds a negative security rating. Aggression against players with a high security rating would still warrant a GCC

response, and subsequent level of sentry fire, and continue to lower a pilot's security rating until they reached the -2.0 threshold.

There are two primary advantages to such a graduated sentry system. The first is that would allow for a greater variety of engagements to occur in a greater variety of ships depending on the location of the encounter. The second is that it allows for pockets to form where the most lawless pirates can retreat and lick their wounds before preparing to raid deeper into the empire core once again.

Death to docking games!

Docking games suck. Pirates hate them, Faction Warfare pilots hate them, and current mechanics favor them. Luckily, there are simple measures that can be done to reduce this.

One of the luxuries Crucible brought us was the benefit of reduced session change timers. This is great for quick and casual game play in general. I think we can all agree the sooner the developers reduce this to zero, the smoother and more responsive EvE warfare will feel.

However, the one current drawback to this change is that the session change timer is tied to the undocking timer, which now falls well below the aggression timer – enabling abuse. Pilots that are aggressed can dock and undock quickly enough to reship in something greatly overpowering the initial aggressor – putting a dampening effect on those that have cornered their prey and want to go for the kill. I feel a proper balance should mean equalizing the aggression timer and the undocking timer, even though quick session changes when fleeing or gate jumping are still a wonderful boon to fluid, constant, PvP.

For Faction Warfare – simply turn the gate guns of militia-occupied stations onto the enemy. This should be a no-brainer, a mission runner deep behind enemy lines should not be able to make frequent repair / resupply stops in their enemy's stations with impunity. If I'm lingering outside a 24th Imperial crusade station, I should be in pain. Also, Scotty the docking manager is always on someone's payroll – and I don't think his employers would appreciate him moonlighting by doing repair work on the enemy's property. Stations may initially be owned by one faction, but as occupancy of a system changes, a title can be placed on the station to reflect this, so that an enemy-occupied structure would still be identifiable and would fire on its previous occupants until reclaimed.

You could have just asked us what needs to be done.

One of the core reasons Faction Warfare has stagnated is that while we have "terrain" to fight inside that reduces blobbing and promotes diverse ship use, the system still lacks incentives for victory. Occupancy of a system only affects its name, there are no rewards for direct PvP participation, and no penalties for being invaded by the enemy. Even potential motivators such as holding rank, are essentially meaningless. No one is proud because they've run 2 dozen missions. We're all "generals" now, even those who have never fired a single shot at another player.

The community has been great about pursuing fights for fun's sake regardless, but it has not been enough to keep PvP activity at casual-friendly frequency levels for any length of time. The Mittani has written that what truly fuels war in 0.0 is pure hatred of the enemy, more so than economics. If this were true of the Faction Warfare culture, we wouldn't have had so many thousand of pilots move away into other parts of the game. The RP motivations should theoretically be enough. They were indeed for a while, but hatred as a driver of conflict is just not a strong value in lowsec culture. The thrill of the fight itself, is. Despite the potential appeal for RP in Faction Warfare, the majority simply want casual PvP – and as often as possible. Within the Amarr-Minmatar conflict, pilots have switched sides frequently to obtain the greatest number of PvP targets, preferring to fight for the underdog because waiting around for the enemy is boring.

The solutions are mostly simple, elegant, and require no new complicated game play structures to be imposed on the old framework. Give players LP for seizing plexes. The plexes will fill with gangs again looking for fights and a paycheck, I guarantee it. We are in the militia because we love engaging in PvP, we hate being forced to grind missions when we could be fighting instead. Ship losses in daily PvP can get expensive, so we have to provide militia pilots an income stream. It only makes sense to tie that income stream to the activity they enlisted in Faction Warfare for to begin with.

And even though missions could be completely removed from Faction Warfare without destroying its primary appeal, if left in the game they at least need to be made more dangerous. The first thing a Faction Warfare pilot learns on their way to a "top rank" is how to run a lot of missions and not get caught along the way. This is asinine. We now have watered down markets due to an abundance of mission farming alts that collect LP but never participate in the PvP culture. CCP already has the capability to tweak NPC AI to encourage ship diversity in the mission system, they just need to apply it.. As the challenge goes up, farming decreases, and those that choose to use missions to gain income no longer have to grind through torturous amounts of them when they'd rather be in a fleet with friends. Having missions on overview is still an excellent way to bait

fights – but since the missions can be completed with stealth bombers, it immediately breaks the risk / reward balance. FW missions have always remained an extremely low risk though highly rewarding source of income, so it should be no surprise that they have been one of the primary culprits that break Faction Warfare game play. Either fix the risk-reward balance, or gut them entirely.

The most important thing to remember – all Faction Warfare system improvements should be made with the following criteria in mind – does this change help create more fights, more often, without extensive travel or down time? If not, its no good for us, and CCP will quickly lose paying customers if this criteria is not fully utilized.

The sad truth is that none of these common-sense, simple to implement solutions are even remotely on CCP's radar. If they are, they haven't shared it with us yet. Instead, we've been given a comical set of “FW overhaul” ideas that couldn't be any less rooted in the understanding of militia pilots or low sec culture in general. The very notion discussed that “FW mechanics could somehow, someday be applicable to null sec sovereignty” stands as irrefutable proof that neither the developers nor the existing CSM have any understanding of who we are, what we like to do, and what we know will fix the problem.

Why limit who you can fight for, in a sandbox role playing game?

I haven't even begun to touch on the many things future developments could hold for low sec, but I'll name a couple.

For starters, if the faction warfare iterations are a success, I think its only natural that they follow the original design intent and expand to include pirate factions as well, should enough player interest be voiced in enlisting as a pirate. We already have an abundance of existing pirate NPC plexes peppering low sec systems, I see no reason why a subset of these can't be converted to PvP use, just as the Faction Warfare plexes have been, and allow pirate role players to help their faction occupy areas of low sec as much as the militias. And just as a militia member gives up the right to access certain areas of high sec space because they belong to the enemy, similarly CONCORD deputy capsuleers would be licensed to fire away on pirate collaborators, perhaps earning bonuses such as LP for flushing them out of a system.

It's also a shame that most pirate mission content that does exist in the game resides in 0.0, whereas most players that culturally consider themselves pirates (and often honor ransom's, etc) primarily reside in low sec. I can't speak for them all as I am not a “true” pirate myself, but I imagine that if I were I'd find it fun to be able to run pirate missions *in low sec* or engage in occupancy plexing if it meant easier access to all those pirate ships and modules.

Low sec problems are not rocket surgery.

Low sec is *FIGHT CLUB!* Leave all the empire-building, resource management, brutally blobtastic warfare, and bullshit political drama to those that seek it in 0.0. Give us the ability to fight whenever we like, in whatever ships we like and you will have a healthy low sec population for years to come. It's just that simple.



*"I ain't in this for your revolution, and I'm not in it for you, Mittens.
I expect to be well entertained!"*

THE GREAT BEYOND

It would be irresponsible and hypocritical for me to run a campaign dissatisfied with a council that refused to consult expert opinion when needed, only to then propose a platform for regions of space I scarcely inhabit myself.

So there you go. I have no agenda, no platform, no grandiose plans for null sec, or wormholes. That space belongs to those that live there, and you'll have to ask them what they want, because I don't really know what is most important to them. I am not a 0.0 candidate, and can only in good conscience claim to represent empire citizens.

However - let me be clear: I am not campaigning to somehow usurp the agenda of the previous CSM or to interfere with every proposal set forth by the incumbents that will no doubt see re-election. To act as a "lone wolf" would neither allow 0.0 experts to make decisions that affect their rightfully won territory, nor would it garnish the mutual support I must seek from them to successfully present the useful ideas that empire residents have for their own space.

Faction Warfare pilots and those belonging to large 0.0 alliances may be radically different in culture and game play preference, but we do share one thing in common. The core mechanics through which we resolve our military conflicts are fundamentally broken in both areas of space. I remember Dominion's release, and how quickly players cried foul over the changes, only to face the same lack of revision that Faction Warfare has also fought to overcome.

The resulting problems are the same – stagnating warfare, reduced economic incentive to fight, apathy about the homogenous resource distribution, and the lack of identity between regions. These have contributed to the chilling effect that has caused so many pilots to leave 0.0 space for Faction Warfare, or to leave Faction Warfare for 0.0 space, restlessly looking for the most concentrated action.

I strongly believe that the best way to fix much of the endless carebear / griefer flame wars that divide the single-shard community is to simply get null sec space fixed as quickly as possible. Those that play EvE to engage in warfare without limits should have plenty of game play tools to entertain themselves with out in 0.0, enough that harassing empire residents becomes less desirable in co. I will be a tireless advocate for fixing the null sec sovereignty system that Dominion laid the foundation for, but never completed. If elected, I hope the council will show me the same respect and cooperative support for my own community's objectives in return.

THE MAN BEHIND THE KEYBOARD

My name is Noah Garaas, and I'm a 29 year old lifelong resident of Seattle, Washington, USA. I am recently married, and am lucky to have a wonderful wife who is both supportive of my hobby and truly understands how much EvE means to me and why I must campaign for CSM this year.

I have been playing computer games from the day my family could afford our first computer – a Packard Bell 486. I grew up on a steady diet of strategy, simulation, and role playing games, but spaceships have always have had a special place for me: X-Wing, TIE Fighter, Wing Commander, Privateer, Freespace, and Homeworld were the staple games of my youth.

My day job consists of managing an asset inventory for a massive online retailer based in Seattle. Unfortunately, there is an NDA that protects me from saying which one - every corporation has them, I guarantee they were not invented by CCP to torture info-hungry capsuleers.

What in the world does this have to do with internet spaceships, you ask?

Well, my work primarily involves handling customer service requests, in the form of a constantly revolving ticket queue. At any given time I usually have hundreds of anxious customers each with their own individual needs that need to be prioritized and completed in a timely fashion. The backlog of EvE features to develop is no different – players from all regions of space have requests that touch every facet of game play. Successful oversight of the completion of backlogged tasks requires strong, two-way communication for a productive relationship to be maintained.

I am already known for this in my advocacy for the Faction Warfare community – I have worked hard to ensure that even when there isn't good news to share about how fast FW improvements are coming along, the player community understands where the process stands so they can provide the most relevant and effective feedback possible.

As a CSM 7 member one of my core agendas will be to ensure that an open a line of communication can be kept between the developers and the players – the more that is withheld, the greater the risk a released feature will fall short of customer expectations.

LAST BUT NOT LEAST....

CCP, PLEASE FIX THE @#\$%ING FORUMS.

FIX EVEGATE-SENT MAIL:

ITS UNREADABLE WITHIN THE CLIENT.

COMMUNICATION IS EVERYTHING.

And to everyone else:

Thank you for taking the time to get to know me, and what I will bring to the next council. If you liked what you heard, *I would greatly appreciate your vote.*

Together we can shatter the assumption that only the 0.0 blocs can win the top council positions. The work has already begun. *Will you help me finish the race?*

VOTE HANS JAGERBLITZEN FOR CSM7

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I'd like to thank a few individuals that have been meaningful to me personally, contributed to this campaign with their time, or simply been inspiring to me during my time as an EvE player. These are in no particular order, and the list is by no means exhaustive. But I couldn't do this without you, and in EvE we all know that you are as only as powerful as strength of your friends and the number of those you command the respect of.

First off – my corporate CEO Indius Lux – my career-long boss, partner and supporter, who has taught me much about leadership despite often working behind the scenes. To my corporation Autocannons Anonymous – the most insanely fun bunch of pilots I've had the honor of being blown up next to – you guys will always be on the top of my watch lists when I drop my Logistics.

To M0220h: my closest friend, confidant, and brother-in-arms. Thanks for always being there for me. To my co-director Kaver Linkovir – who everyone thought was so nutty for his “unite the militias” initiative that would inevitably surface twice a year. This time we've actually done it – though with votes, if not guns. We'll still be nuking each other on Tranquility throughout the election, of course.

To DeMichael Crimson, who was one of the individuals who took the time to teach me everything I needed to know about the game when I started out. I don't know how you do it, but your seemingly masochistic commitment to learning every aspect of EvE PvE inside out proves that there is still much there for experienced players to enjoy despite being ridiculed for “carebearing”. You created a tremendous resource for the EvE community, and are living proof that yes, people really do play EvE for the missions.

To Bahamut420 – the best FC the Minmatar Militia has ever known. We don't need CCP to give us “voted in leadership” because everyone knows you are the Admiral and can wield authority with or without a pointless title. And to Missy Lorelai – who has taken PvP in small ships and turned it into an art form – our corp wouldn't be the same without your expertise and tutelage. Duct Tayp, if you ever read this, its time to get back in your Jaguar again! We miss you.

To Har Harrison – who fired the first shots of a revolution a year ago when you held CCP responsible for failing to meet with their own customers at FanFest. You sparked a wave of feedback from the militias that has grown into volumes over the last year – and yet sadly completely failed to reach CCP after all of our mutual work to deliver it to them. I must also thank Shalee Lianne for documenting the Militia community with your [Sovereignty Wars](#) blog – I hope

you get many more subscribers eager to see how much fun has been had in Faction Warfare.

To the EvE Online forum community – who despite the troll presence still contains an enormous wealth of talent, ingenuity, and tenacity that often goes unnoticed. CCP opens threads that exist for the sake of testing feedback, you all spent hours and hours of your time providing it, and sometimes not a single thing is changed, nor a reasonable explanation given as to why. This is the kind of stuff that needs to be investigated, and resolved. I believe in the forums, I believe in player feedback, and I despise the trolls that disrupt the very process of discussion and improvement, which is needed to generate the type of ideas contained in this document and deliver them into the developers' hands.

Lastly, to the current council members. You have transformed the CSM into an entity with power and influence, and for that should be commended. You have proposed many sensible solutions, and helped deliver a beloved expansion that I think most of us have enjoyed. But the reality is that you and I both know that we can do *better* this coming year. Mistakes were made. Players are still unheard in areas outside of CSM candidate constituencies, and the game suffers as a result. I know full well I will be working alongside many of you should I be elected this March. Understand my goal here is to support the good work you already started, but also to hold you responsible for when features are discussed that are not well known to those of us on the council, and to encourage everyone to listen closely enough to the players that when we discuss a feature with CCP we can truly say that *the people it will affect* are not being left out of the planning.

And yes, Mr. Gianturco – I even need to thank you too. You told me I should run and warned me what it would take to win, and whether or not you actually *are* the devil incarnate as reported, you certainly know how to win elections. You told me Faction Warfare deserved an “alternate” seat (before the recent electoral reform) but *I know* the community can do better. I have worked hard the last several months to provide EvE voters the head start they need to place a true representative of empire space into the top seven of CSM7. This fight is no longer about Faction Warfare, it's now about protecting the interest of *every* pilot who lives outside of 0.0. You have long asserted that the council must be run by null sec representatives “for the good of the game”. I look forward to seeing how many players are willing to support me this March in challenging that assertion.

Game on, indeed!

o7

-Hans