



TRAVIAN

LEGENDS

ON TOUR

WORKSHOP #3

07/07/2020



TRAVIAN

LEGENDS

ON TOUR

PARTICIPANTS

Travian Team

- Brian – Product Owner
- Jake – Game Designer
- Cécile – Head of Customer Service & Community Management
- Laure – Customer Service Manager
- Aiste – Rule Enforcement Team Lead
- Froz – Customer Service Game Expert
- Minke – Community Management Team Lead
- Liudmila – Community Management Team Lead
- Marcus – Customer Service Team Lead



Ambassadors

- BlackBlade - (Anglosphere)
- El_Tano - (Hispano)
- Lotte - (Germany)
- Jelena - (Balkans)
- Kazah - (Russia)
- nionet8 - (Italy)
- Demix_IT (Italy)
- ThomasGB/Spartan - (CM Anglo/France)
- wishmaster3 - (International)





TRAVIAN

LEGENDS

ON TOUR

UPCOMING CHANGES
FROM TRAVIAN GAMES

MULTIACCOUNTS - TOOLS

Internal tools for multihunting will be improved.

Without giving too much details, we hope that these tools will help catch more cheaters.



MULTIACCOUNTS - PUNISHMENTS

Punishments for multiaccounts and password sharing will change and will be significantly stronger from the first offence to the fourth.

- Customer Service will merge punishments for Multiaccount and Password Sharing.
- On the 4th offence, accounts will be set on deletion.
- Multiaccounts are still deleted from the 1st offence. On the 4th offense, both the multiaccounts and the main account are deleted.



MULTIACCOUNTS - RET

The Ambassadors raised the concern that the Rule Enforcement Team has not enough time to do active multiunting, but only react on reports.

Active multihunting time for the Rule Enforcement Team is monitored to make sure they have enough time to handle all servers.

We will continue to monitor and adapt when needed.



TECH ACCOUNTS

Recap of the ambassadors' concerns:

1. Tech account "owner" gets achievements for top raider without much effort.
2. Tech accounts provides resources way beyond the pushing protection limits.
3. Tech accounts are defended. If they'd be open farms, it would be fine.
4. Tech accounts provide free villages to the tech account "owner".
5. Tech accounts are used to clear oasis for the tech account "owner".



TECH ACCOUNTS – RULE CHANGE

Travian Games Suggestion: we add an additional rule.

“An account must always be played in its benefit or its alliance or confederacy’s benefit. Accounts that exist solely for the benefit of another account in another alliance or confederacy may be permanently banned.”

With this rule, we **will punish**:

- accounts that have no alliance or in a 1 player alliance that get raided only by 1 player repeatedly
- accounts that repeatedly defend all other raids from other people but the ones from one player/alliance
- accounts that jump in and out of confederacy with one player to get defense but let this player raid him without defending
- accounts which raid those private farms

With this rule, we **won’t be able to punish**:

- accounts that are within an alliance/confederacy and supports other players from that group of players by parking troops, sending resources
- accounts that give away villages
- spies



DISCUSSION

- It is clear that private farms have taken a huge part in the strategy of players. In some cases, they give close to the same advantage as a multiaccount.
- This change was not intended when Travian Games removed the rule 1.1 “an account must be played in its own benefit.”
- Hand in hand with the next suggestion (slide #13) that came from ambassadors, Travian Games thinks the addition of this new rule and fighting against private farms will help in controlling the advantage given by tech accounts.
- This also requires some improvements of the Rule Enforcement tools.
- The goal is to allow private farms within the confederacy/alliance **only**. These will be subject to the pushing limitations for raiding.
- Once private farms are more under control, we can investigate other behaviors that remain a problem.
- Human interpretation of this new rule will not be an issue like the previous rule 1.1. Only specific behaviors will be actively punished by the Rule Enforcement team.

FOLLOW-UP

Travian Games will work on implementing the tools necessary to actively hunt private farms. Players will be informed when the game rule will be added and Rule Enforcement will start taking actions.



TRAVIAN

LEGENDS

ON TOUR

AMBASSADORS
SUGGESTIONS

CHANGE PUSHING RESTRICTIONS

Make confederacy pushing restrictions the same as alliance restrictions.

Proposed by: **Russia**



DISCUSSION

- A year ago, Travian Games developed changes to the pushing limitations for raiding regardless of the connection between attacker/defender. The community didn't like it. We need to be careful before we change it again.
- Pushing limitations inside an alliance allows more marketplace trading. If we decide to align alliance and confederacy limitations, it will allow more marketplace trading within confederacy as well thus giving an advantage to multiaccounts.
- In order to fight private farms, we require the same raiding limitations within the confederacy as the alliance.
- There is general agreement that **only the raiding limitations should be the same within the alliance and the confederacy** to keep multiaccounts and tech accounts raiding advantages under control.

FOLLOW-UP

Travian Games will proceed with the implementation of the raiding limitations to confederacies.



SAME PC - ACCOUNT INTERACTION

Forbid any type of interaction between accounts connecting from the same PC (type 3). No push, No assistance, no conquest, no nothing.

Proposed by: **France**



DISCUSSION

- Last year during LOT, we came to the agreement to align same PC / IP/ Sitter connections restrictions.
- Sitters should not be punished for helping their alliance.
- To the question, are you interested in implementing the suggestion from last year, most of the ambassadors replied no.
- To the question, are you interested in remove any kind of interaction between same PC connection accounts, most of the ambassadors replied no.
- Travian Games doesn't believe this would solve the issue of multiaccounts. It would negatively impact regular players.

FOLLOW-UP

Travian Games will **not** proceed to implement this suggestion.



SITTER BANS

Ban account if sitter is using it more than owner.

Proposed by: **Russia**



DISCUSSION

- Travian Games asked to specify what is “more”. It can be implemented but we need a threshold in mind.
- On certain servers, there are sometimes whole alliances played by sitters only with very little activity by owners.
- Tracking the online time would be arbitrary. A sitter can have the account he is sitting open all day and not do anything on it.
- Changing how often the owner would need to log in, will not change the outcome. The owner will simply login more often and still not play the account.
- Sitter activity is already tracked as a multiaccount indicator by Rule Enforcement. We use this data in order to investigate further an account and find other multiaccount indicators before we sanction the account.

FOLLOW-UP

We do not see an easy way to implement this suggestion. We're open to more concrete ideas on limitations for sitters that are not linked to online time.



LEADER TO GET BAN NOTIFICATIONS

In every alliance, create a "leader role". The leader will receive a notification when a Team member receives a ban.

Proposed by: **France**



DISCUSSION

- Travian Games will not add a role but simply inform players who have the “assign to position” role within the alliance that “player” was banned.
- Ambassadors agree that it would be beneficial to give this information to leaders (especially for less experienced leaders).
- Travian Games will not share the reason of the ban. This needs to be discussed between the alliance leader and the player who received the ban.
- Payment bans will not trigger a message to the alliance leader(s).
- Warnings will trigger a message to the alliance leader(s).
- It will not impact the amount of multiaccounts, but it will help leaders in their fight against cheating.

FOLLOW-UP

Travian Games will implement this in-game. However this change will not be our top priority and may take a longer time before it's implemented.



ALLIANCE PUNISHMENTS

Punish whole alliance for one member violation.

Proposed by: **ambassadors**



DISCUSSION

- There is a chance that it could be abused by enemies.
- Punishment should not be highly impactful but more an annoyance. So no universal building level, pop, or troops penalties.
- This would make alliance leaders more interested in reducing the amount of cheaters in their ranks.
- Punishment could be linked to the alliance bonus. We could increase the amount of required resources for the next level.
- Several edge cases would need to be looked into like what if a player leaves the alliance before accepting punishment, etc.
- Decision to implement this should be a result of the communities' opinions.

FOLLOW-UP

Ambassadors will approach the topic with their communities in order to define with them what would be the advantages to put this in place. Ambassadors should also discuss what type of punishments it should be.





TRAVIAN

LEGENDS

ON TOUR

WHAT HAPPENS NOW?

NEXT STEPS

- Travian Games will work on implementing the topics that were approved. This implementation will be done step by step to avoid changing too many things at the same time.
- The ambassadors will approach the topic of alliance punishments with their communities.





TRAVIAN

LEGENDS

ON TOUR

THANKS!