
Saturday, 02 December 2017 Hansard

Session 4, Quarter 4 of 2017
02 December 2017

Bills tabled:

| Bill Name Proposer | Bill No | Stage of Consideration | Outcome (Ayes/Noes) |
|---|----------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Mentionable List Revision Bill Minebuilder1223, MP, Prime Minister, PFG | 17410 | First Reading | N/A |

Speaker of Parliament:

1. hinwapoon

Original report written by:
Hinwapoon
AngelKevin
2 December 2017

17410

Bill Name:

Mentionable List Revision Bill

Tabled By:

Minebuilder1223, MP, Prime Minister, PFG

Debate:

1. [Opening Speech] It is the view of this government that the current mentionable list system, which only provides a handful of servers that can be mentioned, has become an impediment to the Civil Liberties and Freedom of Expression we have here in WolvHaven. Therefore, as a way to support our freedoms, A new system will be put in place whereby the mentionable list will be entirely removed and in its place, there will be a stricter set of rules to maintain civility on the server. It is my hope that this bill will foster as a way to support our freedoms, A new system will be put in place whereby the mentionable list will be entirely removed and in its place, there will be a stricter set of rules to maintain civility on the server. It is my hope that this bill will foster.
2. [minebuilder1223, MP, PM, PFG] I believe that all members in this parliament chamber should consider that this bill will not create the recipe for disaster as they seem to believe. Stricter rules will be put in place as the bill says, and over the current strict system and there will be no room for advertisement of any kind.
3. [y0urs_Truly, Independent] Would our dear PM be so kind as to provide a TL;DR. cuz i ain't gonna read that wall of text.
4. [minebuilder1223, MP, PM, PFG] This new bill aims to remove the current mentionable list that is enforced and replace it with a stricter set of rules. We believe this is necessary because the conditions that the mentionable list was created under were much more servers and there were issues rampant across the server but these issues have long gone now and with a new system to limit the conditions and context that server names can be mentioned including a much harder hand on advertisement, we believe that such issues will be avoided
5. [autobus22, MP, HGP] The crossbench fully supports this bill. Currently people often feel very limited in speech for no real reason in many situations. This bill still makes sure people are punished for advertising, but removes the nerves around oh hey, can I actually say what I want to see.

6. [ROM5419, MP, NAT] Would the prime minister agree to elaborate on what could be defined as endorsement? Because there might be cases where, say, an implicit advertiser might attempt discussing about another server in an appropriate context but explain the foreign server in a high detail. That could qualify as advertising in this MP's opinion but falls ambiguously in this bill. Clarification please?
7. [minebuilder1223, MP, PM, PFG] Thank you Mr Speaker. The definition of the word "Endorsement" itself is "Declare one's public approval or support of" and therefore in the context of this bill, endorsement is referring to someone speaking highly of another server, such as praising some of it's traits or so on or implying that in some ways that server is better than wolvhaven. I cannot see a situation where the person would be required to praise another server in order to provide context. Since providing context would only require saying the server's name and genre and some of what it's purpose is.
8. [ROM5419, MP, NAT] Consider this scenario: "Sorry I'm late for parliament, I've been busy all day working at MetroLand. The metro system there is a lot larger and more complex than WH's, so no surprise I took so long." This would fall under endorsement despite not directly considered as explicit support right?
9. [minebuilder1223, MP, PM, PFG] Well i wouldn't consider that second part as needing to be said and a verbal warning would have sufficed and below the terms of the bill itself, that sentence is speaking more highly of another server. Since it is comparing WolvHaven's metro network to one of another, and putting that other one in a higher position in terms of complexity and size. In terms of complexity and size. therefore i would seen it an endorsement.
10. [autobus22, MP, HGP] Minebuilder1223 basically said what I wanted to say to ROM5419 so I retract my call to speak.

Mentionable List Revision Bill

A
B I L L
TO

Remove the mentionable list and replace it with a new set of strict rules

Be it enacted by the president of the federation of WolvHaven, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and Representatives, in this parliament assembled, and by authority of the same, as follows -

I. Removal of the Mentionable List

- A. The current mentionable list which provides a list of mentionable servers on the WolvHaven server chat and prohibits any other server names being spoken will be removed.
- B. All minecraft servers will therefore be mentionable

II. New laws regarding the context and way in which servers are mentioned

- A. The current advertisement laws will remain unchanged.
- B. Servers can only be mentioned if they are to provide context or clarity to a conversation such as if an event has happened regarding a foreign server.
- C. Any endorsement of a server with the server name mentioned will be considered as advertising and will be treated accordingly by staff.
- D. Servers can only be mentioned in moderation, if the same or multiple servers are mentioned consistently within chat, it will be considered as advertising and treated accordingly by staff.

III. Extent

- A. This act extends to WolvHaven City, Gardellia, Pangea, Sandbox and Laboratory.

IV. Commencement

- A. All sections will come into force on the day this act is passed.

V. Short Title

- A. This act may be cited as the Mentionable List Revision Act 2017

Motion: Server security review debate

1. SilverWolv, Independent to move that parliament discuss ways in order to prevent future mass grief cases such as the one that occurred on the 1 December 2017/Early 2 December 2017

Debate:

1. [SilverWolv, Independent] Thank you Mr speaker I move that parliament discuss ways in which we can improve the security of the server without going too far. On the morning of December 2017 singapore time a new member named huhi joined the server for the first time and was soon promoted by carew after a background check. The background check has served us well and has deterred several troublemakers by causing them to either expose their bad behaviour further confirming their unfitness for citizenship or have them reflect on their actions on other servers. This however failed on 2 December as no bans or warnings could be found for huhi on any search engines and allowed him to destroy the sandbox using nuke hacks. Producing extensive amounts of damage that would otherwise only be possible using worldedit. I seek to move that parliament discusses how we can further improve or implement newer measures so as to increase the security of the server, without compromising the experience for newbies to the server.
2. [ROM5419, MP, NAT] This is the fundamental weakness of the BGC system. If the account is new or fresh or otherwise has no evidence of malicious activity, there is no way to flag otherwise. This seems like quite an isolated case at first but based on #server logs. This seems reminiscent of the "joker" events of early 2016. For one, the suspect mentioned "n*gger" on join and later claimed "it was a school assignment CtrlC+V mishap". Then later a couple seconds after getting promoted he got lava bucket achievement and nuked the whole sandbox in seconds and then claimed "i wanted to cypaste in pixelart but whoooooops" then left all seems shady from the start, just for anyone not aware of this morning's events.
3. [SilverWolv, Independent] Thank you I believe that we should also improve staff training in order to get them to notice such behaviour as well. As we speak ezzo has also just pointed out to me that this could have been avoided if the BGC was more thorough. As it was found that the perpetrator had entered a hacking server before which was reflected on minecraft-statistic. I believe we should set a standard protocol for the background check in order to ensure that it tries to dig up as much dirt as it can.
4. [ROM5419, MP, NAT] This MP agrees that setting a standardised BGC protocol is long overdue. But, unless as a last resort, minecraft-statistic is not really the most reliable source. That site logged this MP as spending 10x more time on MRT than WH, and

stated my presence on hundreds of obscure cracked servers, which this MP testifies having no knowledge of. Third party sites are handy, but how does one fact check them all to obtain reliable conclusions?

5. [SilverWolv, Independent] Thank you I agree with what the honorable friend has just said. I believe we should take things with a pinch of salt. We could also reform the background check and immigration process to make it such that a person should be able to declare any bans or warnings that they have had in the past from other servers and it will not be considered in the background check.
6. [ROM5419, MP, NAT] What was just mentioned touches on NAT's pre-election proposal for a mandatory self-introductory document required from every citizen applicant to declare their background. if that is ever passed within this term, the background check could be integrated with that. Problem is, what if the person of interest refuses to declare or deliberately leaves out part of their background history and then the BGC failsafe also fails due to the problems this morning that were just highlighted. Also, how could one detect a newcomer with malicious intent that really has no prior criminal record but immediately starts nuking upon becoming promoted? Especially if that person has had a completely clean and reputable record from elsewhere before joining. This is a worst case scenario, but still...
7. [SilverWolv, Independent] Thank you if we require a self introductory document we might as well make it such that in order to get citizenship, one must apply. Similar to other servers. A permanent residency rank could also work however i doubt it would do much to resolving it if it involves giving PRs build rights.
8. [ROM5419, MP, NAT] On the topic of preventative measures, there is only so much we can do before having to resort to Orwellian-grade surveillance measures or making the citizenship process so bureaucratic and convoluted that only newcomers really intent on causing destruction for a third party's benefit would even bother taking it, i.e. counterproductivity. Also, we are already technically forcing newcomers to apply. Remember, there are some newcomers such as one who joined yesterday that for some reason absolutely refuse to use Discord like the application is some kind of cardinal sin. Forcing newcomers to apply through Discord without any equally accepted alternative (protocol wise). It already helps in security, but did this cost us some player-staff relationship health? How to resolve this without obliterating the playability of WH?
9. [L_izzo, MP, NCP] Well, it seems that, as we prev. said, one of our only ways is to host an application, now that has some cons. as people previously claims, an application or a dec. form can cause a language barrier. But if it is our only solution. then so be it, if we really need to translate it into other language, then we can what happened today was exceeding our slightly comfortable expectations. I recommend people, including our President, in order to compromise some of expectations in order to maintain security because otherwise, would it be a good life to live with people who infiltrate easily?

10. [SilverWolv, Independent] Thank you. In addition to that, I would also like to point out that the defence and intelligence unit (DIU) could also be a bit more proactive in helping with such background checks. The DIU has recently stopped helping processing the bgcs for no apparent reason. In order to increase our security our defence agencies should also chip in to help. We should also rope in the help of server members by asking them to remain vigilant for any of such potential threats. In response to the member rom, I believe certain things can also be derived by forcing people to join our discord. As it was noted, the perpetrator's discord tag was "testdiamondgenerator" which could and should have raised some suspicions.
11. [autobus22, MP, HGP] The crossbench would suggest a strictly standardised and more suspicious background check. A short but simple checkup revealed suspicious data for player Huhi standardised and proper background check checklists could have avoided this, and should be placed going forth.