

“unincluded features”

a Minesweeper Arbiter^[*] investigation

to the attention of

the I.M.C.

<http://www.minesweeper.cc>

by

joni

jonosphere4@gmail.com

Background

On the 31st of August 2006, after having tied for one month Dion Tiu's intermediate record of 10 (with a better decimal score - 10,48 vs 10.91), Jake Warner (a.k.a. Badgers, formerly known as Levente Jakab) claimed the intermediate world record outright with a 9. Dennis Lütken, who had congratulated Jake for his previous records, was one of the first to react on the Guestbook^[†], throwing suspicions that the game might have been actually UPK'd. An I.M.C. declaration followed on the Guestbook a week later, where it was announced additional proof was requested from Jake. One of the reasonings behind it was that since this was a World Record, it needed a higher degree of verification, although, oddly enough, Jake detained at that time both Intermediate Classic and Non-Flagging records. It is now over a full year since those events, and that 9, together with other scores from Jake are still hanging somewhere in mid-air, unquestionably accepted by some, totally ignored by others.

[*] Minesweeper Arbiter, Copyright © 2005-2006 Dmitriy I. Sukhomlynov a.k.a. Rilian

[†] The Authoritative Minesweeper Guestbook:

<http://pub19.bravenet.com/guestbook/show.php?usernum=1561860698> maintained by Damien Moore

“*unincluded features*”, a Minesweeper Arbiter investigation

At that time, as it's in my nature, I believed Jake, and considered the cheating suspicions as relatively unfounded. My views were enforced by coming to learn of other precedents of players unfairly being suspected of cheating and later coming clean. That trust in him has been slowly decreasing during the past year, for not immediately evident reasons... maybe his own behaviour, his attitude towards other players and the attitude of other players towards him have influenced my views.

This letter does not mean to be a letter of accusation towards Jake or anybody. Its main intention is to bring to your attention old issues that have come back to light recently, that regard a vulnerability of an older version of Minesweeper Arbiter. Many sweepers have played on that version, which doesn't necessarily mean they were all aware of this vulnerability, or that they intentionally exploited it even if they were aware. There were some players that have used this version longer than others though -- again that doesn't necessarily mean much *per se* either -- and I have tried to sum up scattered facts about them in one piece. One of these players is Jake and I have tried to pull together relevant information on his case trying to look at everything from an objective point of view, trying also to throw some light into *how* this bureaucratic machinery we call I.M.C. has been handling several Arbiter issues and the Jake case in particular... as it has been evident that it (or a part of its members) has lacked both professionalism and objectivity in more than one occasion.

Acknowledgements

The Archived Authoritative Minesweeper Guestbooks^[*] and the Planète Démineur forum^[†] have been invaluable resources, without which this report wouldn't have existed. I also would like to thank Rilian for telling me about the debug information contained in a video, and for taking the time to answer a couple of questions, and Elmar, Schu and DB for answering a lot of questions regarding what was going on around Arbiter at the time.

[*] <http://www.minesweeper.info/downloads/index.html?category=Guestbooks>

[†] <http://www.planete-demineur.com/phpBB2/index.php> maintained by Grégoire Duffez

“unincluded features”, a Minesweeper Arbiter investigation

Prologue: the Vazgen Geghamyan case

About a couple of months ago an armenian player, Vazgen Geghamyan -- to this day ranked 41st on the World Ranking^[*] -- claimed a 37, that would have been at the time an expert world record, plus two 10 second intermediate games. The games were played on *Minesweeper Arbiter*.

Following are a few excerpts from the Guestbook:

June 18th 2007 at 01:01:15 PM

Name: damien

Comments:

there is a player from Armenia who claims 10x2 and a 37 (at 4.08 3bv/s on a 150). Vids are here:

<http://www.minesweeper.info/videoindex.php?dir=Public/WorldRecordClaims/>

The next several posts express different opinions on the videos: some accepting them as genuine; some noting the boards were extremely easy; others openly tagging them as UPK ... and yet we are talking about valid Arbiter videos, something is wrong, Arbiter has never been so vulnerable ... A refreshing insight comes the next day:

June 19th 2007 at 12:03:23 PM

Name: luke chiang

Best expert: 44

Best intermediate: 13

Comments:

lol @ armeinian... u cheat worse than i do!!!!!!

its a fake board just look at it all the mines are right next 2 each other, its an old vrsn of arbiter that u can cheat with lol it loads minsweeper clone mvf files that u can use colne to edit ur own easy board.....lol what a joker

the issue finally catches Rilian's attention

[*] The Authoritative Minesweeper World Ranking maintained by Damien Moore

"unincluded features", a Minesweeper Arbiter investigation

June 28th 2007 at 10:50:30 PM

Name: Rilian

Comments:

Arbiter 0.43.1 had an UPK feature, which has an *unincluded* feature that allowed loading UPK board in normal mode. In a day it was suggested for everybody to download version 0.44 or later without the feature.

latest is 0.46.2 which is located on <http://rilian.info/files.php>
if someone is playing 0.43 and ignoring announcements, that is just kidding

Rilian's powerful outburst puts an end to the story. The record is safe. We are talking about a known issue, an obsolete Arbiter version, a public appeal not to use it and to update to the next version being intentionally ignored. No-one questions the fact that Vazgen was aware of this *"unincluded feature"* -- read A BUG AS BIG AS A HOUSE! in Rilian English --, no-one questions himself if this guy might have not been aware of this public appeal to update. The videos are way too clear. Vazgen is obviously a cheater. The case is closed, or maybe it was never open. Arbiter has received another blow, perhaps the most severe up till now. The world moves on.

Arbiter suspected

Since the end of last year, when my Clone^[*] began to demand conspicuous amounts of RAM, I started playing almost exclusively on Arbiter. Arbiter already had a *stained* reputation because of the suspects on Jake and AreOut, and it did feel quite weird to be on the other side. As time passed you would now-and-then hear half-voiced suspicions. For some reason young, very active and fast-improving players, had chosen to play on Arbiter... was this a coincidence? Or was Arbiter the reason for their fast improvement? At times, something achieved on Arbiter was accompanied by a raise of eyebrows, or had a small question mark placed beside it. I quote one such example *"Damn! Ian got a sub-50 on Arbiter"* from no less than an active I.M.C. member. I think there's nothing wrong in *"Damn! Ian got a sub-50!"*, one would interpret that as *"Damn! these young guys are getting so fast they're gonna fly past us in no time"* (insert your favourite emoticon there), but saying he got it *"on Arbiter"* makes me wonder if what was meant by that phrase was *"Damn! We had the chance to stop this Arbiter farce long ago and we didn't."*

[*] Minesweeper Clone, Copyright © 2004-2007 by Rodrigo Silveira Camargo

“unincluded features”, a Minesweeper Arbiter investigation

When the Vazgen case came up, it didn't take long for people to point out how these kind of things always happened on Arbiter. When the case was settled it had left me a bitter taste, and I was quite curious to find out more about this *0.43* version. I hadn't been around long enough to have ever played on it, or heard the problematics surrounding it, but apparently --by what I could infer from Rilian's words-- it was common knowledge (to the arbiter players at that time at least) that this "now obsolete" version had a major "unincluded feature".

I opened a *.avf* file on a text editor, and noticed that the version where the game has been played is printed on the copyright on the last line of the video file. This indication might not be accurate though. Because it is positioned after the file's checksum, this line (actually both the last two lines) might be changed without corrupting the video. Fortunately, when I asked Rilian if there was another way to determine the version, he pointed me at the Debug information in the replay file. By loading a video to play on arbiter and clicking *Options->Show Debug Protocol* one can see in one of the debug information lines "replay is correct" followed by the version "*(v.43)*" for a video played on *Arbiter 0.43* for example.

Armed with this knowledge I curiously started to browse through old videos. You can imagine my astonishment as I found out one of the first videos I checked, Jake's 9, was played on the very same *0.43 demo3* version Vazgen had used. What was going on here? I started doing some digging (mostly through damien's old Guestbook⁵) and found Jake's 10 NF. That too was played on the *0.43 demo3*. The next one I found posted was Tommy's first sub-60 played on, you've guessed it, the *0.43demo3*. *“Ah -- I thought to myself -- there probably is nothing to worry about here after all, apparently the 0.43 was actually the latest arbiter version at that time”...*

Browsing through later entries I find Rilian announcing the release of the new arbiter version within a week or so, the *0.46*. *“Hmm...”*. I needed some kind of a reference player, and went for the obvious choice: Elmar. It didn't turn out much of a success either, his record was played in late October (a couple of months later) on the *Arbiter 0.45 DEBUG6*.

Nothing seemed to fit, but it would take another month, when I'd get to talk to Elmar, until the pieces would start falling into place. Elmar would inform me of the very popular *0.45* version released after the *0.43*, and that he didn't remember hearing about a UPK Arbiter bug, despite being Arbiter's most prominent user at the time, one of its beta testers and an I.M.C. member both then and now.

“*unincluded features*”, a Minesweeper Arbiter investigation

The Arbiter timeline

It turns out that the *Arbiter 0.43* was not an insignificant, short-lived, version as one might have thought. *Au contraire*, it was one of the most longevitous, stretching for a period of about 6 months from November 2005 to May 2006.

The first Arbiter video I have been able to find (posted on PM) was from Elmar, switching from *Clone 0.97* to *Arbiter 0.42* in October, then to *0.43* in November 2005. Elmar actually sticks to the *0.43 demo* version while everybody else is playing on the so called "*0.43 demo3*"-- released in December 2005, possibly featuring only minor fixes. At this time we are probably in the most intense period of the Clone Wars, and the *0.43* is in a tough fight with *Clone 0.97*. Both will struggle through numerous problems and both will be eventually succeeded by the highly acclaimed *Arbiter 0.45* and *Minesweeper Clone 2006* -- at about a week distance from one-another -- by the end of April 2006. That adds up to no less than 6 months of honoured service. And when the *0.43* is relieved from duty no disgrace is cast on it whatsoever. Its exit is actually quite weird even by Rilian standards.

On 24-Apr-2006 the stable *0.43* version is removed from the site. The unstable *0.44beta* "with a load of features" is uploaded instead, with Rilian explicitly stating it's not a release^[*] but making it publicly available. Unfortunately the *0.44beta* has a curious "feature" that makes the timer run 1.5 times slower, at least during video playback. On April 28th, after getting this feedback, it is Rilian himself that suggests the trustworthy *0.43* to be used instead for playing until the *0.45* is out. Not exactly the “*no-one ever use this version again!*” announcement, one would have imagined. Moreover, the actual meaning of this statement is not exactly clear either. Was the *0.44beta* removed from the site? Was the *0.43* made available for download again? Unfortunately, Rilian's forums have a tendency to disappear, so it's quite difficult to find any reference to what might have been going on. Judging from the few words on that post, and knowing Rilian's tendency to never admit/always cover up any error of his, I would be extremely surprised if the *0.43* ever made it back to the site for download.

During the first days of May 2006 Rilian posts on the guestbook he has uploaded the *0.45 DEBUG4* (in his own words "the last debug version before *0.45* release"), though it is

[*] see *Appendix B*

“*unincluded features*”, a Minesweeper Arbiter investigation

not clear if he is referring only to his *testers* or it is publicly available for everyone (he doesn't provide a direct download link on the post's website field, although he does add a link to rilian.net/mines). This two weeks of furious Rilian coding end around May 9th with the (*de facto*) final version of this (if I may call it so) release: the *Minesweeper Arbiter 0.45 DEBUG7*. Curiously enough Rilian doesn't announce it at all on the Guestbook. And again one is left with quite a few question marks on how that should be interpreted... Was it announced on rilian.net? Was it made available for public download? Was Rilian thinking of improving it even more before releasing it? Did he wait for another 3 months until the .46 came out with no Arbiter, or an older stable version (*0.43?!!*), available for download? *None* of the above? *All* of the above? ...

I hope you were able to hang on there... sorry for the mess. It is my opinion that the most probable scenario out of those depicted above is the one where the *0.45 DEBUG7* is made available for everybody at the rilian.net website. It sounds by far the most logical thing to do, and Rilian seemed to confirm it when I asked him if that was the case (in his typical cryptical way of answering questions), so that is something I am going to assume as true from now on during the writing of this paper.

I managed to secure a copy of the *0.43 demo* version, courtesy of Nikolaj^[*], and I have to say the bug is quite difficult NOT to notice, if one ever tries playing in UPK mode and is persistent enough to find his way through a Rilianesque maze that is. If Elmar wasn't aware of the bug, that's probably because he rarely used the Arbiter's UPK playing feature as he didn't find it as straightforward as the *Clone*'s F3 key.

There were several other people who did though. Schu^[†] tells me he was "taking arbiter apart" at the time, and reported this among other bugs in late 2005-early 2006, as did Nikolaj in March 2006, and Arjádre with a thread in Rilian's forums (the reported thread name was "I hacked arbiter", though Arjádre didn't actually explain the procedure how he had managed to, in it). This helped increase the awareness of this bug in the community and according to Schu and Daniel Brim the people who should/could/might have known about it at the time add up to Alex Poehner, Arjádre, Daniel Brim, Jake, Nikolaj, Rodrigo, Schu, and a

[*] a.k.a. Robert Farnik

[†] a.k.a. Andrew McCauley, IMC member 2007

“*unincluded features*”, a Minesweeper Arbiter investigation

guy named Luke Chiang -- who had submitted an Int 9 video on this version of Arbiter, was never taken seriously and reportedly later admitted he had cheated.

The Bug

Let’s take a break for a moment and try to understand what this was all about. If you have a recent Arbiter version and you wander around the Game menu, you will notice that an option is not available. More specifically the 4th from the top “*Load Custom Board*” will produce an information box that would inform you that “*the feature is disabled in this debug version*”. If you are picky enough, you might argue you obviously have no debug version... that you actually have the *0.46.2 final release*, but that’s just an insignificant detail, nothing Rilian would worry about. And now that I think of it, that might even be the reason that the *0.45* final release had a *debug* in its name... Anyways, what you just saw was the quickfix Rilian has adopted to close the gate to the UPK bug. Browsing through the helpfile (which, as far as I can tell, seems like it has not been updated since the *0.42* version) one gets to read:

2.1.03. Load Custom Board

You can load previously saved board and replay it (in Custom mode) as many times, as you wish.

Full .MBF format support

Shortcut for this menu is [Ctrl+C] (*sic*)

2.1.04. Save Custom Board

You can save any game board and to replay it (in Custom mode) in future as many times, as you wish. You can also share nice boards between other minesweepers.

Full .MBF format support

Shortcut for this menu is [Ctrl+C]

On the *0.43* version that option worked and you got the opportunity to load a board file (both *Arbiter’s .abf* and *Clone’s .mbf* were supported) and play on it. Rilian’s original idea, as it seems, was to get into *Custom mode* after loading the board. Why not *Cheat mode* must have had something to do with the programming I guess, since *Clone’s UPK mode* is also distinct from *Cheat*. The problem is that in practice, on the *0.43*, you don’t end up

“*unincluded features*”, a Minesweeper Arbiter investigation

neither in *Custom* nor in *Cheat* modes. You get to play that board in *Normal mode*, get the game registered into history if you manage to finish it, get the possibility to save a replay, get a [Rilianesque] popup if the game is fast, and get a highscore vid to go with it too... the whole suite... as if that was a perfectly valid normal game.

Searching through Arbiter's help file I couldn't find when *Custom mode* was first available, but I did find that *Custom* games video recording/playback was first introduced on *Version 0.37* dated 30-Jun-2005. *Version 0.38* released the next day features among other things "+added options to save/load boards in Minesweeper Board File format (mbf/abf)". It's not very probable for the bug to have been introduced from this version, since when a new feature is introduced it is usually tested more or less thoroughly. And it would've taken Rilian some simple tests to notice it. It's more probable for the bug to have been introduced at a later stage while performing fixes on other parts of the code that indirectly affect the feature in question. Usually tests are performed only on those features that were meant to be affected by the changes, so the side-effects eventually get to pass through to the next release untested.

Special Versions 0.40 and *0.41* both released on 04-Jul-2005, are good candidates for example, since both feature fixes related to the *custom mode*. No idea why these versions are denominated *special*, but it is probable that one of those *fixes* might have contributed to this *special* bug. The modifications on the *0.39* and *0.42* versions appear quite distant from the area of interested so I'd tend to rule them out. Unfortunately, we don't have a list of modifications for the *0.43 demo*... what we do have are Rilian's words advertising it on the Guestbook, praising it and boasting many improvements, and of course many modifications are always a good source of bugs.

Recapping:

- The aforementioned bug couldn't have been present before *version 0.38* on 1-Jul-2005, and it might have been *possibly* introduced with this version.
- It is more *probable* the bug was introduced with *special versions 0.40* or *0.41* on 4-Jul-2005
- It is also *possible* the bug was introduced with *version 0.43 demo* on 15-Nov-2005 and it is *certain* the bug was contained in the software after this version.

Fortunately, the *positive* thing about Rilian's *features* is that they enjoy the company and never come alone...

“*unincluded features*”, a Minesweeper Arbiter investigation

More shadows

When the much awaited *0.45* finally came along it was definitely a very improved version, with bug fixes, added features (in the *conventional* sense of the word), richer and smoother working history, better game graphics, built-in fancy indexes, etc... etc... *BUT* there was a much more important reason for escaping from the *0.43* worth as much as all the aforementioned put together. The *0.43* was the last version of *Arbiter* to have the *left-click-on-left-button-release-after-a-double-click feature* [!!] (a.k.a. Rilian click bug) which the I.M.C. had “declared” it would not tolerate^[*], and thus was the last version you could risk getting your performance ruined because of an irregularity of the program itself!

If, after pressing both mouse buttons to perform a double-click, you were to happen to release the left button over an *unopened* square, *Arbiter 0.43* would *uncover* it for you. The behaviour of the original *winmine* in this scenario, considered the correct one in this case, would have been to ignore the release and *not* take any action. Thus *Arbiter 0.43* *deviated* from the original *winmine* behaviour, and, being *Arbiter* merely a *clone*, this was considered irregular.

The irritating thing about it was that you had no way to control it. Unless you clicked with 100% accuracy, there was always the risk of missing a flag, double-clicking on the wrong square, or moving the mouse ahead too fast while double-clicking, which would have been innocuous on *winmine/Clone*, but could have potentially produced an illegal left click on *Arbiter*. The gain was minimal (if there even was one, since a left click somewhere you didn't intend to is a double-edged sword and could result in a blast) but the game was considered “tainted” anyway. Many *Arbiter* players noticed they had played games containing irregular clicks and were worried this could happen during a record game, as it was the case for example for Elmar's best 3BV/s. That's why he, and most other *Arbiter* players, were eagerly

[*] It has to be noted that it's always *very tough* to find any references to I.M.C. decisions, and to my knowledge no real public announcement was made by the I.M.C. that they would not accept videos of games which contained any illegal left clicks. Despite this, their position *appeared to be* so strong on the case, that the community itself was convinced the I.M.C. would consider such games invalid. Detrusor -- a.k.a. Grégoire Duffez, I.M.C. member 2006 -- even jokes about it on his 12-May-2006 post on the Guestbook [see *Appendix B*], after Levente gets a 12. They would go on eventually to have to decide on one such case, an 11 intermediate game played by Vazgen Geghamyan. The I.M.C. would take the decision to disallow it, with the motivation of the game containing such a click.

“unincluded features”, a Minesweeper Arbiter investigation

awaiting the *0.45* release and immediately jumped on it. For some reason though, others didn't...

Appendix A tries to give a compact view of the Arbiter development timeline and of the versions Arbiter's top sweepers were playing on, at different times. It can be observed that Nikolaj is the only player to immediately upgrade to the latest release every time there is one.

“*unincluded features*”, a Minesweeper Arbiter investigation

The Jake Warner Case

I am seriously puzzled by this case, and will not attempt to make any calls on it. I was not around at the time Jake (or rather Levente) made the major improvement everybody thought was unbelievably fast. Maybe being less influenced by these events makes me more objective in my comments. I have once made the error of thinking "*there is no way that guy can be that fast, this video must be fast forwarded or something!!!*" when I watched (read "attempted to figure out what the hell was going on") a 44 expert game (then WR I think) from Lasse over three years ago. I was so shocked (I didn't doubt there were people much faster than me, but that fast?!!) I didn't return to the site for a couple of years. When I eventually did, I felt deeply ashamed to have ever thought something like it, doubted Lasse and Damien... Lesson learned, I don't do that error anymore.

At the moment I became actively involved in the community, after the Vienna 2006 tournament, Jake was a reality and was ranked as number 2 sweeper at the time. His appearance about a year earlier was accompanied by a sup-4 3BV/s game on intermediate played on *Clone*, something I personally haven't matched to this day. His expert times were quite high compared to that, but everybody recognised he had the potential to improve a lot and soon.

In late 2005, As the *Clone 0.97* release experienced problems and crashes, several sweepers including Elmar and Jake decided to switch over to Arbiter. Elmar from the *0.42* version, while Jake probably on the *0.43* version. By December 2005 the *Arbiter 0.43 demo3* was out and the first video I could find from Jake playing on *Arbiter* -- a record 78 on 29-Dec-2005^[*] was played on this version.

Jake was a regular of the *#minesweeper* IRC channel, and there he got eventually involved in Arbiter's development. Of course Rilian was always the only one who had access to the source code, but he relied (heavily) on Elmar and (to a lesser extent) Jake to come up with many ideas for improvement; Curtis Bright for his views on Arbiter's more math-related issues and general behaviour; Nikolaj as a competent user for bug reporting; and Schu because of his interest in clones in general -- though he was not primarily an Arbiter user. I would roughly consider these as some sort of *consultants* in the Arbiter development... even though Arbiter might have looked more of a *one-man* expedition, there were many others

[*] <http://www.planete-demineur.com/phpBB2/download.php?id=783>

“*unincluded features*”, a Minesweeper Arbiter investigation

giving input, and Curtis and Schu were actually more involved in other projects. Jake, as part of this “team”, contributed with his ideas primarily during the time the *0.45* was being developed. He proposed Rilian the use of the *Correctness* and *Throughput* indices among other things. These indices were eventually implemented on the *0.45* along with more basic counters such as *Nr of Openings* or *Path*, indices proposed by Schu, plus others by Rilian himself, the count adding up to 32. He was also involved in the testing of the Arbiter *0.45 debug versions* Rilian was not releasing publically, but providing only to a few sweepers^[*].

Jake's style is very aggressive, with a high click rate and relatively low efficiency. It didn't come as a surprise then, that he was the one to notice the clicking discrepancy between *Arbiter* and the original *Winmine* (that Rilian kept calling a feature for a while) during gameplay, because of the large amount of (relatively uncontrolled) double-clicks he throws on the board. He is to be given credit for bringing the issue to the public attention^[†].

According to IMC sources a discussion on the issue began the next day, March 7th. No decision was reached until June, not much because of contrasting opinions, but more because of the inactivity of several IMC members. Meanwhile, more active IMC members had voiced their opinions to disallow games which involuntarily^[‡] took advantage of this feature in the guestbook or IRC. Incidentally, the first such game to come to the IMC's attention was to be a Jake Warner intermediate game, a 14 on April 24th. Since no official decision was yet reached on the issue in general, the IMC had a tougher time to decide on this particular case. Disallowing the game would have technically meant *retroactively applying a decision that hadn't even been taken yet*. Jake would match his 14 several times in the next few days and eventually get a 12, helping out the IMC. The case was closed with *no official decision* taken. But because of the IMC's slowness, very poor communication with the community, and public declarations of its members expressing personal opinions on the issue, it was perceived by many players as if Jake's game had been actually turned down. Finally on 07-Jun-2006 (a full 3 months later) an IMC poll was concluded with the option "*Refuse bugged arbiter scores from now on till the bug is fixed*" as the winner (3 pro-1 against, out of 7 total members). Ironically enough, the *0.45 DEBUG7* arbiter version, which did not contain the

[*] see early May 2006 posts, *Appendix B*

[†] see 06-Mar-2006 post, *Appendix B*

[‡] It is generally agreed it is difficult to intentionally take advantage of this feature/bug during gameplay

“*unincluded features*”, a Minesweeper Arbiter investigation

bug, had been already publically available for download for at least one month. I have to add that I couldn't find any reference to this decision officially being made public either.

One can understand if Jake is annoyed with the IMC at this moment. They have taken a decision (a year earlier) to consider both Clone and Arbiter as valid for the rankings *as they were* with all the good and the bad they had^[*]. Jake himself had pointed out an Arbiter incorrect behaviour, indirectly helping it to be fixed in the next version, and this was now being used against him to turn his game down (as he perceived it).

To make a small recap: Because of his style, Jake's games were more prone to get an *illegal* click while getting played than other less brutal players (he himself admitting that it had happened several times to him during his games^[†]), and this illegal click even occurred to him on a record game which possibly could have been turned down. On the other hand, it's early May 2006 and the much awaited *0.45* is finally out. Its final release, the *0.45 DEBUG7*, is now considered a landmark in the Arbiter development^[‡], is in many levels superior to the *0.43*, it has resolved the illegal click issue, and also includes improvements which Jake himself has proposed. He expresses his satisfaction on the *0.45 DEBUG6* on the Guestbook^[§] and asks Rilian to provide him the link to the *DEBUG7*. When asked today which version he is currently using, he replies *0.45*.^[**]

And yet... despite all the reasons above to choose the shiny *0.45* over the *0.43*... Jake decides *not* to upgrade. He will continue to play [all his best games] for the next four months on the *0.43* version. Not a single video of him played on the *0.45* or later can be found. No matter how hard I try, I can't seem to find a decent reason why someone would play on the older version risking to get his record invalidated by the aforementioned click bug while there is a [hundred times] *better* alternative he has helped moulding available...

[*] Though this article's topic is Minesweeper Arbiter, it has to be mentioned that Clone 0.97 had its fair share of weird/funny behaving

[†] see 06-Mar-2006 post, *Appendix B*

[‡] It was so successful several players use it to this day as they didn't consider worthwhile updating to 0.46, for it had only minor fixes and no real new features

[§] see 06-May-2006 post, *Appendix B*

[**] when asked on different occasions has been a bit vague and unsure, giving different answers, but it's either the 0.45.6 or the 0.45.7

“*unincluded features*”, a Minesweeper Arbiter investigation

On 1-Aug-2006 he would get his [*then*] intermediate Non-Flagging world record game, a 10.88. The game is played at 6.27 [left] *clicks/second*. Rogen^[*] publicly expresses his doubts on someone being able to move the mouse around and successfully solve a board in NF while constantly clicking at such a high rate. It's at this moment, that the IMC approaches Jake asking for additional proof of his abilities -- they would accept as such videos of him playing a few games on Minesweeper Clone 2006. Jake answers he has difficulties running Clone 2006 on his PC, blaming some kind of conflict between the program and the PC's peripheral devices^[†]. He also adds he would fancy participating to the Budapest tournament the next year^[‡].

on August 11th 2006, *Arbiter 0.46.1* is released with minor improvements on the *0.45* version. *20 days later*, still on his *0.43* Jake achieves his infamous 9. Discussions on it follow, then a further week later the IMC makes an official announcement, declaring they have already requested additional evidence from Jake, and that they will include this new world record in the rankings as soon as they receive it. They add they don't have anything against Jake in particular, but that it's common policy when someone achieves a World Record performance for the IMC to make sure it is genuine by asking for more evidence of the player's skills. There have been people who have tried to cheat in the past, they add, and they are just doing their job.

Jake, though, doesn't share their point of view, and his irritation towards the IMC reaches now its peak. He decides not to submit any more videos in sign of protest, while remaining active in the community, as a regular of the IRC channel, participating in the AR, and continuously reporting very fast times --several 11s plus very low 40s. And that is where the things stalled for about a year.

I did notice the above paragraphs *more often than not* lack a common thread, and are more like a collection of relatively distinct facts, rather than a flowing analysis. That was *precisely* the intention. And it will get worse with the next ones, I just can't help it.

Arbiter has a menu called “*IRC addon*” (implemented since version *0.30* 5-May-2005) which automates the copying of the information of the last *finished* or *blasted* game into the clipboard, so that it can be easily pasted later (complete with IRC Control Codes).

[*] a.k.a. Roman Gammel, IMC member 2006, 2007

[†] chatting on *#minesweeper* with Rogen.

[‡] e-mail correspondence with Christoph Marx, IMC member 2006, 2007

“*unincluded features*”, a Minesweeper Arbiter investigation

This feature does not distinguish *in any way* between games played in legal mode and games played in cheat mode, it produces the same collections of counters all the time!

Jake often plays in, what he calls, “*lawnmower*” mode (i.e. *Auto Flag Set at the Game Start*^[*], in Rilian English). He has recommended it several times as a good practice to develop the clicking speed. What he also does from time to time, is to paste results of series of games in this mode on the IRC channel, only to casually mention later on, the mode he was playing in. If the idea is to have fun by irritating the fellow sweepers on the channel, I guess it serves its purpose quite well, since in my opinion it’s second on the irritating scale only to horst2104’s continuous spamming.

As I said, a year passed and not much happened... Jake stuck to his policy of not submitting any videos and all we could get from him were game logs on the IRC channel. No doubt those were crazily fast and with a fantastic completion rate, but still a pasted log is very little... and his star inevitably began to fade. The longer his struggle versus “the authorities” continued, the more the support fellow sweepers had in him vanished. This deadlock has continued long enough, and by now he should be able to see it is bringing him nothing good. Quite the opposite, every new player that comes along hears about him tagged as a cheater...

While Jake’s behaviour is taking him nowhere, the I.M.C.’s is not to be praised either. Its members voice their personal opinions out loud left and right, while it as a whole is very closed, unable to take any official decisions, or to even make them heard those rare times it does. Its (or more exactly the players who like to voice their opinions in public) attitude toward this case could be interpreted as “we know you are cheating... we just need to find a plausible explanation for *how* you are doing it. Weather that is that you are clicking too fast, your mouse clicks are distributed in a certain way, you know where the openings are before the game starts, or something else, it doesn’t matter, as long as we find something that sticks”. When the I.M.C. [finally] comes out officially, it does so by making, what I really think is, a very reasonable request “just a couple of good clone games and you’re clean”.

Unfortunately, Jake thinks it’s too late as the damage has already been done. There are not going to be any *Clone* vids. Partly also because his *Clone* takes forever to load (as does for a fair share of us), or the peripherals are problematic (more of a typical Jake problem), or later on because he’s fed up with the whole *.Net Framework* thing (he’s not alone at that either) and has decided to throw it on the trash can. No *Clone* vids we said, but he decides we

[*] checkbox in *Options->Preferences->Cheat Mode*

“*unincluded features*”, a Minesweeper Arbiter investigation

wont get any *Arbiter* vids either. What is even more puzzling is that he declares he doesn't save them even to watch them for his own pleasure^[*]. Not even a sub-40 he got about a week ago... a 39 on a 149, his second ever, not exactly every-day business. He might as well, of course, have saved the video, and just doesn't want us to know about it so that he can keep the policy going, or, as some others might be inclined to think, there might be no video because there was no normal-mode 39 in the first place...

Things get more complicated when he beats his NF and Classic expert records in a few days distance. 48 NF, and 36 (World Record) complete with popup. He doesn't think the NF record is any big deal, while he is reportedly too drunk to save the 36. What's more, even his Arbiter exe file has embraced the philosophy of his policy, refusing to automatically save the highscore games the way he is trained to do since version *0.11*^[†].

Jake had a position of strength versus the I.M.C. a year ago, complaining his times were being attacked with no real reason. I'm afraid that position has now gotten a strong blow. The videos he had submitted thus far had been on a 4-month old arbiter version which was as easy to UPK on as stealing candy from a 5-year old kid, and he knew about it. The I.M.C. member's behaviour was unprofessional, but they now have a real reason to ask Jake for more evidence.

As I was in the process of writing this, I would have thrown in my two cents and proposed as solution Jake submitting a video of one of the recent three games I mentioned above (thinking that even if he hadn't saved them, then Arbiter had probably saved them automatically: the 39 as a possible RQP record, the 48 and 36 as NF and Classic time records respectively). If that had been a genuine *Arbiter 0.45.6* (or *0.45.7*) vid then his ranking had to have been restored immediately, and his times to be considered valid unconditionally. Unfortunately, later I came to learn these videos are nowhere to be found. I would restate this proposal in case one of those videos was to reappear. Other than that, I leave in the hands of the I.M.C. the responsibility of coming up with a reasonable decision once they possess the information contained in this letter.

[*] see *Appendix C*

[†] according to Rilian, there is no way to turn off the automatic saving of highscore videos from the Arbiter Graphical User Interface

“unincluded features”, a Minesweeper Arbiter investigation

I would wrap this up by reminding the I.M.C. members that the next time they consider declaring an *Arbiter* video invalid (*version 0.45* and up), the motivation *“we know it’s a cheat, because Arbiter is crap”* is by no means acceptable. They have to uncover and document a vulnerability in the software first. Only then can they consider themselves free to do as they please and kick anyone using that version out of the rankings (myself, Elmar and all others included). I would hope the same measures would be applied for the perceivably *“invincible” Clone* too. I would also feel pleased if I were to see [at least] one particular member resigning from the I.M.C., although I’m afraid that is quite unlikely.

“*unincluded features*”, a Minesweeper Arbiter investigation

The *Thomas Kolar* case

An extremely puzzling case, on which I have more difficulties on remaining objective...

Tommy joins the community as a young and fast-improving 15-year old sweeper in early 2006. He starts to frequently join the *#minesweeper* IRC channel and starts playing on *Arbiter 0.43 demo3*. Is very active in those spring days and is mentioned by Schu as one of the players who *might* have also been aware about the Arbiter UPK bug along with Tam.

Sub-70ies on 1-May-2006 with a 65, gets a 60 on May 6th, keeps posting continuously on the Guestbook^[*] and yet somehow fails to upgrade to the new Arbiter version.

Participates in Vienna 2006 (31-Jul) where I personally saw him play using a mouse sensitivity setting crazy for my standards. During the tournament plays several sub-70s on Christoph's ViennaSweeper with his best time being a 64. He finishes in 4th place.

Back to Arbiter, breaks 60 on August 9th with a 59. Rilian releases *version 0.46.1* on August 11th, Tommy *upgrades* this time, expresses his ideas on the new release and punctually breaks his record again three days later with a 55^[†].

As school restarts he has to decrease the playing hours and it will take him until October to get to 54. Then somehow his next video on the 26th of October is a record 53 on the *Arbiter 0.43 demo3* again... He would then jump from 53 to 47 on November 14th.

Tommy is not finished though, after one month he would mysteriously switch again, to *Arbiter 0.46.2* this time. On it he would score his current record of 46.95 on 15-Mar-2007. Participates in the WCh in Budapest in April, with several low-50 scores, best being a 51. Finishes in 5th place.

As it can be seen, Tommy is always on a fast-improving trend regardless of the clone he is playing on. I have to admit that him missing the upgrade to the *0.45* version for no apparent reason, and later switching back and forth between *0.46* and *0.43* happening to even get a six second jump during that *0.43* spell, can be considered the most suspicious behaviour out of the whole lot of *0.43* sweepers. Fortunately for him, he has been constantly

[*] see May 2006 posts, *Appendix B*

[†] see August 2006 posts, *Appendix B*

“unincluded features”, a Minesweeper Arbiter investigation

participating in tournaments meeting other sweepers who have watched him perform excellent times, and has also managed to beat his former record with a better 46 during the latest Vienna tournament a few days ago.

I don't want to speculate on the reasons why Tommy has messed up the clones in this way, I think only he can answer that question. There is something (probably related to the issue) I can say in his favour though: *“He is one of the most distracted/disorganised people I have ever met!”* xD.

“*unincluded features*”, a Minesweeper Arbiter investigation

The *Thy Cowman*^[*] case

Thy Cowman is a young (17 year old) Latvian player, famous for a number of bizarre games. Most notably a *4-random-clicks* win on beginner that would give him the 3BV/s World Record by the current rules (3BV boards ≥ 4 accepted), although he immediately expressed the opinion the limit should be raised to a higher value so that his game and other similar fortunate games are not counted in this ranking. Other *feats* include blasting a 1 3BV beg board on the second click, and ~ 14 cl/s on a 3 3BV beginner board...
<http://www.planete-demineur.com/phpBB2/viewtopic.php?p=13789#13789>

He joined the ranking at 1-19-78 in July 2006, and reportedly uses a touchpad. His current records are 1-13-59 which would make him the best touchpad player by an astronomical margin. Recently blasted an estimated 55 on a 116 3BV board on a misclick with two safe squares left.

He is also an assiduous density player, among the top ranked, although some people might argue about his style as he sometimes misses patterns as was the case on his int/90 game. He did avenge himself though by superbly playing an int/95 for a new world record. He alternates clone and arbiter while playing density.

extract from the "*What is your most disappointing lost game?*" topic on the Planète Démineur forum

<http://www.planete-demineur.com/phpBB2/viewtopic.php?t=885>

Thy CowMan

Posted: Wed 26 Jul 2006 10:55 am

I have tons of density disappointing games but heres a 1 3bv blast attached: <http://www.planete-demineur.com/phpBB2/download.php?id=1806>

Thy CowMan

Posted: Mon 21 Aug 2006 3:00 am

Not a lost game but I couldn't find the last two squares :evil: :evil: :evil:

[*] a.k.a. Harryck Repse

“*unincluded features*”, a Minesweeper Arbiter investigation

Could have been 13 or maybe even 12 seconds but it wouldn't count because it was only 22 3bv so not really much of a loss...

attached: <http://www.planete-demineur.com/phpBB2/download.php?id=1954>

TamBui

Posted: Mon 21 Aug 2006 3:49 am

Dang, I didn't know boards that low could exist on Arbiter! What version of Arbiter are you using? Very nice try by the way, that board is craazy O_O

Thy CowMan

Posted: Mon 21 Aug 2006 3:55 am

I use Minesweeper Arbiter 0.46, the newer version. I saw on Christoph's tournament site under strange boards I saw a board that Christoph found that is 20 3bv but it's on clone, note sure if clone's boards are lower than arbiter's .

Tam's analysis is spot on, he sees Thy CowMan get a 22 3BV board and correctly suspects he is using an old *Arbiter* version. Thy CowMan has probably downloaded *0.46*, and appears convinced to be using that version, but his videos and the weird boards he keeps getting^[*] tell a different story. Thy CowMan has been -- possibly unawarely -- using *Arbiter 0.43 demo3* to this day.

Update: As the writing of this paper had stalled because of more important activities, Harryck got a 2.7 NF on a 12 3BV beginner board. That game is crazy... even by Cowman standards. A couple of I.M.C. members promptly reacted on the guestbook (a recurring pattern) tagging it as a cheat. I have to add that both of them were aware about the UPK bug of Arbiter 0.43 at the time, and knew I had started to collect information on it^[†]. As usual I won't comment on the game, but I can't help not to point out that his record 59 game is the most humanly played game I have ever seen. One can feel the tension building up as the game approaches it's conclusion, the shaking of the fingers on the touchpad, the terror of blasting on a forced guess right at the end... I refuse to believe someone could fake that...

[*] The 0.43 release preceded the IMC decision to introduce 3BV limits

[†] I reported the bug to Christoph at first, then discussed it with Elmar at a second moment before deciding to do a more thorough investigation by myself.

“*unincluded features*”, a Minesweeper Arbiter investigation

note on James Custer

One of the older players, active from 2003 to 2006. Had a 64 on *winmine* (video on *Sorin's Recorder*) dated November 2005, also a 13 on a low-3bv *winmine* “*known easy board*” he denied to have ever seen beforehand. Switches to *Arbiter* in December 2005. After a syndrome of 17x11 manages to get a 16 on intermediate in the first days of May 2006, also manages to beat his *winmine* record with a 62 on 10-May-2006. Always ready to debate, he might have been playing occasionally, not much interested in newer clones (He complains on the guestbook he has to download the newly released *Clone 2006* in order to watch Dion's new WR), or more probably was simply awaiting an official release of the 0.45 version by Rilian. Rilian was churning out a new debug version every couple of days at the time, with the last one -- the 0.45 *DEBUG7* -- probably made available for download the day before James' record. On the other hand the 0.45 *DEBUG7* wasn't announced on the guestbook, and its name doesn't sound any close to a final release, nor was intended to.

note on Luke Chiang

A really weird character. Came around on the first days of May 2006 (yeah... lots of stuff happening in those days). Found his way to the IRC channel at the same moment he found the Guestbook. Claimed a 13-37 (when Dion's records were 10-39), sent a video of a 15 to those who were interested (Arjádre, DB, Jake) and then somehow felt compelled to get competitive with Jake (whose record at the time was 14, but apparently had managed to convince Luke he had a 9) so he promptly got a 9. Those who saw these videos considered the 15 badly played, and the 9 UPK-ed. After hearing the other guys' doubts “*he absolutely FLIPPED THE FUCK OUT*”^[*] and after pouring down an enormous amount of text (mainly curses) into the channel, reportedly admitted he had cheated.

Since then, Luke has posted on the guestbook twice, but those two occasions have happened to be prompt responses to Dion's WR to congratulate him, and to Vazgen's 37 to ridicule him... That's some timing! (unless he reads every single entry on the guestbook and doesn't say a word, but that would be so not in his style...) Who is this guy anyway??

[*] quoting DB

“*unincluded features*”, a Minesweeper Arbiter investigation

note on AreOut^[*]

I haven't managed to secure any copy of arbiter versions prior to *0.43*, nor a copy of AreOut's *41* game on Arbiter. According to the information on the World Rankings, that game is dated 9-Jul-2005 and as such played on an older Arbiter version, four months before the release of the *0.43*. As discussed in the section “The Bug”, from the information I possess I suggest the bug might have been introduced in different versions which were released from 1-4 July to mid-November. One needs to get hold of them to determine which was the first to contain the bug, but one thing can be said for sure from the information contained on his video (I guess someone in the I.M.C. must have a copy of it): if AreOut's game was played on a version preceding *0.38* than it would have been impossible for him to have exploited this vulnerability.

[*] a.k.a. Stevan Gvozdenovic

“*unincluded features*”, a Minesweeper Arbiter investigation

Ending where it started: the *Vazgen Geghamyan* case.

Call me *naïve*, but I'd like to keep my vision of the world where everything looks slightly brighter than in other people's vision. I don't like to see people cheating left and right and I want to give a chance to Vazgen in this particular case. We don't know much about this guy other than the country he comes from and judging by the size and the spread of the Armenian diaspora nothing guarantees he even lives there either. His participation to the community has been limited to a couple of e-mails sent to Damien and an e-mail reply to Rogen. Despite this he has managed to get the full attention of the top sweepers on two occasions, once even achieving the rare feat of forcing an I.M.C. decision [!!], and not less important he has helped us uncover these old-forgotten swept-under-the-rug issues. What we know is that he enjoyed playing this game, somehow got to Damien's site, somehow went on to download Arbiter. He probably took his time to get used to this devilish program, which as far as I can tell came with no help file and with Rilian's encouraging words on the readme: "*this is a demo, which contains a lot of new features. there is no help file in this demo package, so you probably will not get how some of features work...*". In the meantime the world continued to turn, and the Clone Wars reached their climax.

It would be hypocritical, at this point, to think he intentionally ignored the announcement to upgrade to a higher version, judging by the number of much more active sweepers missing upgrades. We can also safely assume that he was unaware of the main reason people should have upgraded -- the Rilian click -- since he would have later been the only one to ever submit a record which contained such a click, and have it promptly turned down by the I.M.C.

So he's got this new and complicated toy, and since he hasn't gotten any help, he is forced to learn by trying, which I guess he doesn't mind that much. And if he is curious enough, and persistent enough, one day he stumbles on the "*Load Custom Board*" option, and maybe manages to load an old board from a previous game of his. He then figures out that (if he manages to find a way past an annoying popup that doesn't allow this operation to be repeated until you have started a new game first) he can replay that game again and again. And maybe one of these tries is so good a popup appears " ". Who is there to tell him this behaviour is not the intended one? Arbiter has a handful of cheat options, clearly marked with the word *cheat* all-over the board, that don't get saved to history and that you can't make a replay file of. But *this* one is different, he finds out he can save a replay of this game (or very

“unincluded features”, a Minesweeper Arbiter investigation

probably Arbiter already automatically saved one for him) and that the game stands proudly in his *History* and among his *HighScores*. *“That's it! I found the trick! There is no other way everybody else is going that fast!”* -- he might have thought.

I have to note here that I am not making this story completely out of nothing. I do have someone as an inspiration (=). A ukrainian player -- whose name I do not know -- submitted to Rogen a series of records made on the *Clone* on the same board in *UPK mode*. To Rogen's informative e-mail on the UPK mode he replied (original translation by Rogen, edited a bit by me):

“It was very surprising to see that I was allowed to re-play the same board [on the Clone]. I even thought why, with such opportunity, WR is still 37”

I guess the ukrainian guy didn't like help files, or maybe just English help files, and went for the evergreen *learning by doing* technique instead, until Rogen cut down his enthusiasm with his tips.

On the other hand, there was no-one stopping good old Vazgen, and eventually he would have had to become more ingenuous. He had probably already downloaded the *Clone*, and now had to learn to *cook* his own boards (and that is no easy feat to figure out by yourself, from my experience). Once achieved that, he would have had to learn about 3BV limits, get confused by the ever remaining doubts if the expert limit is 99 or 100, and if this was the minimum allowed value or the disallowed value, and eventually decide to go for a 102 board just to have a comfortable security margin xD. Would have correctly assumed a 30 3BV would be enough for Int, while maybe misinterpreting the beginner limit for a 3BV/s record as the actual limit, would have gone for a 5 on Beg. After all these remarkable achievements, all that remained was to actually do his best, play a 1-11-55 and submit them to Damien. The rest would have been history...

Ok, that might sound a little far-fetched. I have to admit it is quite likely that, at some point during that procedure, he might have come to realize what he was doing was not allowed, and kept doing it anyway... but then again, I do like my own brighter vision of the world, and would like to stick to it until proven wrong =D.

“*unincluded features*”, a Minesweeper Arbiter investigation

APPENDIX A

Arbiter timeline and top players.

DISCLAIMER!

I have done my best to track down the versions of Arbiter sweepers have been playing on based on the videos they have submitted. These are not to be taken as absolute, as players might have not submitted videos for prolonged periods of time. These transcripts may contain errors, the reasons for which include, but are not limited to, errors on my part and sweepers playing on multiple versions and/or on multiple computers during a certain period of time. At all times players may have been playing on other clones as well as on Arbiter.

This tables were compiled on the beginning of September 2007.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS!

The Planète Démineur forum has been an invaluable resource in compiling these transcripts along with the BestEver list, the Authoritative Minesweeper Guestbook and World Ranking and to a lesser extent the Video section of www.minesweeper.info.

Arbiter Development Timeline (post Arbiter 0.38)

1-Jul-2005	<i>Minesweeper Arbiter 0.38</i>	
2-Jul-2005	<i>Minesweeper Arbiter 0.39</i>	
4-Jul-2005	<i>Minesweeper Arbiter 0.40</i>	<i>special version,</i>
4-Jul-2005	<i>Minesweeper Arbiter 0.41</i>	<i>special version,</i>
29-Aug-2005	<i>Minesweeper Arbiter 0.42</i>	<i>official release,</i>
15-Nov-2005	<i>Minesweeper Arbiter 0.43 demo</i>	<i>demo version</i>
28-Nov-2006	<i>Minesweeper Arbiter 0.43 demo2</i>	<i>demo version,</i>
Dec-2006	<i>Minesweeper Arbiter 0.43 demo3</i>	<i>demo version, publically available for download, de facto release</i>
24-Apr-2006	<i>Minesweeper Arbiter 0.44beta</i>	<i>beta version, publically available for download</i>

“*unincluded features*”, a Minesweeper Arbiter investigation

30-Apr-2006 *Minesweeper Arbiter 0.45 DEBUG* debug version, available only for beta testers

02-May-2006 *Minesweeper Arbiter 0.45 DEBUG4* debug version, publically available for download (?)

05-May-2006 *Minesweeper Arbiter 0.45 DEBUG6* debug version,

09-May-2006 *Minesweeper Arbiter 0.45 DEBUG7* debug version, publically available for download (?), *de facto release*

11-Aug-2006 *Minesweeper Arbiter 0.46.1.* *official release*, publically available for download

22-Sep-2006 *Minesweeper Arbiter 0.46.2.* patch to be applied to *0.46.1*, *official release*, publically available for download, *latest version*

Arbiter Players

Jake Warner 1- 9-39:

Dec-2006 => 31-Aug-2006 *Minesweeper Arbiter 0.43 demo3*

*no videos submitted since 31-Aug-2006, reportedly currently using *Minesweeper Arbiter 0.45 DEBUG7*

Elmar Zimmermann 1-12-42:

Oct-2005 => Nov-2005 *Minesweeper Arbiter 0.42.*

22-Nov-2005 => 04-May-2006 *Minesweeper Arbiter 0.43 demo*

04-May-2006 => 09-May-2006 *Minesweeper Arbiter 0.45 DEBUG5.*

09-May-2006 => today *Minesweeper Arbiter 0.45 DEBUG6.*

*exp record on 30-Oct-2006, *Arbiter 0.45 DEBUG6*

“*unincluded features*”, a Minesweeper Arbiter investigation

Tam Minh Bui 1-11-46:

 => 04-May-2006 *Minesweeper Arbiter 0.43 demo3*

04-May-2006 => today *Minesweeper Arbiter 0.45 DEBUG.*

*exp record on 20-Jul-2007, *Arbiter 0.45 DEBUG.*

Thomas Kolar 2-12-46:

 => Aug-2006 *Minesweeper Arbiter 0.43 demo3*

12-Aug-2006 => Oct-2006 *Minesweeper Arbiter 0.46.1.*

26-Oct-2006 => Nov-2006 *Minesweeper Arbiter 0.43 demo3*

 Dec-2006 => today *Minesweeper Arbiter 0.46.2.*

*exp record on 15-Mar-07, on the *Arbiter 0.46.2*

Ian Fraser 1-13-46:

 Jan-2006 => today *Minesweeper Arbiter 0.46.2.*

Dennis Lütken 1-12-51:

 Oct-2005 *Minesweeper Arbiter 0.42.*

*exp record on Clone 8-Nov-2005, int record 12 on *Arbiter 0.42.* on 30-Oct-2005
(*BestEver* listing) and on *Clone* on 30-Nov-2005 (*World Ranking* listing)

Jonian Grazhdani 2-13-55:

 Aug-2006 => Jan-2007 *Minesweeper Arbiter 0.46.1.*

28-Jan-2007 => today *Minesweeper Arbiter 0.46.2.*

*exp record 06-May-2007, *Arbiter 0.46.2.*

Robert Farnik 1-14-55:

 => May-2006 *Minesweeper Arbiter 0.43 demo3.*

 May-2006 => Aug-2006 *Minesweeper Arbiter 0.45 DEBUG7*

 Aug-2006 => Sep-2006 *Minesweeper Arbiter 0.46.1.*

 Oct-2006 => today *Minesweeper Arbiter 0.46.2.*

*exp record 19-Jul-2007, *Arbiter 0.46.2.*

“*unincluded features*”, a Minesweeper Arbiter investigation

Harryck Repse 1-13-59:

 => today *Minesweeper Arbiter 0.43 demo3.*

*exp record 17-Jun-2007, *Arbiter 0.43 demo3*

James Custer 1-16-62:

 Dec-2006 => May 2006 *Minesweeper Arbiter 0.43 demo3.*

*exp record 10-May-2006, *Arbiter 0.43 demo3*

Alex Poehner 2-18-66:

 => May 2006 *Minesweeper Arbiter 0.43 demo3.*

*exp record 12-May-2006, *Arbiter 0.43 demo3*, int record on Clone 15-Jul-2006

Jan Farnik 2-17-74:

 => today *Minesweeper Arbiter 0.43 demo3.*

*exp record 03-Jan-2007, *Arbiter 0.43 demo3*, int record on Clone 15-Sep-2007

Other Arbiter players, the version where their expert record is played is shown

Tobias Banzhaf,

Jan Parucka,

Allborz Gharraee,

Rupert Foggo McKay:

Minesweeper Arbiter 0.46.2.

Jason Kriegel,

Victor Ovsyannikov,

Vincenzo Tione:

Minesweeper Arbiter 0.46.1.

“*unincluded features*”, a Minesweeper Arbiter investigation

APPENDIX B

Guestbook extracts

Nov 15th 2005 at 10:03:43 AM

Name: Dmitriy

Best intermediate: 21x5 grr

Comments:

hello everybody!

today I upgraded my site to the newer version. Now it works better. I also got some themes which would be installed on days.

I also uploaded Arbiter 0.43 demo which seems to be 0.429 version. the list of already implemented features is quite large to post it here, shortly there are a load of new game-style related features, new programmable counters window (you may create indicators formulas by yourself), new mouse path drawing tool, 3bv/s pop-up window and ability to load local records from history file, enhanced irc scripts, new menu design.. lol, and much more. Main adding pending features are programmable chart tool for statistics, forced and wasted guesses logging, blasted games information logging, local profiles support, enhanced automatical saving options and more.. the list of all new features is on the site. the "0.43 demo" version is fully compatible with previous and next versions

Nov 28th 2005 at 05:06:58 AM

Name: Dmitriy

Comments:

I have uploaded the demo2 of Arbiter 0.43

I did the critical fixes that appeared after changing to the programmable counters window and the main, fixed the numbers output for American regional settings. Also, new features in this demo2 are unlimited automatical replay saving options (including ability to select folders to save files) and some new gamplay options

@yeah, changes on the top of Bestever are always an event ... i will try to do changes on the bottom soon

“*unincluded features*”, a Minesweeper Arbiter investigation

Mar 6th 2006 at 09:43:12 PM

Name: Levente

Comments:

arbiter's got a bug. (Heaven forbid!)

when one chords, and releases the left button last... in winmine and clone, nothing happens. In arbiter, this is treated as a valid left-click event.

try it: right-click, then push down left to start a chord. Release right, to finish the chord. Then move the mouse to a new location and release left. Different things happen on winmine/clone as on arbiter.

I don't think anyone has ever **gained** any benefit from this bug. But I can sure remember a few games where I was left thinking "now why in god's name did I click THERE? Wow, I'm retarded."

well, now I know. :))

Mar 7th 2006 at 03:39:37 AM

Name: Dmitriy

Comments:

I personally do not think it is a bug. You do the left click while chording to save the chording state. So, you have left button pressed, you release right button and get the 3x3 area cracked. Well. Your left button is still remaining pressed. So, you see the pressure over the unvisited cells. Release left mouse button and get the left click. Everything is logical. There are no rules like "if you do chording you have no rights to make left clicks".

Mar 7th 2006 at 03:41:43 AM

Name: Dmitriy

Comments:

for all the bug finders: you know what does the "contact the developer f_i_r_s_t" mean, eh?

... sporadic discussions on the Rilian click feature ...

Grégoire Duffez asks everybody the dates of their records for the new BestEver

Apr 9th 2006 at 11:30:08 AM

Name: Levente

Best expert: 52.43 (March 21, 2006)

Best intermediate: 14.92 (April 9, 2006 :-)

Best beginner: 1.59 (March 12, 2006)

Comments:

all records are on Arbiter 0.43demo3.

“unincluded features”, a Minesweeper Arbiter investigation

Apr 24th 2006 at 07:47:15 PM
Name: Dmitriy

Best intermediate: 20x11 lol :(
Comments:

@ everybody ! [:)s]

Finally i finished work with the arbiter 0.45 counters engine, i mean, engine that counts effective clicks, openings, modified 3BV routines, simple clicks and other statistical stuff, so, soon i will renew the arbiter history file format and release this version and you could start recording your game effectiveness history. [8-]

i have deleted old 0.43 version from my site and decided to upload 0.44beta version, which has a load of improvements. it has no help file at all and actually is not a release. [o:)]

Schu, Badgers, Benny Benjamin, i will send you a copy of 0.45_debug version so you could test the MBV (modified board value) stuff before official release. It looks leet, i have to say

happy sweepin all, see ya ! [:)]
Website: <http://rilian.net/mines/arbiter/>

Apr 26th 2006 at 03:16:55 PM
Name: Levente

Best expert: 51.62->48.23
Comments:

what is Rilian yammering about, I wonder??

Badgers last exp game --> Games=1400 3BV=142 / 142 Est Time=48,22
3BV/s=3,00 RQP=16,04 total clicks=311 / 6,58 IOE=0,45 Rank Time=1 Rank
3bv/s=56 RPI=98,03

ZOMGUS!!!!!!!! HOLY MONKEYS OF THE OTHER DIMENSION!!!!!!!!
[:D][:D][:D][:D][:D][:D][:D][:D]

SUBFIFTY!!!!!!!! [:)s][:)s][:)s][:)s][:)s][:)s][:)s][:)s]
<http://www.planete-demineur.com/phpBB2/download.php?id=1477>

“*unincluded features*”, a Minesweeper Arbiter investigation

Gergely watches Levente's game but it definitely looks slow to him. He decides to time the game duration and clocks it at 63+ seconds. Dmitriy checks the replay file information and confirms the game is really a 48. After a bit of discussion it's recognised that the 0.44beta (where Gergely had watched the replay) is lagging, while everyone agrees the game plays correctly in the 0.43 version.

Apr 28th 2006 at 08:10:19 AM

Name: Dmitiy

Comments: haha, lmao, note for self: do not publish debug versions

Apr 28th 2006 at 09:21:16 AM

Name: Thomas

Comments:

@Rilian:

Well, releasing them is OK, but make it clear that its a beta version and provide 0.43 for those who want to load boards or view vids ;)

Apr 28th 2006 at 05:44:06 PM

Name: Dmitriy

Comments:

just let you know, i finished history file input/output stuff coding. now arbiter history contains a bunch of game efficiency statistic values

ps: use 0.43 version for playing

Apr 30th 2006 at 05:45:16 PM

Name: Dmitriy

Comments:

As the crowd longed for, i removed the feature to make left click after chording [CookieMonster][Squeeze]

“*unincluded features*”, a Minesweeper Arbiter investigation

Apr 30th 2006 at 07:59:32 PM

Name: Dmitriy

Comments:

for all faithful Arbiter players, i have compiled initial 0.45 version. it has:

- all the possible counters stored in the history file
- fixed left-click-afterchording bug (and made the support for old files)
- datetime bug fixed
- some new features (some disabled)

history viewer and history converter are in development, so, you could browse history as usual and know that all advanced data is sitting there as well

if you wish to download it, PM or email me. it is not shiny public release, so i do not give straight link yet

May 1st 2006 at 06:07:37 AM

Name: Thomas

Best expert: 70,11-->65,86 !!!!!!!

Comments:

sub70!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

[(:)s][(:)s][(:)s][(:)s][(:)s][(:)s][(:)s][(:)s][(:)s][(:)s]

on a 112 3bv board, 1,79 bbbvs/s!

[hyper][hyper][hyper][hyper][hyper]

that puts me in the best 200 in bestever!!!

Vid linked below

<http://free.pages.at/thomaskolar/65,86exp.avf> (file not found)

May 2nd 2006 at 06:32:37 PM

Name: Dmitriy

Comments:

i "finally" fixed the history format in arbiter 0.45. there were some "problems" with mouse path saving because i used a dumb formula, but now it is working well.

now Arbiter history contains about 32 basic indexes for each game, and you can imagine how many indexes you can build of them.

So, i uploaded 0.45debug4 version and it will be the last debug version before 0.45 release.

history converter and history browser will be developed a bit later

Website: <http://rilian.net/mines>

“unincluded features”, a Minesweeper Arbiter investigation

May 3rd 2006 at 06:51:19 PM

Name: Luke

Best expert: 37

Best intermediate: 13

Best beginner: 1

Comments:

which program is recommended to record videos?? i see clone and arbiter, either of these better than the regular minesweeper??? :D

May 3rd 2006 at 10:39:32 PM

Name: Luke Chiang

Best intermediate: 9.53

Comments:

hahaha i beat badgers!!!!

May 5th 2006 at 11:20:53 PM

Name: Levente

Best expert: AR 51

Best intermediate: AR 14

Comments:

in 8 games (2 int, 6 exp)... good enough to avoid the penalty. I went 62->51 on this AR after getting 19 and 14 in two int games. Who!!!

oh and Rilian: arbiter 045_6 seems to work just fine - dunno if the history is any faster since my history file right now is a total of 8 files. Gimme a link to 045_7!!!

May 6th 2006 at 02:35:58 AM

Name: Dmitriy

Comments:

@Levente: yeah, history loading speed is now improved a lot and i am going to make it even faster :D . 045_7 version will have combined(classic), flagging, no-flagging and average records sections of local hi-scores tables

May 6th 2006 at 11:21:32 AM

Name: Thomas Kolar

Best expert: 65,70-->60,42!!!!!!!

Comments:

To think that a few days ago i was at 70...

[8][8][8][8][8][8][8][8][:)s]

[:]s[:])s[:])s[:])s[:])s[:])s[:])s[:])s[:])s

Vid attached!

<http://www.planete-demineur.com/phpBB2/download.php?id=1513>

“unincluded features”, a Minesweeper Arbiter investigation

May 12th 2006 at 12:32:35 AM

Name: Levente

Best intermediate: 14x9 -> 12

Comments: ZORT!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

I knew I had it due when I LCed a 13 on a 55!

* Badgers last int game --> Est Time=12,43 3BV=40 / 40 3BV/s=3,49
RQP=3,55 Clicks=64 / 5,59 Throughput=0,97 * Correctness=0,64 =
Efficiency=0,62 Openings=1 / 1 Path=2035

12!!!!

(and an RQP record)

12!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

1-12-48 on the bestevar!!!!

Website: <http://www.planete-demineur.com/phpBB2/download.php?id=1543>

May 12th 2006 at 02:19:15 AM

Name: Levente

Best intermediate: 12!!!!!!!!!!!!

Comments:

@Rilian: yes, it was a terrible game, I was drunk out of my mind and couldn't click fast. Just ask Elmar what it's like!!

Actually I did a bunch of it NF, because it was a really friggin easy board.

Did I mention, for the sake of completeness: WHOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOO!!!!!!!!!!!!

:D:D:D:D:D

May 12th 2006 at 07:35:21 AM

Name: Grégoire Duffez

Comments:

@Lev

Hmm... too bad you didn't use the arbiter chording bug (it's a feature!!!), so that I could refuse this record [:D]

May 12th 2006 at 09:18:17 AM

Name: Levente

Comments:

@Trouser: I'll be sure to throw one in next time! :)s

“unincluded features”, a Minesweeper Arbiter investigation

May 10th 2006 at 11:23:36 AM

Name: James C

Best expert: 64---> 62!

Best intermediate: 16

Comments:

I had gotten 17x11 when I finally got the 16 last week, but I didn't post. I chopped another 2 seconds off expert today, though. The 62 was on a 131 3bv... totally unexpected. I knew it was an easy board, but I tried to remain calm while I was playing it. I guess it paid off. It's also my first expert untied record that wasn't set on MS.

Jun 18th 2006 at 07:32:16 PM

Name: Levente

Best expert: 47.49 -> 44.40!!!

Best intermediate: AR 14

Comments:

on a 115 board. Way to finish a sub120 for the first time in like 4 months!
verification: Q3KW - isn't that Dennis's personal favourite?
WHOOOOOOOOO [:)s[:)s[:)s[:)s[:)s[:)s[:)s[:)s]

Website: <http://www.planete-demineur.com/phpBB2/download.php?id=1666>

Jul 23rd 2006 at 06:09:13 PM

Name: badgers badgers badgers badgers badgers badgers

Best beginner: 3bv/s: 7.44

Comments:

* Badgers last beg game --> Est Time=3,15 3BV=16 / 16 @ 7,44 RQP=0,42
c/s=8,37 IOE=0,88
Yorp. World record! Watch manu get a 9 just to goat us all.

Website: <http://www.planete-demineur.com/phpBB2/download.php?id=1768>

Jul 23rd 2006 at 07:51:25 PM

Name: ZOMFG!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Best intermediate: 10!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Comments:

* Badgers last int game --> Est Time=10,48 3BV=34 / 34 @ 3,58 RQP=2,92
c/s=6,21 IOE=0,57 :|

[10 in emoticons]

Website: <http://www.planete-demineur.com/phpBB2/download.php?id=1769>

“unincluded features”, a Minesweeper Arbiter investigation

Jul 24th 2006 at 12:34:28 AM

Name: Jake

Comments:

oh yes, and I'm changing my name to Jake Warner... please be to address me by correct-name or the penalty of deathification to be resultinged.

whoo

Jul 25th 2006 at 05:02:02 PM

Name: Jake

Best expert: watch the video!

Comments:

I wore out my old mouse... actually, I had four identical mice and that was the last one, so I went to buy another one just like it, but they were all out, so I got a little Logitech...

after five (six? Jarjar can tell you) straight sub50s, a food break, some games of no consequence... I get THAT.

**** YEAH!!!!!!!!!!!!!! :D:D:D:D:D:D:D

Website: <http://www.planete-demineur.com/phpBB2/download.php?id=1793>

the linked video is his 39

Jul 26th 2006 at 03:39:21 PM

Name: Grégoire Duffez

Comments: Hi everyone!

Good news today, the Clone Rankings are working again for MinesweeperClone 2006!!

You're all invited to upload your history files following the link below. Please email me if you have any issue.

- For MSClone 0.97 (and before) users: please email Rodrigo first in order to convert your history into the 2006 format

- for dark-side users of Arbiter: I'm glad to welcome you on the Clone Rankings!

You are almost able to upload your history... Almost because for now it'll work only if you use 0.43 arbiter version... For those who use 0.44 or 0.45 you'll need to ask Rilian to write and send me the updated script that will allow you to participate in those rankings.

By the way, of course all new variables are stored in the database (distance, flags, openings etc...), so I'll be able to create more interesting rankings for sure...

“*unincluded features*”, a Minesweeper Arbiter investigation

So far there are 465 961 games in the database

Beside that, I'll be on vacation the next week, right after the Active-Ranking deadline... I'll see you later then.

Have a great tournament!

post from the "okay, time to learn how to play non-flagging" topic on the Planète Démineur forum

<http://www.planete-demineur.com/phpBB2/viewtopic.php?p=13689#13689>

AgentSteel53

Posts: 361

Total Words: 16,573

PostPosted: Mon 31 Jul 2006 6:52 am

NF... learned!

Note badgeresque click rate... the left button got a bit wonky (see lower left, where I seem to stall on a square for about 0.5s) so I decided to start slamming down continuously.

Download

Filename: Int_10,88_3BV=37_3BVs=3._Badgers.avf

Filesize: 16.39 KB

Downloaded: 57 Time(s)

<http://www.planete-demineur.com/phpBB2/download.php?id=1844>

“unincluded features”, a Minesweeper Arbiter investigation

Aug 1st 2006 at 10:40:32 PM

Name: Badgers

Best intermediate: 10.49

Comments:

[01:38:56] * Badgers blasted last int game --> Est Time=9,12 3BV=30 / 31 @ 3,81 :E

not a 50/50, just a dense patch with a 6 and a 5 and ... apparently in the heat of the moment, I can count to neither 5 nor 6.

Aug 2nd 2006 at 02:34:12 AM

Name: damien

Comments: well, if badgers thinks he's been getting good boards, i just had an armenian player send me arbiter videos for 1-11-55.

the 11 is played very badly on a beautiful 30 board, and the expert board is the easiest i have ever seen and is a 102 board! (the 1.84 is 5 clicks in a very obvious row beside each other).

Aug 9th 2006 at 03:11:24 AM

Name: Thomas

Best expert: 60*3-->59,31!!!!!!!

Comments:

sub60!!

MINUTE BARRIER!!

/me exp game --> Time: 59,31 «» Est Time: 59,31 «» 3BV: 161 / 161 «» 3BV/s: 2,76 «» Rank Time: 1 «» Rank 3bv/s: 10 «» RPI: 99,18 «» IOS: 1,24 «» RQP: 21,48 «» Games: 552 «» Cl/s: 5,29

On a 161, I started going extremely slow and then got faster as the game went on. AR 18-59!!

[59 in emoticons]

Website: <http://www.planete-demineur.com/phpBB2/download.php?id=1889>

Aug 11th 2006 at 08:25:38 PM

Name: Dmitriy

Comments: Arbiter 0.46 released

also, i am finally going on my 2-week vacations. cya all

“unincluded features”, a Minesweeper Arbiter investigation

Aug 12th 2006 at 05:33:18 AM

Name: Thomas

Comments:

Wow, congrats Arj!

Try not to pass me before I reach the top100. I blasted a couple more good estimates today, most notably est 58 on a 146 (I think) when I was about to be done with the more tedious section.

@Rilian:

Great job on Arbiter 4.6, and I like the new popups, but I think that the highscore window could be a little less complicated. Maybe go back to the old version and build in a "Advanced..." button that pops up the version you have now, otherwise great job!!!

Aug 14th 2006 at 06:01:28 AM

Name: Thomas

Best expert: 59,31-->55,65

Comments:

OH YESSS!!!

I finally did it! A mid50 time, which is also an austrian record :D

/me watched exp game --> Time: 55,65 «» Est Time: 55,65 «» 3BV: 118 (118)
«» 3BV/s: 2,15 «» Ranks: 2 / 10 of 10 / 50% «» IOE: 0,39 «» CL/S: 5,45 «»
Openings: 18 / 18 «» Path: 7084 «» ThroughPut: 0,71 «» Correctness: 0,55 «»
ios rank: 9 «» rqp rank: 4- Tommy

Yeahhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhh 8)8):D

Vid linked below

Website: <http://home.popperschule.at/tkolar/55exp.avf> is an Arbiter 0.46.1 video

Aug 31st 2006 at 11:41:05 PM

Name: Jake

Best intermediate: 9.89!!!!

Comments: sub10!!! :D:D:D:D:D:D:D:D

Website: <http://www.planete-demineur.com/phpBB2/download.php?id=2029>

“unincluded features”, a Minesweeper Arbiter investigation

Sep 7th 2006 at 10:54:45 AM

Name: IMC

Comments:

Perhaps some of you may wonder, why Jake's 9 is not yet updated in the best ever.

The IMC had a look at it in the last weeks and discussed about Jake and the communities attitude towards him. We came to the conclusion that we have to ask him for additional proof - what we did.

So there might be some more delay till the update.

Sep 22nd 2006 at 01:55:54 PM

Name: Dmitriy

Best expert: 69

Best intermediate: 18

Comments:

Uploaded Arbiter 0.46.2 patch
just unpack it into Arbiter folder

there are some feature fixes [:)s]

Sep 30th 2006 at 03:37:37 PM

Name: Jake

Best expert: 39

Best intermediate: 9

Comments:

play brutal :) :) :) :)

and for DB:

SORIN YOU *** ** ** * * ** ** ** *** :) :) :) :) :)

(end Luke Mode... DB have you met that guy???)

“unincluded features”, a Minesweeper Arbiter investigation

the issue finally catches Rilian's attention

June 28th 2007 at 10:50:30 PM

Name: Rilian

Comments:

Arbiter 0.43.1 had an UPK feature, which has an unincluded feature that allowed loading UPK board in normal mode. In a day it was suggested for everybody to download version 0.44 or later without the feature.

latest is 0.46.2 which is located on <http://rilian.info/files.php>

if someone is playing 0.43 and ignoring announcements, that is just kidding

August 20th 2007 at 09:09:54 PM

Name: thy cowman

Best beginner: 3BVs 6,00 --> 7,05 (NFing!)

Comments:

This was unexpected! Just clicked down the side without thinking about what I was doing

2,70 on a 12 NFing!!!!
vid linked

@Zhang: When I download and then try watch your videos it says they are corrupted? I can still watch them on youtube, I'd just like to have the file saved on my computer to watch it anytime..

Website:

<http://www.minesweeper.info/videoindex.php?dir=HarryckRepse/Speed/&file=7%2C05%203BVs%20beginner%21%21%202%2C70%20on%2012%203BV.AVF>

August 21st 2007 at 12:25:30 AM

Name: Rogen

Comments:

@thy cowman: nice try, but I think its obvious fake [::][:][:]

August 21st 2007 at 01:17:11 AM

Name: AreOut

Comments:

It looks possible Rogen [:S]

“unincluded features”, a Minesweeper Arbiter investigation

August 21st 2007 at 01:53:03 AM

Name: Christoph

Comments:

@Thy: Very nice try indeed. Fake of course. But hopefully you helped us to show that we're not that bad in detecting fakes [:)]

Only a brief look helped me find four very strong hints that it must be fake. If you would like us to believe such a score, you should at least hesitate on the right spots.

However, grats to all recent record breakers. I missed a lot in the last weeks (I was busy with exams, trainings camps and lifting a card playing world title [: D]). Now I'm back to vienna and again busy with preparing the tourney. There's still a lot of work to do and time is flying. Would be great to see one or two more of you showing up to what will for sure be a fascinating event.

August 21st 2007 at 10:11:52 AM

Name: AreOut

Comments:

Grats Matthew, I wish you enter top100 before your 12th year

Christoph where exactly you think is the problematic spot?! And why the hell would anyone hesitate on beginner?!

“*unincluded features*”, a Minesweeper Arbiter investigation

APPENDIX C

A few irc.initialized.org #minesweeper logs

August 2 2006

after Badgers has gotten a 10 NF

[23:56] <Rogen> Badgers, why you don't use the clone?

[23:57] <Badgers> clone06 runs slowly on my computer

[23:58] <Badgers> not the game itself, but the peripherals

[23:58] <Rogen> why?

[23:58] <Badgers> takes forever to load

[23:58] <Badgers> i'm not sure

[23:58] <Badgers> and i've just gotten used to arbiter

[23:58] <Badgers> from back when clone was pretty crashy

[23:58] <Badgers> that's when i switched over

[23:58] <Badgers> and right now i see no real reason to switch back

Session Start: Sun Sep 16 10:06:37 2007

(10:06:53) [@Badgers] AR x-39?

(10:06:59) [@Badgers] DB when does AR begin and end?

(10:07:07) [@DB] fuck if I know

(10:07:08) [@Badgers] [01:10:00] * Badgers last exp game --> Est Time=39,56 3BV=149 / 149 @ 3,86 RQP=10,24 c/s=4,71 IOE=0,81

(10:07:09) [@Badgers] [01:10:06] <Badgers> WHERE DID THAT COME FROM!!!!????

(10:07:09) [@Badgers] [01:10:15] <Badgers> FUCK MY INTIMATE DEATH

(10:07:09) [@Badgers] [01:10:19] <Badgers>

(10:07:09) [@Badgers] [01:10:21] <Badgers> DOUCHES

(10:07:09) [@Badgers] [01:10:26] *** DB was kicked by Badgers (YOU)

(10:07:09) [@Badgers] [01:10:27] *** DB has joined #minesweeper

(10:07:09) [@Badgers] [01:10:27] *** Explosion sets mode: +o DB

(10:07:12) [@Badgers] JONI!!!!!!!

(10:07:20) [@Badgers] 39 on a 149!!!!

“*unincluded features*”, a Minesweeper Arbiter investigation

(10:07:34) [joni|sick] hoooooooly fuck

(10:07:37) [@Badgers] okay time to 10 on int

...

long discussion mostly between DB, Ostriches and Badgers

...

(10:27:03) [joni|miserable] are you saying you don't want to save vids, you won't, you can't,

(10:27:24) [Ostriches] Their burden of proof is noth that

(10:27:28) [Ostriches] And you know it

(10:27:32) [joni|miserable] arbiter .47.7 not running as it should

(10:27:36) [@Badgers] joni: if i were to turn on "auto save" it would cause, between games, a 10 second delay in which my entire computer would freeze

(10:27:36) [joni|miserable] 45.7

(10:27:40) [@Badgers] erm there isa 47.7 now?

(10:27:43) [@Badgers] oh

(10:27:44) [joni|miserable] i thought that was the best version out there

(10:27:55) [@DB] well, you could always sweep in front of me if we actually had time :-P

(10:27:56) [@Badgers] it's been deemed "good enoguh" haha

(10:28:12) [@Badgers] DB, first you resign from IMC hten i will consider it

(10:28:14) [@DB] good enough = runs crappily?

(10:28:20) [@DB] I'm not rerunning

(10:28:23) [Ostriches] Dude

(10:28:25) [@DB] I've already stated that

...

(10:28:51) [joni|miserable] well, fuck autosave... but hey, you get a single great game (fucking best in the world) and you don't even look at it?

(10:28:58) [@Badgers] not really

(10:29:07) [@Badgers] if it popped up 36 i'd be like "fuck yeah"

(10:29:24) [@Badgers] but otherwise it's like "yeah been there done that not dion don't wanna go back"