

Forum:[Hack Forums](#)

Thread: [You may only vouch for marketplace threads in which you are a verified buyer](#)

SUI-3183372 - February 7, 2019, 11:15 am

Was just posting on a thread about [fake reviews and vouches](#) and was thinking about ways to cut down on all these fake vouches that have been a plague on our marketplace (primarily in ebook sales) for some time now.

Now, this suggestion may be a bit extreme, but I think that even with it being declined it can introduce discussion on combining our contract system with a system to combat/stop fake vouches.

Right now, as of Feb 7th, you do not need contracts to deal in the marketplace. Come March 1st, all marketplace deals must be completed through the contract system or risk punishment, so in a sense, we're already forcing users to verify their deals/sales/whatnot on the site. Since we're already going that far, why not add to that and make a rule that you may only vouch for a product/seller if you have a completed contract with the seller, by either, 1, showing you bought that specific product through the contract system, or 2, showing you've bought any product from that seller using the contract system(not a fan of the second part, but only having the first part may be too exclusive). This will make it so vouches are only coming from buyers who have legitimately dealt with the seller before.

Now, there is the possibility for abuse. People can start phony contracts and instantly accept/complete them to allow their friends to vouch for them. I don't think there's any avoiding this, but this is already an issue that we deal with today, and I think the only thing we can do here is have faith that staff will deal with abuse of the contract system/B-rating system accordingly.

I know this is far from perfect. Any sales from pre-mandatory contract times would not result in a valid vouch and it may leave some sales threads looking a bit bare (vouches seem to be the only posts some threads have). Perhaps allowing everyone to vouch for the seller but only verified buyers vouch for the product its self could be an alternative, but that seems to easy to abuse still.

SORRIE - February 7, 2019, 11:15 am

I very much like this idea, think it could definitely improve the quality of vouches

Jombah - February 7, 2019, 11:18 am

Vouch for Previously Known As, im sure his methods are high quality!

Yes that's a good idea and I support

King - February 7, 2019, 11:26 am

I support this suggestion. Will improve the quality of the vouches.

Axe - February 7, 2019, 11:27 am

I really like that idea, fits really well with contracts being enforced on all on-site deals.
Vouch

Xerotic - February 7, 2019, 11:41 am

FYI if you have a contract with a TID attached your already have your post distinguished from

others. Check out this post:

<https://hackforums.net/showthread.php?tid=5932004&pid=58172886#pid58172886>

The link is clickable to the contract as well:

<https://hackforums.net/contracts.php?action=view&cid=23328>

Maybe a button on the page "View Contracted Customer Posts" to filter out non-contracted customer posts would be neat.

#Skyline - February 7, 2019, 11:57 am

Yeah I like this idea. I'm all for it.

And makes sense leaving a vouch/review after purchase anyway.

Bluffer - February 7, 2019, 11:58 am

Xerotic has a great idea about sorting posts by contracted customers.

The issue I see with this is what happens to those who:

- Bought the product (without contracts) before the deadline
- Received the product as a vouch copy
- Received the product as a free copy to a friend

I suppose for a vouch copy, one could make a contract with them? I don't know if that's against the rules or not.

Cool - February 7, 2019, 12:03 pm

I support this idea, it's super confusing reading fake vouches on a thread and always the same circle of scammers, but how will we deal with vouch copies, when the product is given away for free in exchange of a review, if this is implemented?

jobhip - February 7, 2019, 12:19 pm

While I like this idea, what about people that received it for free for a vouch copy? They have no reason to be in a contract.

Axe - February 7, 2019, 1:33 pm

(Feb 7, 2019 01:19 PM)jobhip Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) While I like this idea, what about people that received it for free for a vouch copy? They have no reason to be in a contract.

Maybe you could make a contract with the person receiving the vouch copy?

Your service for their review. Not 100% certain if thats allowed though

Elitas - February 7, 2019, 1:41 pm

It's already easy to see who is a contracted customer, and who isn't. I don't see a need for this, as all it does is add to the amount of marketplace violations which can happen. Additionally, could see an issue with previous customers (from a past thread) vouching on a newer thread and getting BANNED. Only way to work is if this was automated, and automatically detected vouch posts from normal posts and blocked users from vouching without a contract. Such a thing isn't possible without vouching being changed to some sort of thread reputation system, which shouldn't and likely wouldn't ever happen.

jobhip - February 7, 2019, 1:43 pm

(Feb 7, 2019 02:33 PM)Cemo Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Maybe you could make a contract with the person receiving the vouch copy?

Your service for their review. Not 100% certain if that's allowed though

I'm almost certain it isn't. Contracts are for when stuff is being exchanged. Not when it's being given away.

SUI-3183372 - February 7, 2019, 2:05 pm

(Feb 7, 2019 02:41 PM)Elitas Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) It's already easy to see who is a contracted customer, and who isn't. I don't see a need for this, as all it does is add to the amount of marketplace violations which can happen. Additionally, could see an issue with previous customers (from a past thread) vouching on a newer thread and getting BANNED. Only way to work is if this was automated, and automatically detected vouch posts from normal posts and blocked users from vouching without a contract. Such a thing isn't possible without vouching being changed to some sort of thread reputation system, which shouldn't and likely wouldn't ever happen. I see you sell / have sold ebooks...

(Feb 7, 2019 02:43 PM)jobhip Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I'm almost certain it isn't. Contracts are for when stuff is being exchanged. Not when it's being given away.

I believe this is fine. Start a contract stating the "buyer" gets a copy of the product in return for a review. If he doesn't review you could even posted a deal dispute for breach of contract.

jobhip - February 7, 2019, 2:07 pm

(Feb 7, 2019 03:05 PM)Previously Known As.... Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I see you sell / have sold ebooks...

I believe this is fine. Start a contract stating the "buyer" gets a copy of the product in return for a review. If he doesn't review you could even posted a deal dispute for breach of contract.

Hmm. Never thought of it that way. Good point, and if I ever decide to do a vouch copy for a book of mine I might try this. Will ask admins first though just to make sure all's good.

webdev77 - February 7, 2019, 2:27 pm

(Feb 7, 2019 03:07 PM)jobhip Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Hmm. Never thought of it that way. Good point, and if I ever decide to do a vouch copy for a book of mine I might try this. Will ask admins first though just to make sure all's good.

I would hope they are okay with such a contract given that all deals on site will require a contract. I would still consider that a deal.

Blogger - February 7, 2019, 3:30 pm

(Feb 7, 2019 12:41 PM)Xerotic Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) FYI if you have a contract with a TID attached you already have your post distinguished from others. Check out this post:

<https://hackforums.net/showthread.php?tid=5932004&pid=58172886#pid58172886>

The link is clickable to the contract as well:

<https://hackforums.net/contracts.php?action=view&cid=23328>

Maybe a button on the page "View Contracted Customer Posts" to filter out non-contracted customer posts would be neat.

I was just going to say this.

You can see who was a contracted buyer. If you only want vouches from verified buyers, just look

at the vouches and check if it was left by someone who actually bought the item, i.e. a Contracted Buyer.

SUI-3183372 - February 7, 2019, 3:52 pm

(Feb 7, 2019 12:41 PM)Xerotic Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) FYI if you have a contract with a TID attached your already have your post distinguished from others. Check out this post:

<https://hackforums.net/showthread.php?tid=5932004&pid=58172886#pid58172886>

The link is clickable to the contract as well:

<https://hackforums.net/contracts.php?action=view&cid=23328>

Maybe a button on the page "View Contracted Customer Posts" to filter out non-contracted customer posts would be neat.

Do you know what percentage of users who complete contracts, lets say successfully, have a TID attached to the contract?

I was unaware of that feature in contracts, and while I haven't exactly been looking for "Contracted Customer" at the top of anyone's posts, I can't say I remember ever coming across this 'in the wild' either, so I'm imagining contract usage with TID's attached is fairly low? However it doesn't really stand out either, so even if I have come across posts with "Contracted Customer" on them, I don't think I would have noticed it unless I was already looking for it.

If the percentage of contracts with attached TID's is low, I'd saying finding a way to increase that number and then adding the feature you mentioned in your last sentence could be a pretty decent step towards fighting fake vouches.

Elitas - February 7, 2019, 4:03 pm

(Feb 7, 2019 03:05 PM)Previously Known As.... Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I see you sell / have sold ebooks...

I believe this is fine. Start a contract stating the "buyer" gets a copy of the product in return for a review. If he doesn't review you could even posted a deal dispute for breach of contract.

And that makes my opinion worthless? Nice censorship. I see left-wing politics has though you well. Disagree with me? YOU SHALL BE CENSORED!

TBH though, it is a petty reaction. Prove what I said wrong with an actual argument, not a personal insult as that just reflects poorly on your own character but I guess it's to be expected from someone with an ego greater than their ability to express oneself, how's that for a personal insult? ?

Smexy - February 7, 2019, 4:06 pm

(Feb 7, 2019 03:05 PM)Previously Known As.... Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I believe this is fine. Start a contract stating the "buyer" gets a copy of the product in return for a review. If he doesn't review you could even posted a deal dispute for breach of contract. Depends if they receive the review and other side got the vouch copy, now do this 150 times and you have 150 green b-rating which makes the system broken...

All it would take is to write 150 worthless e-books...

SUI-3183372 - February 7, 2019, 4:10 pm

(Feb 7, 2019 05:03 PM)Elitas Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Prove what I said wrong with an actual argumentk

(Feb 7, 2019 02:41 PM)Elitas Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Only way to work is if this was automated, and automatically detected vouch posts from normal posts and blocked users from vouching without a contract. Such a thing isn't possible without vouching being changed to some sort of thread reputation system, which shouldn't and likely wouldn't ever happen. Yes it is.

Make a rule saying "vouching for sales threads without "Contracted Customer " status is a warnable offense.

When people do vouch without "Contracted Customer" other members here report that post.

Eagle 95, who constantly tells me we aren't reporting enough posts, swoops in and cleans house with the fake vouchers.

We get less fake vouchers, not automated system is required, Eagle 95 gets to go to sleep happy.

(Feb 7, 2019 05:03 PM)Elitas Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) ... but I guess it's to be expected from someone with an ego greater than their ability to express oneself, how's that for a personal insult? ?ouch

(Feb 7, 2019 05:06 PM)Sm?exy Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Depends if they receive the review and other side got the vouch copy, now do this 150 times and you have 150 green b-rating which makes the system broken...

All it would take is to write 150 worthless e-books...

That's a good point, I'd need further clarification from staff on how they intend Contracts and B-Rating to be used. Is it valid to create a contract for a non-monetary deal and then award B-Rating when the deal is successful? Or should B-Rating be reserved only for deals involving some sort of currency, or anything more than a review even?

funnymao - February 7, 2019, 5:43 pm

I'm still new to everything on this site. it went from me finding out on how to get twitch bots to ebooks on making money. But my question is if all the ebooks on this site are fake and stuff has anyone ever tested it or has anyone even actually check to see if they made money. I know if you void TOS for some of these you can get banned or worse Swatted but I was wondering because I need to make some mad money soon so I can help out my family.

Like is the professor tikkify method actually good because he replied to me a lot even though I didn't buy it.

and is Bezos method also legit because people say they had tried it and say it works while others don't so...

someone explain to this newbie

SUI-3183372 - February 7, 2019, 7:39 pm

(Feb 7, 2019 06:43 PM)funnymao Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) and is Bezos method also legit because people say they had tried it and say it works while others don't so...

This is not the thread to discuss this, but since this furthers the point of this thread, [another user has pointed out](#) it is highly, highly likely that Bezos is paying for people to sign up to HF and vouch for him, or he's doing it himself with proxies.

If you visit his thread here and go through the last ~10 or so pages, you'll see a high number of normal accounts between 1 and 30 posts posting on his thread. Many of these accounts have similar posting styles, almost all of these accounts have the GMT or GMT+1 timezone set, and all of these accounts, including the OP's account, overused the :) smiley.

Here's an example of extreme :) usage over the last few pages of his thread:

Spoiler [\(Click to View\)](#)

Not gonna bother taking pics of these 10 instances... <https://i.imgur.com/gQSSkVK.png>

<https://i.imgur.com/GZgX2cd.png>

I'd wager that further analysis of the accounts shows abuse, but this is just speculation

Happeh - February 7, 2019, 9:09 pm

(Feb 7, 2019 08:39 PM)Previously Known As.... Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) This is not the thread to discuss this, but since this furthers the point of this thread, [another user has pointed out](#) it is highly, highly likely that Bezos is paying for people to sign up to HF and vouch for him, or he's doing it himself with proxies.

If you visit his thread here and go through the last ~10 or so pages, you'll see a high number of normal accounts between 1 and 30 posts posting on his thread. Many of these accounts have similar posting styles, almost all of these accounts have the GMT or GMT+1 timezone set, and all of these accounts, including the OP's account, overused the :) smiley.

Here's an example of extreme :) usage over the last few pages of his thread:

Spoiler [\(Click to View\)](#)

Not gonna bother taking pics of these 10 instances... <https://i.imgur.com/gQSSkVK.png>

<https://i.imgur.com/GZgX2cd.png>

I'd wager that further analysis of the accounts shows abuse, but this is just speculation

Nice detective work on that [Vendor], lol. I like the idea and despite the blowback of people using fake contracts, its better than the current system. Xerotics further follow up of having a filter system

on the page for only confirmed customers seems amazing and an easy way to see who has bought and what they said. Only if there were a way to combat the former; people using fake contracts.

Also, just want to laugh at Elitas who has his own personal bias in the marketplace try to insult you.

SUI-3183372 - February 7, 2019, 9:14 pm

(Feb 7, 2019 10:09 PM)Happeh Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Nice detective work on that [Vendor], lol. I like the idea and despite the blowback of people using fake contracts, its better than the current system. Xerotics further follow up of having a filter system on the page for only confirmed customers seems amazing and an easy way to see who has bought and what they said. Only if there were a way to combat the former; people using fake contracts.

I think the best way to combat fake contracts right now is to simply report anything that seems suspicious. I'm not sure if there is a way to directly report contracts, but maybe that's another feature the site can explore in the future. I feel like contract/b-rating abuse is more serious than rep abuse ever was using the old system, so I trust with valid reports that punishment towards this sort of abuse will be serious.

(Feb 7, 2019 10:09 PM)Happeh Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Also, just want to laugh at Elitas who has his own personal bias in the marketplace try to insult you.

Yeah, that went 0-100 pretty quickly. Seems like we may have interacted in the past, don't recall though.

Pyro - February 7, 2019, 11:53 pm

(Feb 7, 2019 04:46 PM)James! Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Sure posts say if they're a contracted customer, but this doesn't always stand out. The only way to fix fake vouches and reviews is by ONLY allowing people who have a relevant contract to post a vouch, as well as displaying that they're a contracted customer.

if u are not including thread UID in contract it wont display Contracted customer status when u vouch I think, correct me if im wrong but I think I'm not :D

funnymao - February 8, 2019, 3:53 am

(Feb 7, 2019 08:39 PM)Previously Known As.... Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) This is not the thread to discuss this, but since this furthers the point of this thread, another user has pointed out[url] it is highly, highly likely that Bezos is paying for people to sign up to HF and vouch for him, or he's doing it himself with proxies.

If you visit his thread here and go through the last ~10 or so pages, you'll see a high number of normal accounts between 1 and 30 posts posting on his thread. Many of these accounts have similar posting styles, almost all of these accounts have the GMT or GMT+1 timezone set, and all of these accounts, including the OP's account, overused the :) smiley.

Here's an example of extreme :) usage over the last few pages of his thread:

[/spoiler]

I'd wager that further analysis of the accounts shows abuse, but this is just speculation wow and I thought I could make money on here my life is a lie I tell u

JoshAllen - February 8, 2019, 5:03 am

Well currently when starting a contract you have an option to put a thread UID, so maybe after the contract is complete, there is a "review" section on the contract.

Then on the HF thread you originally put on the contract, there will be a "reviews" button and you will be able to see all reviews ever made for that product.

I would like to see some feature like this introduced. Even if people were to get their friends to make phony contracts, you are able to see the contracts people have made with others, so it would be pretty obvious if you see someone buying 10 ebooks a day.

Traum - February 8, 2019, 7:55 am

(Feb 7, 2019 02:41 PM)Elitas Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) It's already easy to see who is a contracted customer, and who isn't. I don't see a need for this, as all it does is add to the amount of marketplace violations which can happen. Additionally, could see an issue with previous customers (from a past thread) vouching on a newer thread and getting BANNED. Only way to work is if this was automated, and automatically detected vouch posts from normal posts and blocked users from vouching without a contract. Such a thing isn't possible without vouching being changed to some sort of thread reputation system, which shouldn't and likely wouldn't ever happen.

So threads who only have vouches from people who aren't contracted customers aren't to be trusted? That's how I'm handling it right now and that leaves about 5% of quality products.

Especially the e-book market is so shady that we need a system to protect buyers, and I think a good solution for that would be the system OP mentioned.

Polymath - February 8, 2019, 7:58 am

I agree with this, it is an excellent idea. It might not get rid of the problem entirely but at least it will make it harder for these idiots using fake vouches and reviews.

Off topic suggestion: Warn and ban users selling shitty useless Ebooks, it is the biggest scam going around HF for long time now.

Biggy - February 8, 2019, 8:06 am

I don't see a downside to this suggestion.

It helps newer users feel just a bit safer that these vouches are a bit more legit.

Of course people could still write a fake contract, then a fake review but it makes everything a bit more difficult that way, which is good.

Elitas - February 8, 2019, 8:49 am

(Feb 7, 2019 05:10 PM)Previously Known As.... Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) k

Yes it is.

Make a rule saying "vouching for sales threads without "Contracted Customer " status is a warnable offense.

When people do vouch without "Contracted Customer" other members here report that post.

Eagle 95, who constantly tells me we aren't reporting enough posts, swoops in and cleans house with the fake vouchers.

We get less fake vouches, not automated system is required, Eagle 95 gets to go to sleep happy.

ouch

That's a good point, I'd need further clarification from staff on how they intend Contracts and B-Rating to be used. Is it valid to create a contract for a non-monetary deal and then award B-Rating when the deal is successful? Or should B-Rating be reserved only for deals involving some sort of currency, or anything more than a review even?

I disagree. I don't think it's sustainable, or necessarily fair, to add a new rule along with hundreds of new weekly reports and pile it all onto Eagle.

Address the issue of people purchasing off the seller from a previous thread? Will staff have to check each person who vouches' account to ensure they've never purchased from the seller?

(Feb 8, 2019 08:55 AM)Traum Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) So threads who only have vouches from people who aren't contracted customers aren't to be trusted? That's how I'm handling it right now and that leaves about 5% of quality products.

Especially the e-book market is so shady that we need a system to protect buyers, and I think a good solution for that would be the system OP mentioned.

Look, priorities need to be set straight here.

There really are 2 outcomes here. Either all sellers get legit vouches to convince people to buy products, or their sales will decrease loads.

If e-book market sales decrease loads because we are 'protecting buyers', well there goes a huge income for the entire forum. Omniscient makes money from his members profiting. If people are profiting from the market there, money remains within the community and is spent on donations, upgrades, banners, stickies, sales tags and all the other optional purchases members can get on here. It's important to have a rich community of members, so that the community as a whole can survive financially.

Yes, protecting members is important, but protecting them from scammers is of the upmost importance. I agree that some eBooks are trash, and some products are trash, but will this suggestion even provide a remedy for this? Several issues with legitimate people vouching when they haven't purchased the exact product on the thread, or purchased the same product on a previous thread. Additionally, most vouches are actually helpful. They're not showing fake proof, or any of that other shady stuff, and legitimately just say the user selling the product is a trusted person. Which could very well be the opinion of that user.

I think it goes without saying, that if you are going to use the internet and purchase something from a forum you just arrived on, and see a large number of members posting vouches for each other, then you have to use your common sense and know what's going on and decide whether you want to purchase the item based on actual resources. This forum, in particular, provides sufficient resources to do so. You can check out a user's previous contracts, their contract reputation or other reviews from VERIFIED CUSTOMERS, which is where their reviews will go. If someone has a review to post, they'll post it on the contract/market rep. It's a much more accurate place to read reviews than some random posts on the thread. I don't think we need to staff to protect members from their own stupidity.

SUI-3183372 - February 8, 2019, 9:27 am

(Feb 8, 2019 09:49 AM)Elitas Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I disagree. I don't think it's sustainable, or necessarily fair, to add a new rule along with hundreds of new weekly reports and pile it all onto Eagle.

Address the issue of people purchasing off the seller from a previous thread? Will staff have to check each person who vouches' account to ensure they've never purchased from the seller?

So you're telling me it's non sustainable for Omni to come up with new rules and then ask his moderators to enforce them? I think you believe that mods have a workload of 300,000 reported posts a day and this is going to up that to 900,000 and only poor Eagle is going to be able to field all these reports. That's not how this forum works. If anything look at the current state of HF, we've lost most of our mini mods, I think it's fair to assume that reports are lower than they've ever been, and I know I've seen mods suggest that we start to [still correctly] report more threads and posts.

Plus, the approach I replied to you with is how we've ALWAYS done it here. Case and point, did a quick search for 'Vouch' by 'Omniscient' and came across the 'Vouch Begging' rule he made years ago: <https://hackforums.net/showthread.php?tid=2871682>

1. This is a new rule
2. Breaking this rule is punishable
3. If you see someone breaking it, report it

Don't think any mods lost their fucking minds when this got introduced. If we introduce something similar to combat fake vouches, I'd say mod workload increases by roughly 25% (pulling this number out of my ass but it sounds good) for the initial period after the rule release, then drops back down to more or less the same workload they have now. It's not like if we make this a rule the same number of fake vouches is going to continue coming in, that number will drop drastically simply due to the existence of the rule, it'd be up to mods to handle the small minority who continue to do it anyways.

Cooligan - February 8, 2019, 9:29 am

I absolutely love the idea of this and I feel as if it wouldn't be too hard to implement into the already existing Contract system.

For example, I've seen many places add the text "Verified Purchase" next to that persons vouch/review, meaning that person had to have actually purchased that item for it to be counted as a verified review. If we could find a way to implement that here I think it would help this case quite a bit. ?

Effexion - February 8, 2019, 9:38 am

It would be great to see this implemented. The marketplace is currently ruined by fake vouches and nothing can be trusted. They also entice newer members to buy crap.

SUI-3183372 - February 8, 2019, 9:38 am

(Feb 8, 2019 09:49 AM)Elitas Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) If e-book market sales decrease loads because we are 'protecting buyers', well there goes a huge income for the entire forum. Omniscient makes money from his members profiting. If people are profiting from the market there, money remains within the community and is spent on donations, upgrades, banners, stickies, sales tags and all the other optional purchases members can get on here. It's important to have a rich community of members, so that the community as a whole can survive financially.

If ebook market sales decrease because we eliminate shady practices and fake vouches, then that's a fucking win in everyone's book (except for vendors who rely on fake vouches). I don't know how you think ensuring maximum profit is achieved from the market is preferred to eliminating shady practices, but it's not. To think that shows that you don't mind new or unknowing members being taken advantage of if it means your ebook scammers can make top dollar. Sure, maybe some of e-book vendors / fake vouch connoisseurs buy fancy awards with your immorally gained money, but to the rest of us you're pretty much scum and I'm sick of seeing you guys prey on new and unknowing members. I am grouping you with the rest of them, as your largest marketplaces threads are ebooks, gambling, and mentoring, 3 great "I don't have an actual product to sell but let me try to swindle you out of some money anyways" threads.

(Feb 8, 2019 10:24 AM)James! Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) With you having said this, it does raise some issues that I can't believe I didn't see. This is basic economics and what we've been learning about as part of my economics and I certainly see this on HF.

Another possible solution to this problem is displaying non-contracted customer on people's posts who aren't contracted and, obviously, displaying contracted customer on those who are. I think we should increase the size of the message about that as well and make sure that people see it. This is another viable solution that could actually be good.

Omni already bans people who upgrade ban evaders/scammers. He's shown numerous times that he doesn't mind not making a sale if it's to protect the integrity of the site and his members, I don't

see why he'd feel differently about potentially losing upgrade purchases from members who planned on abusing our marketplace. It's not like E-Books drive our marketplace's economy either. He may lose out on some donations from big name ebook vendors who begin struggling to maintain that name, but the economic hit this site will take is, or is very close to, nil.

(Feb 8, 2019 10:29 AM)Cooligan Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I absolutely love the idea of this and I feel as if it wouldn't be too hard to implement into the already existing Contract system.

For example, I've seen many places add the text "Verified Purchase" next to that persons vouch/review, meaning that person had to have actually purchased that item for it to be counted as a verified review. If we could find a way to implement that here I think it would help this case quite a bit. ?

Yep, I was unaware of this feature until yesterday, but if we can build off of this in the marketplace in a way that really lets verified vouches stand out and fake vouches take a back seat, it'd be huge.

Elitas - February 8, 2019, 9:51 am

(Feb 8, 2019 10:38 AM)Previously Known As.... Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) If ebook market sales decrease because we eliminate shady practices and fake vouches, then that's a fucking win in everyone's book (except for vendors who rely on fake vouches). I don't know how you think ensuring maximum profit is achieved from the market is preferred to eliminating shady practices, but it's not. To think that shows that you don't mind new or unknowing members being taken advantage of if it means your ebook scammers can make top dollar. Sure, maybe some of e-book vendors / fake vouch connoisseurs buy fancy awards with your immorally gained money, but to the rest of us you're pretty much scum and I'm sick of seeing you guys prey on new and unknowing members. I am grouping you with the rest of them, as your largest marketplaces threads are ebooks, gambling, and mentoring, 3 great "I don't have an actual product to sell but let me try to swindle you out of some money anyways" threads.

Reaction is to be expected when you insult someone's "perfect" opinion. Listen, someone has to point out the obvious issues and see if you can deal with them, because if you can't solve those simple questions I asked then the idea is not practical.

Saying my mentoring is useless when it's legit the most comprehensive hacking mentoring course made available on this forum in years. You, as a self proclaimed "hacker" should have some appreciation for that, but apparently not.

It's not about new members being taken advantage of, and this rule won't even solve this. Ebooks already have, and always will, make ridiculous claims that attract unsuspecting members. All this forum needs to do, is to provide the suite of tools which it already does, to make educated and safe decisions before purchasing.

Who the hell is forming their opinion of products based on thread vouches?!?!?!?

You'll say new members, well then maybe we need to educate new members more about market rep, AND THE ENTIRE REASON WE CREATED CONTRACTS.

Cooligan - February 8, 2019, 9:57 am

(Feb 8, 2019 10:51 AM)Elitas Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Reaction is to be expected when you insult someone's "perfect" opinion. Listen, someone has to point out the obvious issues and see if you can deal with them, because if you can't solve those simple questions I asked then the idea is not practical.

Saying my mentoring is useless when it's legit the most comprehensive hacking mentoring course made available on this forum in years. You, as a self proclaimed "hacker" should have some appreciation for that, but apparently not.

It's not about new members being taken advantage of, and this rule won't even solve this. Ebooks already have, and always will, make ridiculous claims that attract unsuspecting members. All this forum needs to do, is to provide the suite of tools which it already does, to make educated and safe decisions before purchasing.

Who the hell is forming their opinion of products based on thread vouches?!?!?!?

You'll say new members, well then maybe we need to educate new members more about market rep, AND THE ENTIRE REASON WE CREATED CONTRACTS.
Lol uhh..

Previously Known As... is not a "self proclaimed hacker" by any means lmao. You literally couldn't be more wrong about that one man.

SUI-3183372 - February 8, 2019, 10:10 am

(Feb 8, 2019 10:57 AM)Cooligan Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Lol uhh..

Previously Known As... is not a "self proclaimed hacker" by any means lmao. You literally couldn't be more wrong about that one man.

He joined (2016) long after I left the scene and doesn't stray far from ebooks. I don't blame him for being ignorant. I do blame him for basing such a large portion of his replies around being insulted and a small bit of it is actually on topic. Elitas, perhaps try making more constructive posts then just throwing in a sentence or two mixed in there to get your flames across, it's pretty effective and you'll actually look like your a constructive member _(?)_/_

(Feb 8, 2019 10:51 AM)Elitas Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) It's not about new members being taken advantage of, and this rule won't even solve this. Ebooks already have, and always will, make ridiculous claims that attract unsuspecting members. All this forum needs to do, is to provide the suite of tools which it already does, to make educated and safe decisions before purchasing. Yes it will. Failure to see this leaves me greatly concerned regarding the rest of your judgement. There's an example of this happening ON THIS VERY THREAD.

1. Member posts off topic looking for ebook suggestion and naming one he is interested in:

<https://hackforums.net/showthread.php?tid=5938681&pid=58240450#pid58240450>

2. I point out, 'hey, you're off topic, but since you're here, all his vouches are fake':

<https://hackforums.net/showthread.php?tid=5938681&pid=58240958#pid58240958>

3. User expresses shock and disgust:

<https://hackforums.net/showthread.php?tid=5938681&pid=58242319#pid58242319>

I'm glad you don't even have to leave this thread for an example of how this will help people. Stop thinking like someone who's been here for 2 years and start thinking like someone who's brand new to a massively active and ever changing forum.

(Feb 8, 2019 10:51 AM)Elitas Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Who the hell is forming their opinion of products based on thread vouches?!?!?! So many people. Sure it's not a good idea but it's the norm.

(Feb 8, 2019 10:51 AM)Elitas Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) You'll say new members, well then maybe we need to educate new members more about market rep, AND THE ENTIRE REASON WE CREATED CONTRACTS. This is not the entire reason we created contracts, however it is A reason. And unfortunately it's not possible to sit here and educate new members of every single intricacy of HF. No one is going to read that much, it'd take staff a year to write it all anyways. On HF you don't get training wheels, you're thrown in with the rest of us and if you make a fool of yourself you get punished for it, and if you don't ask the right questions or spend ages reading old and irrelevant

threads, you may never know how toxic and fake our ebook section really is.

HOMODIN - February 8, 2019, 10:18 am

This is one thing that I have been thinking about too but never came up with a solution. This suggestion might actually work, however how would one show that the person has bought the said product? -the contract should be public sure but how can people see it directly in the thread that the voucher in question actually has bought it?

SUI-3183372 - February 8, 2019, 10:27 am

(Feb 8, 2019 11:18 AM)HOMODIN Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) This is one thing that I have been thinking about too but never came up with a solution. This suggestion might actually work, however how would one show that the person has bought the said product? -the contract should be public sure but how can people see it directly in the thread that the voucher in question actually has bought it?

So, I was unaware of some of this until after I posted this thread, but it's a pretty nice process.

When you create a contract, you are able to attach a thread ID(tid) to the contract (for example, this thread's tid is: 5938681).

Spoiler [\(Click to View\)](#)

Now, with this tid attached to a contract, after the contract is successfully completed, anytime the buyer posts on that specific thread there will be something showing the buyer as a "Contracted Customer" above his post.

Example post here:

<https://hackforums.net/showthread.php?tid=5932004&pid=58172886#pid58172886>

So we already have most of what we need actually already implemented into the contract system.

My suggestion now is either 1 of 2 possible scenarios:

1. What Xerotic said, add a button that lets you filter out all non-Contracted Customer posts (or style it after the 'view your posts in this thread' feature and make it inclusive rather than exclusive).
2. Create a rule that disallows vouching for sales in which you not a Contracted Customer.

Elitas - February 8, 2019, 10:34 am

(Feb 8, 2019 10:57 AM)Cooligan Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Lol uhh..

Previously Known As... is not a "self proclaimed hacker" by any means lmao. You literally couldn't be more wrong about that one man.

He is though? He has called himself a hacker in many threads. I'm not saying he isn't, he certainly is a knowledgeable user, but additionally self proclaimed.

Lavish Living - February 8, 2019, 10:35 am

(Feb 8, 2019 09:06 AM)Biggy Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I don't see a downside to this suggestion.

It helps newer users feel just a bit safer that these vouches are a bit more legit.

Of course people could still write a fake contract, then a fake review but it makes everything a bit more difficult that way, which is good.

Plus, if caught they'd get contract banned or closed. So bigger risk for them tbh

Eagle 95 - February 8, 2019, 10:35 am

(Feb 8, 2019 11:34 AM)Elitas Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) He is though? He has called himself a hacker in many threads. I'm not saying he isn't, he certainly is a knowledgeable user, but additionally self proclaimed.

Oh you couldn't be more wrong. He isn't self proclaimed.

Yin Yang - February 8, 2019, 10:38 am

But then who'd buy all the shitty e-books?

Cooligan - February 8, 2019, 10:39 am

(Feb 8, 2019 11:34 AM)Elitas Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) He is though? He has called himself a hacker in many threads. I'm not saying he isn't, he certainly is a knowledgeable user, but additionally self proclaimed.

...

Wow, just please stop while you're behind.. ??? ?

Elitas - February 8, 2019, 10:44 am

(Feb 8, 2019 11:10 AM)Previously Known As.... Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) He joined (2016) long after I left the scene and doesn't stray far from ebooks. I don't blame him for being ignorant. I do blame him for basing such a large portion of his replies around being insulted and a small bit of it is actually on topic. Elitas, perhaps try making more constructive posts then just throwing in a sentence or two mixed in there to get your flames across, it's pretty effective and you'll actually look like your a constructive member _(?)_

Yes it will. Failure to see this leaves me greatly concerned regarding the rest of your judgement. There's an example of this happening ON THIS VERY THREAD.

1. Member posts off topic looking for ebook suggestion and naming one he is interested in:

<https://hackforums.net/showthread.php?tid=5938681&pid=58240450#pid58240450>

2. I point out, 'hey, you're off topic, but since you're here, all his vouches are fake':

<https://hackforums.net/showthread.php?tid=5938681&pid=58240958#pid58240958>

3. User expresses shock and disgust:

<https://hackforums.net/showthread.php?tid=5938681&pid=58242319#pid58242319>

I'm glad you don't even have to leave this thread for an example of how this will help people. Stop thinking like someone who's been here for 2 years and start thinking like someone who's brand new to a massively active and ever changing forum.

So many people. Sure it's not a good idea but it's the norm.

This is not the entire reason we created contracts, however it is A reason. And unfortunately it's not possible to sit here and educate new members of every single intricacy of HF. No one is going to read that much, it'd take staff a year to write it all anyways. On HF you don't get training wheels, you're thrown in with the rest of us and if you make a fool of yourself you get punished for it, and if you don't ask the right questions or spend ages reading old and irrelevant threads, you may never know how toxic and fake our ebook section really is.

Lets just stop the passive insults as it gets us nowhere....

Anyway, I'm not saying your idea is completely stupid. It's certainly within the realm of possibility and could be constructive.

I'll lay this out simple so that you can form your response and outline/tackle all the key issues I take with this:

1) What about members who purchased a product off a user, then they made a new thread, and the buyer was satisfied, and wishes to vouch for the product on the new thread. He is not a contracted buyer on this thread in particular, but has availed of the particular service/item in question on the thread. It'd be grossly unfair for this user to be warned for leaving a vouch. Now, if we are to have staff hand out warnings, they would need to manually check each user's previous contracts to see if that's the case or if it's a 'fake vouch'. This is a huge workload, so it's not just a few more reports we're talking about here if it's the case. I'm sure there could be a reasonable solution to this problem but I haven't thought of one yet.

2) Vouch copies kind of become useless. I know it's not really a big deal, but we do have an entire group based around reviewing products. If they are not a contracted customer, how do we separate these users who are writing a review of the product versus those that are giving fake reviews/vouches. It's just another thing that needs to be considered.

3) New users, just like everyone else who purchases in the marketplace, will be forced to use contracts very soon. This should completely solve this issue, as when they are using contracts, they will be forced to familiarize themselves with the entire process. And, at one time or another, will read all of the seller's legitimate reviews on their marketplace profile. Additionally, once all users have to use contracts, there will be much less shady deals in order to avoid negative marketplace reputation.

A potential solution could be to only show posts by contracted users by default in the marketplace. That way members can post and ask questions, but only those who have purchased will be shown to new members by default. Just an idea which could solve the issue but prevent the above problems.

(Feb 8, 2019 11:35 AM)Eagle 95 Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Oh you couldn't be more wrong. He isn't self proclaimed.

(Feb 8, 2019 11:39 AM)Cooligan Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) ...

Wow, just please stop while you're behind.. ??? ?

That's not the point I was making. I don't want to get into a petty argument about who's a hacker and who's not. I already posted that he is knowledgeable (meaning I accept he is knows a lot about the subject). All I was doing with the self proclaimed part was highlighting that he should not call himself a hacker if he is going to belittle my efforts to bring higher hacking standards to this forum. It was meant as an insult so it doesn't have to be factual, he has insulted me multiple times now but I feel it's no longer constructive.

Bob White - February 8, 2019, 10:47 am

(Feb 8, 2019 11:38 AM)Yin Yang Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) But then who'd buy all the shitty e-books? Trappy's customers.

Dotexe - February 8, 2019, 11:00 am

Would like to see this in action :D

SUI-3183372 - February 8, 2019, 11:01 am

Thanks for support to those who posted kindly about me.

@Elitas you have good points, but I still don't personally believe that they outweigh the positives that we can gain here.

1. Yes, creating a new thread would eliminate any posts you had vouching for you on your old thread, but is that a bad thing? I actually think it's disingenuous to make a new sales thread then

contact old customers and ask them to vouch again, it's a bad look in my opinion. I think a better solution, although still one I think can be abused, would be to link to old threads displaying vouches, or do what people do now and copy and paste the vouches into their OP.

However, I think what you see as a negative I see as a positive. I like the idea of sales threads receiving less posts. It removes the clutter and lets those interested in the product sort through the relevant and helpful replies quickly and easily (Xerotic's "filter by contracted customer" would be a great idea here). I'm also not trying to get discussion based posts removed from sales threads, I simply want scenarios where we have big name ebook vendors pming people to vouch on their threads to be eliminated.

2. Vouch copies can easily be distributed through the contract system, and I believe it's actually a good use case of the contract system as I've seen plenty of people receive vouch copies for something then never return with the review they were supposed to provide. Now you can use contracts to also distribute vouch copies. Enter the voucher's name, INCLUDE THE TID, and set terms of 1 copy of xxxxx in return for 1 review of xxxxx. However, a concern would be how does the B-Rating system come into play when you're dealing with contracts with no monetary exchange taking place? Would you still be allowed to rate someone for a review or receiving a review copy?

3. Forcing people to use contracts will definitely help, especially if more vendors start actually including the TID into their contracts. We should start seeing more "Contracted Customer" check marks above posts. However, this only strengthens the good guys, it doesn't eliminate or really even weaken the bad guys. We'd still have the exact same people doing the exact same thing... asking for, begging for, paying for, or doing whatever else for, vouches, and this is what I'd like to see eliminated somehow.

Elitas - February 8, 2019, 11:12 am

(Feb 8, 2019 12:01 PM)Previously Known As.... Wrote: [CITE](#) Thanks for support to those who posted kindly about me.

@Elitas you have good points, but I still don't personally believe that they outweigh the positives that we can gain here.

1. Yes, creating a new thread would eliminate any posts you had vouching for you on your old thread, but is that a bad thing? I actually think it's disingenuous to make a new sales thread then contact old customers and ask them to vouch again, it's a bad look in my opinion. I think a better solution, although still one I think can be abused, would be to link to old threads displaying vouches, or do what people do now and copy and paste the vouches into their OP.

However, I think what you see as a negative I see as a positive. I like the idea of sales threads receiving less posts. It removes the clutter and lets those interested in the product sort through the relevant and helpful replies quickly and easily (Xerotic's "filter by contracted customer" would be a great idea here). I'm also not trying to get discussion based posts removed from sales threads, I simply want scenarios where we have big name ebook vendors pming people to vouch on their threads to be eliminated.

2. Vouch copies can easily be distributed through the contract system, and I believe it's actually a good use case of the contract system as I've seen plenty of people receive vouch copies for something then never return with the review they were supposed to provide. Now you can use contracts to also distribute vouch copies. Enter the voucher's name, INCLUDE THE TID, and set terms of 1 copy of xxxxx in return for 1 review of xxxxx. However, a concern would be how does the B-Rating system come into play when you're dealing with contracts with no monetary exchange taking place? Would you still be allowed to rate someone for a review or receiving a review copy?

3. Forcing people to use contracts will definitely help, especially if more vendors start actually including the TID into their contracts. We should start seeing more "Contracted Customer" check marks above posts. However, this only strengthens the good guys, it doesn't eliminate or really even weaken the bad guys. We'd still have the exact same people doing the exact same thing... asking for, begging for, paying for, or doing whatever else for, vouches, and this is what I'd like to see eliminated somehow.

1. Well your entire point is to only allow contracted sellers to vouch on the thread. But now, you're saying only contracted sellers who have purchased since a new thread has been created can vouch. IMHO this will slightly damage some legitimate seller's sales. At this rate, we might as well ban vouching altogether. Ban vouching altogether? That sounds like a pretty reasonable idea to me actually. I think it's certainly more plausible than only allowing contracted members. Contracted members should be vouching via B-Rating, not in threads. Only downsides would be of course less posts, so some sellers finding it hard to bump their thread or whatever but really I don't know if that's an issue. Bump wars have always trashed the marketplace.

2. Yeah, that's my point. It's the fact that there's no monetary gain. I would agree that contracts is pretty useful when it comes to vouch copies and can ensure that everything is kept above board, but would additionally allow some serious B-Rating farming for those in the reviewing groups. HOWEVER, a possible feature in the future is contracts without B-Rating. No money used? No B-Rating. But still a verifiable contract exists, could be pretty useful for cases like that.

3. Yes, but with contracts forced, new members, and everyone doing deals, will see the seller's B-Rating. Which means any shady sellers attempting to offer below par ebooks will get negative B-Ratings and thus no longer be able to sell as all members will see their rating when doing a contract! This is why it will solve the problem entirely, with the exception of stupid members who fail to actually see the huge amount of bad reviews a particular seller has. But even still, nobody will ever sell bad items again for fear of getting a lower B-Rating, so this one solves itself.

Almonds - February 8, 2019, 11:17 am

This is more than necessary- I am tired of 'friends' vouching for sales threads in no regards to the actual context.

If they didn't buy the product, then they should not feel obliged to speak on the thread.

Nicholas - February 8, 2019, 11:20 am

Good idea, I am all in support for this!

?lex - February 8, 2019, 11:24 am

I personally only vouch for products I've used, but if someone needs to fake a vouch, he doesn't need to use the words: "I vouch for this seller", he can simply say: "HQ member, don't hesitate to deal with it".. So I don't know how can this be implemented to bypass this, but nice idea nonetheless.

SUI-3183372 - February 8, 2019, 11:52 am

(Feb 8, 2019 12:12 PM)Elitas Wrote: [CITE](#) 1. Well your entire point is to only allow contracted sellers to vouch on the thread. But now, you're saying only contracted sellers who have purchased since a new thread has been created can vouch. IMHO this will slightly damage some legitimate seller's sales. At this rate, we might as well ban vouching altogether. Ban vouching altogether? That sounds like a pretty reasonable idea to me actually. I think it's certainly more plausible than only allowing contracted members. Contracted members should be vouching via B-Rating, not in threads. Only downsides would be of course less posts, so some sellers finding it hard to bump their thread or whatever but really I don't know if that's an issue. Bump wars have always trashed the marketplace.

2. Yeah, that's my point. It's the fact that there's no monetary gain. I would agree that contracts is pretty useful when it comes to vouch copies and can ensure that everything is kept above board, but would additionally allow some serious B-Rating farming for those in the reviewing groups. HOWEVER, a possible feature in the future is contracts without B-Rating. No money used? No B-Rating. But still a verifiable contract exists, could be pretty useful for cases like that.

3. Yes, but with contracts forced, new members, and everyone doing deals, will see the seller's B-Rating. Which means any shady sellers attempting to offer below par ebooks will get negative B-Ratings and thus no longer be able to sell as all members will see their rating when doing a contract! This is why it will solve the problem entirely, with the exception of stupid members who fail to actually see the huge amount of bad reviews a particular seller has. But even still, nobody will ever sell bad items again for fear of getting a lower B-Rating, so this one solves itself.

1. I've always intended on this suggestion making it so old customers would not be able to vouch on new threads. So if you purchased an item from someone before March 1st (and didn't use a contract with a TID) or if you make any purchases after March 1st without a contract, then you will not be able to vouch for that purchase. I realize this kind of sucks, but it would be necessary to jump start the new system (if it were to be implemented based on my specifications). And while I actually kind of like your "no vouching at all" proposal, I feel like we'd be the minority in that situation and that'd be taking things a bit far. I still feel like a good compromise is allowing vouches, but only through verifiable purchases, and I feel like the contract system is the best way to determine validity. Regardless of how this is implemented, this would indeed result in less posts, probably just a small decrease but potentially bigger if somehow that 'no vouching at all' rule is what we get out of this. However, this suggestion doesn't touch on any other types of posts such as pre-sale, discussion about the product/vendor, support, feature requests, etc. We can still get a large amount of posts out of those sort of subjects.

2. I think we're on the same page here.

3. This is where I'm admittedly ignorant. Since my return to HF I haven't been doing any business here, and thus haven't fully explored B-Rating. Can new users, say a 2-month old account with 60 posts, leave B-Rating on Vendors once they complete their contract successfully? Because while I like the idea of B-Rating, I haven't personally noticed anyone with super negative B-Rating yet, and it's made me wonder if somehow everyone is just happy with their purchases (unlikely)

New users can't rate (likely)

Users are afraid to give negatives as they'd receive one back (also likely)

B-Rating definitely is a useful metric for ensuring you're dealing with reputable vendors, but are we currently seeing a high enough volume in B-Ratings being given out to be able to fully trust and depend on this system yet? I'm not actively doing deals on HF but I would say that the marketplace is still by far my most active section, and with that being said, I don't think I've come across a situation yet where I've felt comfortable forming an opinion on someone based on their B-Rating alone. In fact, I don't think I've really seen any cut and dry cases where I've been able to look at someone's B-Rating and confidently say "oh, this dude is definitely a scammer." These are just my own experiences though, it could be I've just been viewing all the wrong threads or not paying attention as closely as I should be, others could have an entirely different experience on this subject.

Edit: In fact, new suggestion to piggy back on my initial one:

Thread ID is a mandatory field in contracts. If you are making a contract for a deal not associated with a thread, simply enter '0' for the TID. This will increase usage of the TID field as most people will have to fill it out. I just hope they fill it out accurately.

(Feb 8, 2019 12:24 PM)?lex Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I personally only vouch for products I've used, but if someone needs to fake a vouch, he doesn't need to use the words: "I vouch for this seller", he can

simply say: "HQ member, don't hesitate to deal with it".. So I don't know how can this be implemented to bypass this, but nice idea nonetheless.

I agree that people will always find creative ways to skirt past rules. We've had rules in the past about begging for vouch copies, about negatively reviewing a product, etc, and for each of these rules people have found the right phrasing to still essentially break these rules, but without technically breaking them. I don't think there's any avoiding that, but I do think that even knowing people are doing this, bypassing the new rule with loopholes, the total number of fake vouches will still be lower than what it is today.

Omniscient - February 8, 2019, 3:10 pm

And this is why requiring Contracts is just part of the plan and always has been.

Eventually fake vouchers are going to have to go through extra work like opening a Contract, creating a blockchain transaction and making sure they don't get caught making persistent fake Contracts. Everyone involved in faking Contracts will get closed.

Once we have more things in-place I can create policies against vouching without a Valid Contract.

Quote:While I like this idea, what about people that received it for free for a vouch copy? They have no reason to be in a contract.

I personally think that free vouch copies are nonsense and do not provide very good reviews of products. I might disallow them eventually or at least create distinct policies concerning them. Contracts could still be used a setting for "Review" copy could be created where no payment is used. But overall I just think vouch copies are bullshit and I'd be happy to ban the practice. For now you can do Contracts for review/vouch copies as a "Trading".

I think members are only now beginning to grasp the potential HF can achieve with Contracts. But these are things we've planned ahead of time many many months ago.

Quote:Do you know what percentage of users who complete contracts, lets say successfully, have a TID attached to the contract?

15k completed contracts with 9k having a TID, usage is higher than you thought. It's the majority of Contracts.

Part of the point of Contracts is to weed out these fake marketplace activity which improves quality and reduces scams. Things that only scammers and low-quality sellers can disagree with. If you have a great product or service....you will be rewarded with high B-ratings and more customers. The days of shitty ebook sellers are ending. That cancerous activity is being removed from HF.

Quote:I would like to see some feature like this introduced. Even if people were to get their friends to make phony contracts, you are able to see the contracts people have made with others, so it would be pretty obvious if you see someone buying 10 ebooks a day.

Exactly right. Over time the fakes will be spotted because of the Contracts trail.

Quote:So threads who only have vouches from people who aren't contracted customers aren't to be trusted? That's how I'm handling it right now and that leaves about 5% of quality products.

I'd say once the new policy is in-place that requires Contracts you will begin to notice a difference with vouches. I'm sure the fakers will get spotted and they'll be closed.

Elitas Wrote:There really are 2 outcomes here. Either all sellers get legit vouches to convince people to buy products, or their sales will decrease loads.

I'd say that accurate. Both outcomes will happen. Good sellers get legit vouches and make more sales....bad sellers and fake vouchers will get CLOSED. Do you have a problem with that Elitas?

You got something to tell us? Or should I be BLUNT and say your time is almost over here. It might be time for you to review the quality of your products and services you offer in Marketplace.

Quote:Omniscient makes money from his members profiting
I make even more money when HF has a good reputation for having an excellent Marketplace and members refer others to HF for quality goods.

Quote:Who the hell is forming their opinion of products based on thread vouches?!?!?
New members who are naive and unsuspecting. And you know this. To better protect new members from being duped by scammers and bad sellers I have to create policies and features because no amount of written warning is enough.

Quote:You'll say new members, well then maybe we need to educate new members more about market rep, AND THE ENTIRE REASON WE CREATED CONTRACTS.
I already send them a PM which is mostly ignored because it's probably too long for them to give a shit about. HF is a huge beast and it's better to have policies in place than it is to rely on noobs being educated.

Quote: And unfortunately it's not possible to sit here and educate new members of every single intricacy of HF. No one is going to read that much, it'd take staff a year to write it all anyways. On HF you don't get training wheels, you're thrown in with the rest of us and if you make a fool of yourself you get punished for it, and if you don't ask the right questions or spend ages reading old and irrelevant threads, you may never know how toxic and fake our ebook section really is.
EXACTLY, very well stated. Basically all the [Help Docs](#) should be read fully by all new members but that's unrealistic.

Quote:2. Create a rule that disallows vouching for sales in which you not a Contracted Customer.
That's coming, you just have to wait till more of our Marketplace is using Contracts and it's required in all deals. Things are going to feel drastic pretty soon. Just like when I deleted the reputations...I may literally have to close all existing Marketplace threads in order to ensure all sellers create new threads which comply with HF policy.

There are concepts some of you haven't even considered. Like if a Contract is dispute it's automatically a new thread in the Deal Dispute forum and that's the only way to create a thread there. Or that upon a completion of a Contract a post is made in the thread automatically to signify the sale. Really a lot can be done to enhance the HF Marketplace based on the new Contracts system.

Pyro - February 8, 2019, 3:46 pm

(Feb 8, 2019 04:10 PM)Omniscient Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) There are concepts some of you haven't even considered. Like if a Contract is dispute it's automatically a new thread in the Deal Dispute forum and that's the only way to create a thread there. Or that upon a completion of a Contract a post is made in the thread automatically to signify the sale. Really a lot can be done to enhance the HF Marketplace based on the new Contracts system.

I really like the sound of this, would be awesome to see this soon :)

scam. - February 8, 2019, 3:54 pm

I think it's a smart idea to be honest.

Maskin - February 8, 2019, 3:56 pm

Mhm, I support this idea aye.

eian6003 - February 8, 2019, 6:40 pm

This would be a great addition, since if you had verified buyers only vouching, you can skip right to good reviews.

SUI-3183372 - February 9, 2019, 10:47 am

(Feb 8, 2019 04:10 PM)Omniscient Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) And this is why requiring Contracts is just part of the plan and always has been.

Eventually fake vouchers are going to have to go through extra work like opening a Contract, creating a blockchain transaction and making sure they don't get caught making persistent fake Contracts. Everyone involved in faking Contracts will get closed.

Once we have more things in-place I can create policies against vouching without a Valid Contract. Does this mean there are plans / ideas floating around to force, or at least heavily encourage, all transactions to go through the a blockchain? (or at least one of the parties involved need to use crypto?) This is to make transactions more verifiable, I assume? I like the idea.

Now I'm kind of forming an idea in my head of what I think you're trying to do with HF, and I feel like the contract system may eventually shape out to me almost a pseudo-blockchain. Transactions will be verifiable in a semi-public ledger of sorts.

So, I have two questions regarding this.

1. If I'm going down the right path here, do we have any plans to change how private contracts work, as the information they provide now is enough (for a normal member) to see that a deal took place between two parties, we can see when it was initiated and completed, and we can see whether or not the contract was successful. We can not however verify that a deal actually took place, so we are unable to determine [quickly and easily] whether or not this contract is to be trusted. If you do require txID's for contracts, is that something that will be viewable to normal members on private contracts, or will we need to rely on staff to ensure that private contracts aren't being abused?

2. So, again, assuming I'm on the right page here in thinking that eventually you may require at least one party to include a txID to contracts, where do you stand on the privacy aspect of all of this? If the point in time ever comes that we do require valid txID's to be attached to contracts, then we'll be collecting more data than most blockchains that I'm aware of. Admin would theoretically be able to see the usernames of those involved, the email addresses, ip addresses, contract details potentially including the product being purchased or the services being rendered, potentially payment addresses, potentially payment amounts, potentially transaction IDs, rough times that the deal was made, and anything else that may be slipping my mind atm. So, I just hit 10 years on HF a couple of days ago, and over that time it's become clear to me that you care about your members here, you don't have some secret agenda to spy on people and collect data. While I wouldn't say I blindly trust you, I'm still try to approach everything with caution, I would say that I do have a good amount of trust that I can accept the contract system for what it is at face value, a system to protect members. However, with the amount of data that is tied to each contract, and the fact that contracts are being forced, I have heard [understandable] concerns from others and the amount of data that they're entrusting the site with. I've kind of gone off on a tangent and at this point there's not really a clear question, so I'm guessing I'm just asking if there is any insight to how you handle this data that can help put minds at ease?

(Feb 8, 2019 04:10 PM)Omniscient Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I personally think that free vouch copies are nonsense and do not provide very good reviews of products. I might disallow them eventually or at least create distinct policies concerning them. Contracts could still be used a setting for "Review" copy could be created where no payment is used. But overall I just think vouch copies are bullshit

and I'd be happy to ban the practice. For now you can do Contracts for review/vouch copies as a "Trading". I've always felt like the action of giving away something for free is almost akin to buying a good review. Not everyone will cave and write a good review for a free product, some will show integrity and post how they really feel, however as it stands now, it's all just a dance between buyer and seller to get free stuff, may it be a product or a 5* review. I'd definitely support the removal of review copies. If you're having trouble making your first sale then you're either not demoing your product well enough, you don't have demand for what you're selling, or maybe you just need to offer a discount to your first couple buyers to get real reviews.

(Feb 8, 2019 04:10 PM)Omniscient Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I think members are only now beginning to grasp the potential HF can achieve with Contracts. But these are things we've planned ahead of time many many months ago. I'm still yet to actually fully complete a contract, my 'business' days on HF are more or less over, but you're right. I'm only just now discovering the full potential of contracts. And even better, it seems like everytime I have an idea that I think will make contracts better, I generally get told "oh that already exists, just do this" and even on this thread you've revealed that most of what has been mentioned have been plans of yours for a while now. I've been very impressed with the contract system. I know the idea has been in your head for years and years, I'm happy it's finally come to fruition.

(Feb 8, 2019 04:10 PM)Omniscient Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) 15k completed contracts with 9k having a TID, usage is higher than you thought. It's the majority of Contracts. You're right. I was expecting a number closer to 25%. This is very good to hear and it probably just means that I haven't been visiting the right threads to really witness this.

(Feb 8, 2019 04:10 PM)Omniscient Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Part of the point of Contracts is to weed out these fake marketplace activity which improves quality and reduces scams. Things that only scammers and low-quality sellers can disagree with. If you have a great product or service....you will be rewarded with high B-ratings and more customers. The days of shitty ebook sellers are ending. That cancerous activity is being removed from HF. This has long been my biggest gripe here, I've made numerous suggestions in the past attempting to fight back against [cancerous] e-book vendors, may it be banning them, isolating them, or any number of different solutions. I'm glad all of those suggestions got denied as this is definitely the better approach to dealing with them.

(Feb 8, 2019 04:10 PM)Omniscient Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Exactly right. Over time the fakes will be spotted because of the Contracts trail. Goes back to an earlier question. Will members be able to follow this contract trail? As it stands now I can see how we'd be able to until we hit a private contract. Will that change or at that point does the trail turn into 'staff/admin-only follow mode'?

(Feb 8, 2019 04:10 PM)Omniscient Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I'd say that accurate. Both outcomes will happen. Good sellers get legit vouches and make more sales....bad sellers and fake vouchers will get CLOSED. Do you have a problem with that Elitas? You got something to tell us? Or should I be BLUNT and say your time is almost over here. It might be time for you to review the quality of your products and services you offer in Marketplace.:fire: :fire: :fire:

(Feb 8, 2019 04:10 PM)Omniscient Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) EXACTLY, very well stated. Basically all the [\[url=//hackforums.net/misc.php?action=help\]](http://hackforums.net/misc.php?action=help)Help Docs[/url] should be read fully by all new members but that's unrealistic. Thanks

(Feb 8, 2019 04:10 PM)Omniscient Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I already send them a PM which is mostly ignored because it's probably too long for them to give a shit about. HF is a huge beast and it's better to have policies in place than it is to rely on noobs being educated. I feel like that's all you can do. As you said HF is a huge beast, and every time I see people asking for policy updates I don't know what they expect. You don't read the terms and conditions when you install software [I hope], yet it seems like many people are suggesting for just that, for HF to adopt some 100 page summary of everything that is and isn't allowed, and I just don't get why anyone thinks that's viable.

Nobody wants to read that.

Nobody wants to write that.

HF changes every. single. day. It'd be a job in its self just maintaining a document like that. The way things are done now is perfectly acceptable. If you're new or spent a considerable amount of time away there's always some catch up to be played, but I've taken a 2 year break and a 1 year break from HF, and it's never too hard to get back into the swing of things upon coming back, just pay attention.

(Feb 8, 2019 04:10 PM)Omniscient Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) That's coming, you just have to wait till more of our Marketplace is using Contracts and it's required in all deals. Things are going to feel drastic pretty soon. Just like when I deleted the reputations...I may literally have to close all existing Marketplace threads in order to ensure all sellers create new threads which comply with HF policy. I look forward to it.

(Feb 8, 2019 04:10 PM)Omniscient Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) There are concepts some of you haven't even considered. Like if a Contract is dispute it's automatically a new thread in the Deal Dispute forum and that's the only way to create a thread there. Or that upon a completion of a Contract a post is made in the thread automatically to signify the sale. Really a lot can be done to enhance the HF Marketplace based on the new Contracts system. I really like this on numerous levels, but what I think many people don't realize is this will also drive away shady/illegal business too, and help build HF's name that, warranted or not, gets dragged through the mud far too often.

Despite being disallowed, there's still a pretty decent amount of blackhat activity that goes on in the shadows. People making vague deals to avoid being reported/punished, but still selling what they're not supposed to. Being forced into contracts and then having contracts automatically perform an action upon completion is going to be something people conducting in illegal business are not going to like. Sure they can still be vague about it in contracts, but now there's publicly recorded proof that the transaction took place, and nobody conducting illegal sales is gonna like dealing with that.

Thanks for the reply, I've been very happy with contracts thus far and I like where you're taking them. I'm sure it doesn't mean much, but the transformation I've seen HF go through since the forum upgrade has been massive, yet it seems every step I've seen you guys take has been thoroughly thought out and executed very well. I guess I'm just trying to say the work you and Xerotic have done over the last year has been greatly appreciated. 12 years is a long time to give any website your all, especially a forum that doesn't always seem appreciative of what it has. Thanks for doing what you do.

Omniscient - February 9, 2019, 1:14 pm

Quote: Does this mean there are plans / ideas floating around to force, or at least heavily encourage, all transactions to go through the a blockchain?

Yes, it's part of the long-term plan. We already log the blockchain address in the Contracts. Essentially we could begin to require the transaction ID and confirm the payments were made. That's the beauty of blockchain. After it's confirmed we can contact both parties and mark the Contract paid. We are not trying to be an escrow service where we hold payments but blockchain

allows us to monitor and do alerts.

Quote: If you do require txID's for contracts, is that something that will be viewable to normal members on private contracts,

On a private Contract you could see in such a case that the payment was made and completed in the blockchain without giving up the privacy of the details of the Contract.

Quote: you may require at least one party to include a txID to contracts, where do you stand on the privacy aspect of all of this

I don't think we'll go full "require" on something like this. However it would be encouraged and we would likely provide incentives like maybe only B-Ratings with verified blockchain Contracts. That's an option I would be interested in.

There is a balance between privacy, our involvement, and the ease of making deals at HF which all have to be weighed.

Quote:you don't have some secret agenda to spy on people and collect data

I have a clear agenda...make money. I do that by running the best site I possibly can and offering what I hope is the best forum experience I can provide. Members have asked me for years to deal with scammers and to help make the market safer. The Contracts system was something I wanted for many years and in the current form it's pretty much how I wanted it to work. Now there is blockchain which allows me to do even more stuff to secure the Marketplace but privacy is a concern which is why we built into the Contracts a Private option. And note that we don't verify whatever is said in Contracts. I assume someone should be clever enough to sell "Widget Installs" or other forms of obscure text in the Contracts to avoid their private details being exposed. Contracts don't require you to be truthful in your details. It's more or less meant for 2 parties to have an agreed terms.

Quote:I'd definitely support the removal of review copies.

In such a situation where review copies were banned, I could see allowing the Official Reviewers group again where they would be the only ones allowed to provide a review. I've been asked repeatedly over the years to allow that group back. I see no point in doing so unless it's under more strict guidance.

Quote:I know the idea has been in your head for years and years, I'm happy it's finally come to fruition.

We should all thank Xerotic for making my vision become a reality. No doubt without his assistance we would not be having the development pace we are experiencing.

Quote:Will members be able to follow this contract trail? As it stands now I can see how we'd be able to until we hit a private contract.

Private Contracts are not private to Admins. I wasn't implying that members will spot the fakes as easily as I would. However, members get suspicious based on what they see and when reported to me, I can easily see the bullshit. Then they are gone and everyone involved is gone. Happened early on with Contracts and I'll tell you a secret. I review all Deal Dispute threads. The ones with Contracts I scrutinize and previous Contract history. When I find patterns of abuse, everyone is CLOSED. I don't fuck around anymore, I'm clearing up the Marketplace of the bullshit much faster than most recognize. Just like you didn't expect heavy usage of TID I think you don't realize that our Marketplace is much cleaner in terms of bad sellers being booted permanently because I'm being proactive.

Quote: but what I think many people don't realize is this will also drive away shady/illegal business too, and help build HF's name that, warranted or not, gets dragged through the mud far too often.

Correct and it's something I hope to improve is our reputation.

Quote:yet it seems every step I've seen you guys take has been thoroughly thought out and executed very well

As much as it might seem like I do things without thinking. I actually give a ton of thought to everything I do. I can sit on ideas and concepts for years. I have a huge list of projects and I keep notes on ideas that I update daily. Xerotic is the reason all this is happening because I'm taking those lists and giving him the dirty work while guiding him to create the vision I have of HF.

SUI-3183372 - February 9, 2019, 2:34 pm

(Feb 9, 2019 02:14 PM)Omniscient Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) On a private Contract you could see in such a case that the payment was made and completed in the blockchain without giving up the privacy of the details of the Contract.Good idea

(Feb 9, 2019 02:14 PM)Omniscient Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I don't think we'll go full "require" on something like this. However it would be encouraged and we would likely provide incentives like maybe only B-Ratings with verified blockchain Contracts. That's an option I would be interested in.Good idea

(Feb 9, 2019 02:14 PM)Omniscient Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) And note that we don't verify whatever is said in Contracts. I assume someone should be clever enough to sell "Widget Installs" or other forms of obscure text in the Contracts to avoid their private details being exposed. Contracts don't require you to be truthful in your details. It's more or less meant for 2 parties to have an agreed terms. That's fair.

(Feb 9, 2019 02:14 PM)Omniscient Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) In such a situation where review copies were banned, I could see allowing the Official Reviewers group again where they would be the only ones allowed to provide a review. I've been asked repeatedly over the years to allow that group back. I see no point in doing so unless it's under more strict guidance.I like the idea as long as it's implemented well and ran by someone who isn't afraid to piss people off. The moment someone who cares more about how they're viewed rather than doing their job correctly gets power, the whole thing comes crumbling down.

(Feb 9, 2019 02:14 PM)Omniscient Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) We should all thank Xerotic for making my vision become a reality. No doubt without his assistance we would not be having the development pace we are experiencing. Definitely happy that you guys have such a good dynamic going. I think both of you are very good at viewing the big picture and not making rash/rushed decisions.

(Feb 9, 2019 02:14 PM)Omniscient Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Private Contracts are not private to Admins. I wasn't implying that members will spot the fakes as easily as I would. However, members get suspicious based on what they see and when reported to me, I can easily see the bullshit. Then they are gone and everyone involved is gone. Happened early on with Contracts and I'll tell you a secret. I review all Deal Dispute threads. The ones with Contracts I scrutinize and previous Contract history. When I find patterns of abuse, everyone is CLOSED. I don't fuck around anymore, I'm clearing up the Marketplace of the bullshit much faster than most recognize. Just like you didn't expect heavy usage of TID I think you don't realize that our Marketplace is much cleaner in terms of bad sellers being booted permanently because I'm being proactive.Perfect, I'm really happy to hear it. I wish I still had something to offer so I could participate, but it's obvious even as an observer that things are trending positively.

(Feb 9, 2019 02:14 PM)Omniscient Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) As much as it might seem like I do things without thinking. I actually give a ton of thought to everything I do. I can sit on ideas and concepts for years. I think the contract system / b-rating is testament to that.

(Feb 9, 2019 02:14 PM)Omniscient Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Xerotic is the reason all this is happening because I'm taking those lists and giving him the dirty work while guiding him to create the vision I have of HF. Again, definitely happy that you guys have such a good dynamic going.

Anyways, thanks for taking time to reply. After hearing some more insight from you regarding the future of the contract system, I think the best thing I can do is just sit back and wait. It really sounds like you have a strong vision on where you want to take this, and it seems like anytime I do have a concern, you and Xerotic have already thought of it and have plans on how to tackle these concerns as they arise. I'm not usually an overly-optimistic person, but I'm really looking forward to seeing the full potential contracts have to offer.

SUI-3183372 - February 9, 2019, 3:28 pm

(Feb 9, 2019 04:03 PM)James! Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) That is actually going to be awesome if implemented - it will clear up the marketplace greatly. The only problem would be for when using PayPal as they can't be verified.

I think the plan is to try and discourage PayPal usage.
or perhaps just encourage crypto usage over PayPal.

Either way, PayPal is a fraud riddled disaster for a marketplace such as ours. I can imagine us coming up with cool features to integrate blockchain transactions with contracts, but have a hard time seeing us doing similarly for PayPal.

Xerotic - February 9, 2019, 4:18 pm

(Feb 9, 2019 03:34 PM)Previously Known As.... Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) [...] it seems like anytime I do have a concern, you and Xerotic have already thought of it and have plans on how to tackle these concerns as they arise.

Right. Most of what HF sees is just a portion of what we've discussed so far.

SUI-3183372 - February 9, 2019, 4:43 pm

(Feb 9, 2019 05:18 PM)Xerotic Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Right. Most of what HF sees is just a portion of what we've discussed so far. Well, I'm sure I'm not alone in being pleased on how proactive you guys are in mapping the future of this site.

Somewhat off topic, but still relevant to maybe prying a bit more info out of you regarding what you, Omni, and other staff may have discussed recently.

That being said, has there been any further discussion regarding adding a PGP System to the forum? Even if it's not full integration and just a way for you to easily list your public key (like so: <https://i.imgur.com/kLG3Ywr.png>) it'd be a very welcome privacy feature.

I'd rather not make another topic about it as it has been suggested before, and while the suggestions I looked at weren't denied, they were closed with statements about it not being a bad idea or it'd be something we explore in the future.

I'm on the fence about this actually, could lead to issues. Disregard.

Omniscient - February 9, 2019, 4:51 pm

Quote: It really sounds like you have a strong vision on where you want to take this, and it seems like anytime I do have a concern, you and Xerotic have already thought of it and have plans on how to tackle these concerns as they arise.

Part of my process is thinking of how it will be implemented, how it will be abused, and how a feature will effect multiple aspects of the community. I also have to consider if the feature will be a good business decision that will provide value in some form to both the community and myself.

Quote:The only problem would be for when using PayPal as they can't be verified.

True, that's why I doubt it could be "required" in the near future. One day when blockchain rules the world things might be different.

I've already wondered why Paypal doesn't have a method to API call partial transaction details securely for 3rd parties. Maybe they do, I have to look closer at it.

Eagle 95 - February 10, 2019, 12:53 am

(Feb 9, 2019 02:14 PM)Omniscient Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) In such a situation where review copies were banned, I could see allowing the Official Reviewers group again where they would be the only ones allowed to provide a review. I've been asked repeatedly over the years to allow that group back. I see no point in doing so unless it's under more strict guidance.

I used to be in reviewers back in the day. While we did nail some hideous ebooks from getting any sales with our reviews. However, a good portion of reviewers was being soft if the product/ebook was from a member they knew.

Cooligan - February 10, 2019, 6:31 am

(Feb 8, 2019 04:10 PM)Omniscient Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) snip

It's honestly so nice to see all of this slowly but surely implemented to the site. I remember when I first joined and we didn't have half of the on site features and marketplace user protection that we have now. I'm sure everyone here already knows this but HF by FAR is the most successful online forum, and with all these features that continue to be added only makes it that much better.

Basically for instance, you know how there's almost always a rival company, a rival sports team, a rival anything, however when it comes to HF from what I see we don't have any "rival" forums due to the fact alone that features like the ones you're discussing and the ones that have already been added is what separates HF from the rest and in my opinion what has also cemented its name and reputation into the online forum community. I mean Omni you alone know what this forum has done for me and my irl lifestyle and whatnot, and there's not many things in this world that I can say that I am PROUD to be a part of, however HF, I am 10,000% proud of being a part of/member here. Without the forum itself and all the continuous work and effort that goes into keeping HF what it is from Staff, there would be many members (including myself) whose lives would be much different today, so thank you for still actually caring as much as you do and for still putting in all the effort. I feel like I haven't said something like that to you in a while so I felt it was due. ?

Shoot me a PM whenever you have some free time, I miss our chats bossman. That and I have a few ideas that I feel could strongly benefit HF especially during this time period on the site. ?

(Feb 9, 2019 02:14 PM)Omniscient Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) As much as it might seem like I do things without thinking. I actually give a ton of thought to everything I do. I can sit on ideas and concepts for years. I have a huge list of projects and I keep notes on ideas that I update daily. Xerotic is the reason all this is happening because I'm taking those lists and giving him the dirty work while guiding him to create the vision I have of HF.

I have probably 100+ sticky notes saved on my desktop with the most random ideas, yet good ones at that, and I can only IMAGINE the amount of random ideas in text docs and sticky notes you have saved from over the years lmao.

(Feb 10, 2019 01:53 AM)Eagle 95 Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I used to be in reviewers back in the day. While we did nail some hideous ebooks from getting any sales with our reviews. However, a good portion of

reviewers was being soft if the product/ebook was from a member they knew.

If I remember correctly wasn't Reviewers shut down for that exact reason; because members were purposely being soft on products listed by a member that they knew?

If Omni and Staff can somehow figure out a way for that to be much less of a probability, I strongly feel as if an Official Reviewers Team would immensely benefit the marketplace along with all the new features/additions to contracts themselves.

Junx - February 10, 2019, 9:46 am

(Feb 9, 2019 05:51 PM)Omniscient Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Part of my process is thinking of how it will be implemented, how it will be abused, and how a feature will effect multiple aspects of the community. I also have to consider if the feature will be a good business decision that will provide value in some form to both the community and myself.

True, that's why I doubt it could be "required" in the near future. One day when blockchain rules the world things might be different.

I've already wondered why Paypal doesn't have a method to API call partial transaction details securely for 3rd parties. Maybe they do, I have to look closer at it.

For getting transaction history from a buyer I believe you can use PayPal Sync (part of the Rest API). A good thing with this is you can play around with it and make it so the customer doesn't necessarily have to make a purchase for you to get details you are looking for, they'd just have to grant you 3rd party perms. If that's not what you're looking for you can read around on <https://developer.paypal.com/> as you probably know, but I do think it is possible.

Riyu - February 10, 2019, 9:52 am

Official reviewer team wouldn't be a good idea imo. Just having contracted customers post reviews only would work.

Too many members here are biased if it's their friend.

Even when Mr. Reviewer or someone from the Appraisers reviewed something (afaik) they only reviewed the contents and never tried the actual methods.

Something can look good on paper but not actually work as expected etc.

Vytrex - February 10, 2019, 10:18 am

itseems decent to me, but if a vouch copy is done under contract (if thats within the rules) then what is the contract for? the exchange of a review? it almost seems like people will be trading good reviews regardless of quality for free products. it has its ups and downs.

Vytrex - February 10, 2019, 10:34 am

(Feb 10, 2019 11:24 AM)James! Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Contracts are not for free deals. Deals have to involve real money or they're essentially abusing the contract system and the users will be banned from doing contracts.

okay, sorry for not reading everything. I figured that it was against the rules anyways, thank you for clarification.

LoveOverFear - February 10, 2019, 10:36 am

Yo please make this a reality, getting tired of all these fake vouchers and sellers here gaining money like this, it's fucking annoying.

The contract system is golden though, this site needs to think more like the guy that made the

contract system and this site could go places, big places.

Soulmate~?? - February 10, 2019, 12:44 pm

(Feb 10, 2019 10:52 AM)riryu Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Official reviewer team wouldn't be a good idea imo. Just having contracted customers post reviews only would work.

Too many members here are biased if it's their friend.

Yeah that's pretty much what happened with the old Reviewers group.

SUI-3183372 - February 10, 2019, 1:55 pm

(Feb 10, 2019 10:52 AM)riryu Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Official reviewer team wouldn't be a good idea imo. Just having contracted customers post reviews only would work.

Too many members here are biased if it's their friend.

Even when Mr. Reviewer or someone from the Appraisers reviewed something (afaik) they only reviewed the contents and never tried the actual methods.

Something can look good on paper but not actually work as expected etc.

You weren't around for JD (assuming this is your first account), and I doubt he could ever be replaced, but someone with a similar personality/mindset would be a perfect candidate for the position. The dude had a very 'no-bullshit' 'lets not fuck around' kind of attitude and anyone who tried to waste his time got a swift boot to the ass. But what made him stand out, at least in my interactions with him, was he genuinely seemed to care about the community, he wasn't just some dude on a power trip. He was a good dude when I knew him, and I never knew the circumstances of his departure, but I hope it was a clean exit.

I agree that a Reviewers group under the wrong leadership will fail, however, if Omni has another JD up his sleeve, it could be a very beneficial group.

Nate - February 10, 2019, 2:28 pm

This idea is honestly better then a reviewer group, mainly because Marketplace users would have to give free copies of there product to members of HF.

If not picked wisely methods could leak, etc.

I think after going with the contract system, and perhaps posting the contract ID etc is a way better approach rather then giving out free copies..

As well there would be people who just apply to the group just for the free products they could receive.

Xerotic - February 10, 2019, 3:38 pm

(Feb 10, 2019 04:05 PM)James! Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) This thread has kind of gravitated to people talking about having an official reviewers group again like there used to be. This will obviously never come back and there is no need for it so there is no point in talking about it. There have been more than enough things posted in this thread that would mean we don't require a reviewers group so idk why some of y'all are talking like we may potentially introduce one again.

They are talking about it because of what Omniscient posted in this thread.

(Feb 9, 2019 02:14 PM)Omniscient Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) In such a situation where review copies were banned, I could see allowing the Official Reviewers group again where they would be the only ones allowed to provide a review. I've been asked repeatedly over the years to allow that group back. I see no point in doing so unless it's under more strict guidance.

Omniscient - February 11, 2019, 7:52 am

Quote:For getting transaction history from a buyer I believe you can use PayPal Sync (part of the Rest API). A good thing with this is you can play around with it and make it so the customer doesn't necessarily have to make a purchase for you to get details you are looking for, they'd just have to grant you 3rd party perms

Looking at it now. Unsure if Paypal will allow me API access since my account is permanently Limited.

Quote:Even when Mr. Reviewer or someone from the Appraisers reviewed something (afaik) they only reviewed the contents and never tried the actual methods.

With official Reviewers team that was not allowed. The review was of the ebook content itself and not statements made from the ebook. What if someone wrote an ebook on how to get physically fit? Would you expect a reviewer to spend 2-3 months working out? It's not a good idea to try "methods" in ebooks for reviews. It was more about the quality of the ebook itself such as grammar, length, layout, and even originality. Also if it was written about what the author claims. In the past someone will make a statement about the ebook like "no credit card required" or "no blackhat activity" which turned out not to be true with someone purchased the ebook. So a Reviewer would be able to confirm all those things.

Reviewers were closed down because they weren't imho really needed anymore and their usefulness was questionable. And when the reviews are done under my specifications outlined above it also minimizes corruption because the review is not about the greatness of the ebook. I wouldn't even allow personal comments like "this method will really work" or "amazing ebook". If anything there would be an official Reviewer template to stay within certain guidelines.

Quote:You weren't around for JD (assuming this is your first account), and I doubt he could ever be replaced, but someone with a similar personality/mindset would be a perfect candidate for the position.

I wonder if F8 is interested at all. He's not been doing too much lately even though he is still Admin.

Quote:He was a good dude when I knew him, and I never knew the circumstances of his departure, but I hope it was a clean exit.

I think JD just moved onto other things. It's easy to get bored after years of posting in the same forum and maybe he got into social media like Facebook instead (just guessing).

Quote:As well there would be people who just apply to the group just for the free products they could receive.

Overall that wasn't a huge problem as review copies were rotated between members. I think at most just 2-3 times was there complaints about leaking or abuse of the review copy and the member was removed from the group.

Banter. - February 11, 2019, 8:05 am

I guess a having the Reviewers team in action it could make for some good Quality reviews, issue being i have seen 'Vouch' copies only giving out to select people that could be there friends etc i think i attempted to review something once and the guy point blanked refused me because if it was wrote poorly and lacks the correct information i would be honest in my review and tell people about the flaws.

Kinda falls back to what i was saying there is people who only give vouch copies to certain people knowing they will automatically have a good Review/Vouch which really pisses me off because its misleading and it fucks it up for genuine buyers. so i will say i would be excited to see this put into place if Omni decides it is needed.

King - February 11, 2019, 11:19 am

(Feb 11, 2019 08:52 AM)Omniscient Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) With official Reviewers team that was not allowed. The review was of the ebook content itself and not statements made from the ebook. What if someone wrote an ebook on how to get physically fit? Would you expect a reviewer to spend 2-3 months working out? It's not a good idea to try "methods" in ebooks for reviews. It was more about the quality of the ebook itself such as grammar, length, layout, and even originality. Also if it was written about what the author claims. In the past someone will make a statement about the ebook like "no credit card required" or "no blackhat activity" which turned out not to be true with someone purchased the ebook. So a Reviewer would be able to confirm all those things.

Reviewers were closed down because they weren't imho really needed anymore and their usefulness was questionable. And when the reviews are done under my specifications outlined above it also minimizes corruption because the review is not about the greatness of the ebook. I wouldn't even allow personal comments like "this method will really work" or "amazing ebook". If anything there would be an official Reviewer template to stay within certain guidelines.

Exactly. We used to review eBooks' content and specifically the originality, quality of content, ease of use, layout and grammar. There was a review template for that and we would rate each one on a scale of 1 to 5.

If there was something mentioned about the eBook like what is required and whatnot, we would make it clear in the review.

I like the part where you mentioned that there will be (if you allow it again) certain guidelines; I think this is what was needed back then.

Nate - February 11, 2019, 5:24 pm

(Feb 11, 2019 08:52 AM)Omniscient Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Overall that wasn't a huge problem as review copies were rotated between members. I think at most just 2-3 times was there complaints about leaking or abuse of the review copy and the member was removed from the group.

That's actually really interesting. I never would of thought that. I always just assumed there was a couple dedicated members and the rest simply just wanted the status, and to benefit themselves.

The only benefit I can see in having back the reviewers group, that it would possibly promote quality in the marketplace, such as actual good working methods, not ones that can be found online etc

Just my thought.

SUI-3183372 - February 12, 2019, 12:20 am

(Feb 11, 2019 08:52 AM)Omniscient Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I wonder if F8 is interested at all. He's not been doing too much lately even though he is still Admin.I've had limited interactions with him, but have always respected him. As long as you think he'd be active enough to actively monitor his reviewers I think he'd be a good choice. I'd see if he's interested.

(Feb 11, 2019 08:52 AM)Omniscient Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I think JD just moved onto other things. It's easy to get bored after years of posting in the same forum and maybe he got into social media like Facebook instead (just guessing).That's fair.

It's rare that I speak to Bugga anymore but last I did she mentioned he was doing well. Hopefully he's found something new that he enjoys to spend his time with.

Anyways, I've heard everything that I've wanted to hear. Contracts have a bright future and it's best that I sit back and watch it unfold. Reviewers potentially returning should benefit the marketplace. Both will combat e-book toxicity. All sounds great to me.

I'll leave the thread open if you want to continue discussion, otherwise do what you please with it.

Also I've been on the fence about suggesting this/mentioning it, so I guess I'll just toss it here and you can field it if you want...

People have suggested integrating PGP into our PM system before, however that's a large overhaul to our PM system(I assume) and not really a high enough priority to even consider a job of that size. Have you ever considered going half way and instead of integrating PGP into the PM system, simply creating a container on our profiles where we can openly display our public key?

Example of Public Key Container ([Click to View](#))

I'm always a fan of privacy related features and feel compelled to make suggestions regarding them, but I'm also aware that adding a feature such as this could compromise site security with you losing the ability to monitor PM's when users do make use of this. Is this something you'd ever consider or would you prefer that if we do choose to communicate using PGP that we organize it ourselves?

Happeh - February 12, 2019, 3:30 am

(Feb 11, 2019 06:24 PM)N?te Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) That's actually really interesting. I never would of thought that. I always just assumed there was a couple dedicated members and the rest simply just wanted the status, and to benefit themselves.

Although it's hard to know everyone personal members own motives, with my time in the Reviewers it was run very strictly and almost like a real reviewing job. I remember doing the thing that Omniscient mentioned, making a comment with a personal bias like "this is a fantastic ebook that I like a lot"; I posted the review ready for editing/proofreading by another member who shat on me for it. The Reviewers were one of my favourite times on HF and I even touched upon it on my [testimonial](#).

SUI-3183372 - March 2, 2019, 10:21 am

Main point of this thread is becoming a reality! The thread branched in numerous different directions, some of which I'd also like to see (such as Reviewers (under a suitable leader)) but seeing this alone makes me very happy.

Things continue to move in a very positive direction.