Subject: Map rating
Posted by rrutk on Mon, 16 Feb 2009 02:18:12 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Well, with TT there will be automatically map download and we all hope, that this will be the start for playing more maps then the standard ones.

There are ~400 (?) Ren Maps around.

There are masterpieces and bad ones.

We should start o make a list of really (!) good maps.....a map rating for all existing ren maps.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by Aircraftkiller on Wed, 07 Sep 2011 22:06:21 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

This is an old topic, but it's becoming increasingly relevant since the TT release shouldn't be too far from now. Who wants to help put together a list of playable, well-built levels, without regard for personal bias?

I would volunteer but I'm a bit opinionated.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by iRANian on Wed, 07 Sep 2011 22:28:23 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I'd be interested in helping out.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by z310 on Wed, 07 Sep 2011 23:15:43 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I'll do.

Maik, we can probably get Leper in on this as well.

Edit: We might be able to get Otto too.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by iRANian on Wed, 07 Sep 2011 23:17:16 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

no clown left behind

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by Aircraftkiller on Wed, 07 Sep 2011 23:20:17 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I propose that there's a solid rating system, with a score assigned based on three different factors.

Game-play: 40 points maximum. This includes extra units being added, any modifications to the weapons and damage, health, etc.

Design: 40 points maximum. This includes the layout of the level and whether or not it's conducive to enjoyment.

Aesthetics: 20 points maximum. This includes any custom assets made for the level and the quality of them should be assessed with this.

Altogether you should end up with a maximum score of 100 for levels. Agree, disagree?

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by z310 on Wed, 07 Sep 2011 23:24:28 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

You can probably drop the value for aesthetics. Renegade will never look very good.

Put aside your bias and help out.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by Aircraftkiller on Wed, 07 Sep 2011 23:29:10 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Really? What about this?

You can work within the constraints of the engine and make things look good in it. It is important that we aren't looking at nothing but boxy garbage.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by z310 on Wed, 07 Sep 2011 23:39:57 GMT

Alright.

Those that are interested in ranking Renegade's maps, say so in this thread.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by halo2pac on Wed, 07 Sep 2011 23:56:46 GMT

OOO that map's perdy... what is it called and are there any major servers running it?

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by liquidv2 on Thu, 08 Sep 2011 00:17:14 GMT

i suggest you have a Bloom rating for each map as well

my favorite maps are generally the most Scrin-infested

i'd be willing to help out with that iRan
and the ginger

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by iRANian on Thu, 08 Sep 2011 00:45:26 GMT

we also have a clown

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by GEORGE ZIMMER on Thu, 08 Sep 2011 00:57:15 GMT

I'd be interested, since I should hopefully be able to fully come back to the magical land of the internet (and thus Renegade) sometime soon.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by Aircraftkiller on Thu, 08 Sep 2011 01:32:35 GMT

For this to have some air of impartiality I won't be participating in it. I suggest that all of you simply

run through levels and grade them, or play together and do it that way. It should make for an interesting outcome.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by iRANian on Thu, 08 Sep 2011 02:35:34 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

no kebab8616 allowed

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by Goztow on Thu, 08 Sep 2011 06:33:34 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I think we should first make a pre selection of maps to test. Say 50 maximum. I'm willing to help make the preselection but I won't go through all maps again to test them due to time constraints.

We actually already started this a few weeks ago in another topic. these were some interesting posts that can be the base of the preselection. At least it's a start:
  http://www.renegadeforums.com/index.php?t=msg&th=38133&start=100&rid =4882#msg_num_1
  http://www.renegadeforums.com/index.php?t=msg&th=38133&prevloaded=1& rid=4882&start=25#msg_num_11
  http://www.renegadeforums.com/index.php?t=msg&th=38133&prevloaded=1& rid=4882&start=25#msg_num_12

Also a real rating in % doesn't seem like the best way to go about it. There will be a huge bias due to the person that judges the map. I'd simply judge on each criterium with "half decent, decent, good, very good" and then an overall score of "half decent, decent, good, very good".

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by Aircraftkiller on Thu, 08 Sep 2011 06:51:05 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

That's why you average the scores of several people.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by nikki6ixx on Thu, 08 Sep 2011 06:54:56 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I don't see how a 'decent/half decent' system works any better than an overall percentage. If anything, it'd be worse.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by Goztow on Thu, 08 Sep 2011 07:04:46 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Do you think you'll find 10 people to test the same map?

If I score something 50 %, you may score the same thing 70 % not because you think it's better than me, just because you'll rate differently. If you only have 5 categories, it'll be easier to find a consensus.

An average is never a good idea. If 2 find it great and 1 finds it awful, then it'll get an average score. It would be better to "force" them to agree then? Just my 0,02

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by Reaver11 on Thu, 08 Sep 2011 09:01:04 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I think it is hard to rate maps towards usage in a server.
Mostly the guy that set it up will determine which maps will run regardless of what rating you apply.

The same goes for the TT server atm.
I mean how did C&C_enterway end up in the mapcycle?
(no offence but that map isn't finished at all, just boxes slammed through each other)

The part of proper mapconstruction has however never really bothered people to play the maps (Something like C&C_Sunken2 gets played, heck one of the harvesters doesn't work?)

Though now it would be a great opportunity to either fix up the broken maps or temporarily stop using them.

Depending on the time I have I can either help you guys out with rating or creating fixed versions of certain maps. (if the rating shows the maps needs / is worth fixing)

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by MUDKIPS on Thu, 08 Sep 2011 11:55:24 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

i nominate hourglass for #1

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by GEORGE ZIMMER on Sat, 10 Sep 2011 01:45:08 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

How about reviews of each map with 3-5 different ratings in different categories? Visuals, gameplay flow, balance, etc with a rating between 1 and 5, leading to an overall score rating. I think that'd work pretty well.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by iRANian on Sat, 10 Sep 2011 04:16:58 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

We tested a bunch of maps yesterday and all of them except for two or so scored 1/5 for every category, they're just that bad.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by Aircraftkiller on Sat, 10 Sep 2011 04:31:14 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

List the names and the scores so we can start a thread that has the information for everyone.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by Aircraftkiller on Sat, 08 Oct 2011 00:41:14 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

So, nearly a month later, has anyone rated anything yet?

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by iRANian on Sat, 08 Oct 2011 00:54:14 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

liquid recorded all our ratings for like 100 maps we tried.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by Aircraftkiller on Sat, 08 Oct 2011 00:55:59 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Well, post the results then!

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by liquidv2 on Sat, 08 Oct 2011 00:56:10 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

we could go back and do the specific maps we have that didn't suck
our list so far:

Blizzard
Cliffs
Meadows
Mutation
Mountainforce
Mineshaft
Metropolis
Meadow
Land
Hillbilly_Valley
Grasslands
Fudplex
Dusk
Deth_river
Worthy_Classic
Arid
Creekdale_Flying
MetroTS
Conquest_Winter
Twisted_System
Urban_Rush
Uphill
Underpass
Tomb
Tobruk
Tiberium_Redux
Niagra
Night0X
BasinTS

---

we had a bunch more, what happened to them?

---

fuck if i know, this is all i have
Fjord or Fjords is a good map, i just don't have it listed

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by iRANian on Sat, 08 Oct 2011 01:02:27 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

our list of decent maps was four times as big

wtf is wrong with your brain

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by Aircraftkiller on Sat, 08 Oct 2011 01:07:03 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

liquidv2 wrote on Fri, 07 October 2011 20:56we could go back and do the specific maps we have that didn't suck
our list so far:

Blizzard
Cliffs
Meadows
Mutation
Mountainforce
Mineshaft
Metropolis
Meadow
Land
Hillbilly_Valley
Grasslands
Fudplex
Dusk
Deth_river
Worthy_Classic
Arid
Creekdale_Flying
MetroTS
Conquest_Winter
Twisted_System
Urban_Rush
Uphill
Underpass
Tomb
Tobruk
Tiberium_Redux
Niagra
Night0X
BasinTS

This is a list of maps that don't suck? I hope not since there's a lot of shitty ones in here. I'll list the

ones I know:

Night0X
Conquest_Winter (St0rm runs it, and it's just four hour stalemates every game)

Land (I didn't bother to change much of the terrain, and I fucked up some PTs and the Airstrip control tower isn't registered as part of the Airstrip, so it needs to be fixed before it could be considered good)

Metropolis looks like ass, that's enough of a reason to not play it. I made that as well.

If Mountainforce is the same thing I remember, with the huge mountains that let snipers destroy anything, fuck it in the ass.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by liquidv2 on Sat, 08 Oct 2011 01:08:39 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

those are the maps that either i or iran liked
we'll eventually go back and be more thorough
the maps that look like shitty asshole can be edited, correct?
someone could go in and touch them up
if there are other older maps that could use work it might not be a bad idea either

---

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by Jerad2142 on Tue, 18 Oct 2011 00:35:53 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Aircraftkiller wrote on Fri, 07 October 2011 19:07Metropolis looks like ass, that's enough of a reason to not play it. I made that as well.

Oh come now, there is more to it than that otherwise minecraft wouldn't have shown its shitty face.

You guys should rate the maps by gameplay and by looks, because I'm sure, there are plenty of maps out there that look bad but are just fun to play, as there are maps that look good and don't play worth shit.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by R315r4z0r on Tue, 18 Oct 2011 00:50:18 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Personally, I'm not a fan of maps that modify the game's balance aside from adding in a recon bike or making the turret of an MRLS rotate.

Things like new weapons/vehicles, adjusted weapon damage settings and adjusted movement settings are all things that I feel take away from the map's enjoyment. I like stock Renegade.. and maps that use it's brand of gameplay but in new environments. If I wanted a new version of Renegade I'd either play on a modded server or download a Renegade mod like APB.

Now, that isn't to say that I don't think such maps should not be played or am I saying that I don't like those types of maps period. They are fun in their own right... I just think that there should be a specific server dedicated to playing them just as there would be a specific server dedicated to playing vanilla Renegade (with new maps that complement vanilla Renegade's game play).

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by iRANian on Tue, 18 Oct 2011 00:56:23 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

the problem with playing vanilla is that GDI's tanks are just terribly weak and slow while nod can just literally steamroll over the enemy team by just buying techs+arties on most maps.

then of course the arty splash is just ridiculous on newer video cards, and playing widescreen probably also makes it worse, nod has stealth units and sakura is a lot thinner than havoc. On marathon servers with a decent amount of players on, nod wins around 80% of the time, even if really terrible players are playing like on jelly marathon or n00bstories.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by R315r4z0r on Tue, 18 Oct 2011 01:12:02 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

So... then find maps that give GDI some environmental advantages that outweigh Nod's apparent power.

GDI will usually win a tank battle if there is a bottleneck.. so maps with long, narrow passageways would be beneficial to GDI.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by Aircraftkiller on Tue, 18 Oct 2011 04:01:24 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Renegade's balance sucks. If someone has the time to balance it out effectively, I encourage them to do so. If you enjoy Renegade's gameplay as it stands now, with no modifications, you enjoy a broken game that only works because the underlying foundation is strong enough to keep it propped up.

I spent months working on Fjords and getting the balancing tweaked to the point that it's how

Renegade should have played. I think most people appreciate that, instead of playing the same broken shit they've played for many years.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by Goztow on Tue, 18 Oct 2011 06:37:47 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Actually, by some small miracle Renegade's balance actually works out with very few modifications:
* points fix, but that's just a broken formula that needed to be fixed;
* some fixes for death zones on maps like hourglass and mesa.

If you then play with 0 starting credits, no donate and no other shitty modifications, then the win-loss % is around 50 % (BI once tested this, BTW).

Of course the standard maps are created to work with this balance. Most maps are rather small, have multiple choke points and have multiple ways in for both infantry and vehicles. Most fan maps are just huge, have little choke points and infantry needs to run for 10 minutes to reach the enemy base.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by Aircraftkiller on Tue, 18 Oct 2011 06:59:36 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Stock levels aren't a lot of fun, either. They're either a canyon or a set of islands that happen to have little in the way of cover and "funnels" for vehicles to drive through. Artificial choke points clog up vehicles so that you're forced to travel one at a time, and base defenses sitting on choke point kill zones make it easy for Artillery to camp a spot and make it nearly impassible.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by Omar007 on Tue, 18 Oct 2011 07:45:41 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

liquidv2 wrote on Sat, 08 October 2011 02:56we could go back and do the specific maps we have that didn't suck
our list so far:

...
Tiberium_Redux
...
Don't you mean 'Mutation Redux'???

Also, when the list is made, are there any plans of making it a mappack?
Just make sure you don't lose the list with rankings

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by iRANian on Tue, 18 Oct 2011 15:40:16 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

when jelly aow ran pointsmod, nod would win islands pretty much every time from what i heard.

also in most comm wars nod wins most of the maps

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by liquidv2 on Tue, 18 Oct 2011 16:00:40 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Goztow wrote on Tue, 18 October 2011 01:37If you then play with 0 starting credits, no donate and no other shitty modifications, then the win-loss % is around 50 % (BI once tested this, BTW). Black-Intel never had enough players to accurately test ideal ren in my opinion (somewhere between 10v10 to 20v20, 32 total players being the ideal)
what i go by is when we had it on Jelly 1, which had over 10 players per side every day on average
it was pretty filthy

Nod had Complex, Hourglass, Islands, Mesa, Walls_Flying, and Canyon by the balls
Complex and Islands were a Nod win nearly 4/5 of the time

GDI maps included (surprisingly) City and City_Flying, and Walls

Volcano was nearly dead even, which is why i like it so much

Omar007 wrote on Tue, 18 October 2011 02:45
Don't you mean 'Mutation Redux'???

Also, when the list is made, are there any plans of making it a mappack?
no, i meant what i typed
i know Snow, Fjords, and Mutation_Redux are all cool already so i didn't bother adding them to that list

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by Aircraftkiller on Tue, 18 Oct 2011 16:16:12 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Enough with the "map packs". They're unnecessary with 4.0.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by ehhh on Tue, 18 Oct 2011 16:26:09 GMT

gdi would win a lot more rush maps, if people actually got meds instead of mrls and if nod didnt get a flukey nuke off every game.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by iRANian on Tue, 18 Oct 2011 16:50:19 GMT

even when players do only primarily get meds on Islands and complex, nod wont have much issue winning solely with arty, especially with pointsmod on

i dont think that gdi winning more on city flying is that amazing, it was the same with bc's aow server, mainly because nod will always try to do a stank rush, meds can be protected by orcas pretty well and you can easily pointwhore nod's pp with mrls. though they did run a veterancy system that gives armour mod to vehicles after getting promoted in a match.

i'd like to try out playing a few of the stock maps with Fjord's vehicles, even though Fjord's vehicles are balanced for that map and not the stock ones.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by ehhh on Tue, 18 Oct 2011 16:56:34 GMT

fjords plays a lot different to any of the stock maps, I also hate the light tank on fjords lol... the med/mrl issue was more towards maps like canyon, volcano and complex.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by iRANian on Tue, 18 Oct 2011 18:32:06 GMT

On canyon on jelly marathon you need to get two meds for every arty (if every arty has 0.5 techs on it). on islands i'd say its 1.5 med per arty, but nod can just sit back in their base with arties to defend.

having guys use meds instead of mrls does help a bit, but having meds do a little bit more damage and be a bit quicker (like on ACK's 'TS" maps) or having techs/hotties repair vehs at 70-75% the rate they do now would help gdi a lot more.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by Omar007 on Tue, 18 Oct 2011 21:03:24 GMT

Aircraftkiller wrote on Tue, 18 October 2011 18:16Enough with the "map packs". They're unnecessary with 4.0.

Ah yea kinda forgot about the resource downloader due to not having to download custom maps that much (yet)

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by NACHO-ARG on Wed, 19 Oct 2011 01:43:27 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

iRANian wrote on Tue, 18 October 2011 11:32On canyon on jelly marathon you need to get two meds for every arty (if every arty has 0.5 techs on it). on islands i'd say its 1.5 med per arty, but nod can just sit back in their base with arties to defend.

having guys use meds instead of mrls does help a bit, but having meds do a little bit more damage and be a bit quicker (like on ACK's 'TS" maps) or having techs/hotties repair vehs at 70-75% the rate they do now would help gdi a lot more.

i wonder if it could be posible to insert the mrls rotating turret in clients or server side may be whit TT, that would help a lot, plus their missiles should be a litle bit faster, litle details like this could make GDI actually have a chance against artys and techis.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by liquidv2 on Wed, 19 Oct 2011 02:59:06 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

when 4.0 has all the bugs worked out we could make custom jelly marathon versions of the original maps
mrls could have the rotating turrets, mammies could be like the fjord ones, etc.

i'd like both of those changes actually

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by Goztow on Wed, 19 Oct 2011 07:31:43 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Ah see Liquid, there's where our opinion differs. For me, the standard maps are ideally played with 8 to maximum 24 players. This does, of course, change the outcome.

Quote:
Nod had Complex, Hourglass, Islands, Mesa, Walls_Flying, and Canyon by the balls
Complex and Islands were a Nod win nearly 4/5 of the time

GDI maps included (surprisingly) City and City_Flying, and Walls

---

Volcano was nearly dead even, which is why i like it so much

Islands needs a little "tweak" to make it more even, by allowing the MRLS to shoot the hon from right over the first river. That's actually no tweak, it's just allowing what the map "offers". That way Nod is forced to move up and GDI can pump out their meds to level up the field.

Mesa -> I did mention the deadzones. Mesa2 is actually a GDI map IMO.

Complex -> it's just a matter of surviving the first 5 minutes.

Walls flying -> GDI should be able to beat Nod with their superior rifles, getting crate and killing the Nod harv while protecting their. If they cannot do this, then they very well deserve to loose. If they can do this, then it's simply a matter of med tanks and a few havocs, right?

Canyon -> same as Walls flying.

Volcano is one of my favorite maps.

Generally speaking it is simply easier to win with Nod on public servers because you need less teamplay and the arty spam is just plain obvious. But that doesn't mean the game isn't balanced.

Also in bigger games, which you refer to, the vehicle limit is an immediate advantage for Nod with their arty splash / huge firepower. 7 teched arts will beat 7 repaired meds, but in e.g. 5v5 5 meds will beat 3 arts with 2 techs.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by Aircraftkiller on Wed, 19 Oct 2011 07:48:19 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Quote:But that doesn't mean the game isn't balanced.

It isn't. It has never been balanced in the 10 years it's been playable.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by Spoony on Wed, 19 Oct 2011 09:07:21 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

remove pointbug + infinite infantry ammo + fix mesa deadzones = balanced

---

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by iRANian on Wed, 19 Oct 2011 09:33:57 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

---

i doubt allowing mrls to shoot from 1st river on islands will affect much, on jelly marathon thats allowed and nod always is up on score after 30-40 mins. if you have the default vehicle limit it's one vehicle less and it's still easy for arties to roll up to gdi's base. having the mrls shoot from the 2nd river/island is more useful as they can support the meds trying to fend off nod tanks.

mesa with dead zones fixed won't really help much, as long as you have arties+techs who know how to position themselves under the bridge without taking damage from gdi's base and from the guys on the bridge it's more of an annoyance. If nod can get 1-2 arties on long with 1 tech they can also hold off gdi tanks and they could move out to the middle and shoot the gdi tanks on the bridge.

walls fly nod has an easier time pointwhoring with arties, lights are better than meds on the map, saks are a lot harder to kill than havocs and the difference between orca and apache range hardly matters, they do have a harder time at the beginning keeping their harvester alive and if not surviving the first minutes.

Canyon has always been a nod map. Volcano is pretty balanced, but it's more because of the retarded ability to sneak like on glacier, which causes a building to be lost within the first 10 minutes most of the time. Nod has an easier time on the long side of field but they can't tech their arties in the tiberium field on short.

@liquid: you should consider tweaking the med to be quicker and having it do 10-15 more damage. And of course removing the arty screen shake and reducing the splash area (and maybe the damage). the mrls could also do 25% more damage or so, and the rotating turret hurts gdi on field.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by liquidv2 on Wed, 19 Oct 2011 10:02:42 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

if you're clever you can still curve rockets even with the rotating mrls

just sayin

and to goztow, it's easier to say a game is balanced when dealing with less people - the trouble is ren wasn't designed for such small games, and my issue is trying to balance the larger ones

---

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by iRANian on Wed, 19 Oct 2011 10:15:33 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

How do you do that?

and yeah i dont mind playing gdi with a low player count but once theres a decent amount of players it isn't that fun

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by Goztow on Wed, 19 Oct 2011 10:48:01 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Of course Renegade was made for smaller player counts as well, considering how small most standard maps are. It was created in 2002, when you could hardly get a FPS of 10 with more than 20 players. I don't understand why none of the big communities run servers with smaller player counts anymore.

You'll never be able to really balance things out by changing one or the other vehicle's stats. If you start doing this, you'll rapidly realize that the change you made has an impact on other parts of the game, which will force you to change other values again. The only exception may be the transport heli which really just needs decent armour versus light weapons.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by Caveman on Wed, 19 Oct 2011 11:05:14 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Just like to point out a few things;

ACK: What is it with you and X maps sucks because its not a pretty map? We've had this discussion before. Pretty maps != good map. Take fjords for example (Im not going get into that debate again) its a very pretty map and you did a great job however I personally think its a horrible map (gameplay wise)

I think with the deadzones being fixed, especially on hourglass it balances out the game a lot more. I can now sit on the hill with my mrls and hit every building as opposed to hitting every building with a arty pre TT.

Also I don't think the MRLS is underpowered at all.. Yeah it sucks when up close against an arty but from a distance, like on field from entrance to entrance my MRLS usually outbeats a arty purely down to 6 lock.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by iRANian on Wed, 19 Oct 2011 11:44:39 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

westwood used to run 24 and 32 player servers iirc

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by liquidv2 on Wed, 19 Oct 2011 11:56:25 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Caveman wrote on Wed, 19 October 2011 06:05Also I don't think the MRLS is underpowered at all.. Yeah it sucks when up close against an arty but from a distance, like on field from entrance to entrance my MRLS usually outbeats a arty purely down to 6 lock.
that's if you get an arty one on one
in a game where there's, say, 15 players on the other team you may not get that opportunity
a teched arty will beat a hotwired mrls in a war of attrition

such is renelife

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by Jerad2142 on Wed, 19 Oct 2011 13:47:01 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Aircraftkiller wrote on Tue, 18 October 2011 00:59Stock levels aren't a lot of fun, either.
Ah, that explains why they've been the most played for 9.5 years now.

Also, I like how some people hate stalemates but like balance; however, if the game was perfectly balanced, and the teams both had players with the same skill, the game would just completely stalemate all the time.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by ehhh on Wed, 19 Oct 2011 16:13:35 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

stock levels are simple and make much more sense then any fan made maps. Anyway arts aren't as over powered as you think they are, perhaps use infinite ammo, if you think gdi aren't as powerful as nod.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by iRANian on Wed, 19 Oct 2011 16:20:04 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

how come nod wins some maps 80% of the time with them then?

anyway infinite ammo is just terrible once the killwhoring starts and it makes 1000$ infantry way too powerful, last time i played on a server with that enabled i killed 20-25 arties on field with a jet and i only had to kill myself 2 times because i couldnt be arsed to refill. incredibly lame. i still was ranked 10th or so because i wasnt getting any points for killing/damaging the arties, just for killing infantry, pretty cool

---

Subject: Re: Map rating

Posted by ehhh on Wed, 19 Oct 2011 16:30:52 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

80? swear it was something like 60, I suppose It's probably because the average player some how finds it diffcult to kill the techs, arts are weak as fuck without them. You can easily kill whore without infinite ammo, imo makes pics/ramjets worth their cost.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by Jerad2142 on Wed, 19 Oct 2011 17:27:11 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Harvester probably has to move an extra meter for one team thus slowly delaying their income more and more as the game proceeds, thus giving that team a disadvantage on that map.

iRANian wrote on Wed, 19 October 2011 10:20
anyway infinite ammo is just terrible once the killwhoring starts and it makes 1000$ infantry way too powerful, last time i played on a server with that enabled i killed 20-25 arties on field with a jet and i only had to kill myself 2 times because i couldnt be arsed to refill. incredibly lame. i still was ranked 10th or so because i wasnt getting any points for killing/damaging the arties, just for killing infantry, pretty cool
46.5 points per artillery means you have to kill 15.5 basic infantry to break even with one arty (assuming no one else is damaging the infantry or the vehicles).

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by ELiT3FLyR on Wed, 19 Oct 2011 17:51:23 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Quote:you should consider tweaking the med to be quicker and having it do 10-15 more damage. And of course removing the arty screen shake and reducing the splash area (and maybe the damage). the mrls could also do 25% more damage or so, and the rotating turret hurts gdi on field. lol. so retarded

really there is nothing else to it other than the fact that you play a map like islands which was never designed to play with more than like 16 people and play with 50 people. ofcourse nod will win, gdi cant even fit enough tanks through the passages at the same time to kill the arts. then you play city fly or volcano and its much more balanced because the maps are big enough to accomodate more people.

its like playing in a 50player killhouse server on cod4 and then complaining because u think the sniper is too weak. u can buff the sniper if u want, but when u change the map to something bigger its gunna be op as shit.

sure, u can make meds do 15 more damage per shot to balance out a 25v25 islands or complex. then u can go play the fan maps which are retardly open and big and watch gdi win 90%

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by iRANian on Wed, 19 Oct 2011 18:31:19 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

who said anything about applying those changes to fan maps? are you retarded or something?

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by Sean on Wed, 19 Oct 2011 19:07:42 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

liquidv2 wrote on Wed, 19 October 2011 04:56Caveman wrote on Wed, 19 October 2011 06:05Also I don't think the MRLS is underpowered at all.. Yeah it sucks when up close against an arty but from a distance, like on field from entrance to entrance my MRLS usually outbeats a arty purely down to 6 lock.
that's if you get an arty one on one
in a game where there's, say, 15 players on the other team you may not get that opportunity
a teched arty will beat a hotwired mrls in a war of attrition

such is renelife

You're kidding right?

A good mrls player > a good arty player, in terms of killing the support if you know how to aim the mrls properly.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by ELiT3FLyR on Wed, 19 Oct 2011 19:24:11 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Quote:who said anything about applying those changes to fan maps? are you retarded or something? no, but you definatly are for even suggesting that meds should do 15 more damage.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by iRANian on Wed, 19 Oct 2011 19:44:42 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

ok

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by Goztow on Wed, 19 Oct 2011 19:51:25 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

iRANian wrote on Wed, 19 October 2011 18:20how come nod wins some maps 80% of the time with them then?
Probably as I said: the art spam is just plain obvious, so in public server with often little coordination, it wins games.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by ehhh on Wed, 19 Oct 2011 19:55:02 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Simpee is right, making meds more powerful might help islands, but other maps, say field for example, would be dumb.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by Spoony on Wed, 19 Oct 2011 21:19:59 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

iRANian wrote on Wed, 19 October 2011 09:20how come nod wins some maps 80% of the time with them then?
because at least half the people in public servers don't know what they're doing. i don't like saying it but it must be said.

Quote:anyway infinite ammo is just terrible once the killwhoring starts and it makes 1000$ infantry way too powerful, last time i played on a server with that enabled i killed 20-25 arties on field with a jet and i only had to kill myself 2 times because i couldnt be arsed to refill. incredibly lame. i still was ranked 10th or so because i wasnt getting any points for killing/damaging the arties, just for killing infantry, pretty cool
sorry, what's "killwhoring"? is that killing lots of infantry because the enemy can't kill you? that's a good thing, isn't it? either you're very good or the enemy just plain sucked. none of them could snipe you back, none of them were bright enough to get a heavy vehicle, none of them had the teamwork to gang up on you. so in a nutshell, the enemy had no sniping skill, no teamwork, and not enough of a fucking brain to get any heavy vehicles, against which a havoc/sakura are useless. no, 1000 infantry aren't too powerful with infinite ammo; indeed they aren't worth 1000 unless they have infinite ammo. your opposition just plain sucked. they all got arties and thus they couldn't handle a gdi team that was prepared for arties; if they were bright enough to get some lights as well they would have done better.

this is also why arties are not overpowered, and why nod can't only get arties.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by liquidv2 on Wed, 19 Oct 2011 21:26:49 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Azazel wrote on Wed, 19 October 2011 14:07You're kidding right?

A good mrls player > a good arty player, in terms of killing the support if you know how to aim the mrls properly.

does anyone else support this statement?

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by TankClash on Wed, 19 Oct 2011 21:45:06 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

The projectiles for the artillery and MRLS have different speeds.

Why not just make the artillery like the one in coming changes to FjordsTS?

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by ehhh on Wed, 19 Oct 2011 21:45:46 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

It's just the scouse been stupid again!

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by Goztow on Thu, 20 Oct 2011 06:40:10 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

liquidv2 wrote on Wed, 19 October 2011 23:26Azazel wrote on Wed, 19 October 2011 14:07You're kidding right?

A good mrls player > a good arty player, in terms of killing the support if you know how to aim the mrls properly.

does anyone else support this statement?
Well, no...

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by GEORGE ZIMMER on Thu, 20 Oct 2011 09:08:05 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Azazel wrote on Wed, 19 October 2011 12:07

You're kidding right?

A good mrls player > a good arty player, in terms of killing the support if you know how to aim the mrls properly.

---

wait
what the fuck would you know about being a good player?

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by Starbuzz on Thu, 20 Oct 2011 23:04:10 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

iRANian wrote on Wed, 19 October 2011 04:44westwood used to run 24 and 32 player servers iirc

yes Prince, but does increasing the player slots on the official servers have anything to do with the max amount of players the game/maps were designed to handle...dont ya think?

Spoony wrote on Wed, 19 October 2011 02:07remove pointbug + infinite infantry ammo + fix mesa deadzones = balanced

I don't understand why this is so hard to grasp. Fixing the balance should not require changes to the entire way the game is played because there is risk of messing up too many things and ending in a quagmire...and as Goztow points out, you wind up with perpetual tweaking.

ELiT3FLyR wrote on Wed, 19 October 2011 10:51really there is nothing else to it other than the fact that you play a map like islands which was never designed to play with more than like 16 people and play with 50 people. ofcourse nod will win, gdi cant even fit enough tanks through the passages at the same time to kill the arts. then you play city fly or volcano and its much more balanced because the maps are big enough to accomodate more people.

gold quote; probably why Volcano became my favorite non-base defense map.

Spoony wrote on Wed, 19 October 2011 14:19iRANian wrote on Wed, 19 October 2011 09:20how come nod wins some maps 80% of the time with them then?
because at least half the people in public servers don't know what they're doing. i don't like saying it but it must be said.

I can't believe we are talking about balance changes when what you said above is true.

Caveman wrote on Wed, 19 October 2011 04:05Take fjords for example (Im not going get into that debate again) its a very pretty map and you did a great job however I personally think its a horrible map (gameplay wise)

I think "horrible" is too evil to say about Fjords! The map does have some good balance changes by trying to make the rocket-launching units useful. I said I half-agree because I don't like the idea of sniper rifles/ramjets being essentially taken out of the picture...err game.

---

probably why I feel all of stock Renegade's balance problems are solved if pointsfix/inf

ammo/deadzone fix are implemented as it preserves the battles as we have always played and keeps them going fast and fluid. Smaller symmetrical maps beautifully tie in with the game mechanics...if you had large maps like Cairo, then snipers/ramjetters VS light vehicles would be a nuisance and difficult to locate at the heat of the moment (still easily managable and/or the flyer can switch to tanks)...but in a great map like City_Fly, there are a few standard places to instantly check for a sniper/ramjetter. The game balances itself out pretty well.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by **iRANian** on Fri, 21 Oct 2011 00:01:30 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Except when you put on pointsmod

"Nod had Complex, Hourglass, Islands, Mesa, Walls_Flying, and Canyon by the balls Complex and Islands were a Nod win nearly 4/5 of the time"

while running without pointsmod the maps were pretty balanced

---

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by **liquidv2** on Fri, 21 Oct 2011 00:13:59 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

black-cell had data covering years with the original points (spoony's points bug) and every single map was like 50/50 or very close to it

in terms of balance shit stayed closer with the bugged system, whether it was intended or not

that's why i don't mind so much playing on servers that use either

---

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by **iRANian** on Fri, 21 Oct 2011 00:16:31 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Yes I remember that data. They did disallow hill camping on hourglass though and you also had to be over the second river on islands for both teams. And the players were a lot better than the downers playing today.

Marathon had a 32 player limit and it had the default Renegade vehicle limit, teams had to mass by shelling tanks and reviving them later, which also meant you could only do med/light masses basically.

Subject: Re: Map rating

Posted by [EvilWhiteDragon](#) on Fri, 21 Oct 2011 00:18:36 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Aircraftkiller wrote on Tue, 18 October 2011 06:01Renegade's balance sucks. If someone has the time to balance it out effectively, I encourage them to do so. If you enjoy Renegade's gameplay as it stands now, with no modifications, you enjoy a broken game that only works because the underlying foundation is strong enough to keep it propped up.

I spent months working on Fjords and getting the balancing tweaked to the point that it's how Renegade should have played. I think most people appreciate that, instead of playing the same broken shit they've played for many years.
OK, you just lost all my respect.

Statistical analysis has proven that Renegade is extremely balanced. The largest difference on stock maps was on Mesa, with if I remember correctly a difference within 5% win/loss ratio. Find a game that's more balanced with different units and is a FPS, please!

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Fri, 21 Oct 2011 00:24:39 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

You're arguing that the game is balanced overall because certain units make others nearly worthless. Maybe "balance" means something else to you than it does to me. Perhaps you might like imagining a scale where Havoc and Sakura weigh the same amount as Buggies, Humm-vees, Orcas, Apaches, Transport Helicopters, all infantry, MRLS and Artillery. The fact that one type of unit can counter so many different things, with little fear of retaliation, is not balanced. I don't really give a shit about the win/loss ratios in this case.

/if your respect is so easily lost because I disagree with you on a slightly controversial subject, your respect is something I don't need
//slashies

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by [EvilWhiteDragon](#) on Fri, 21 Oct 2011 00:28:42 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

liquidv2 wrote on Tue, 18 October 2011 18:00Goztow wrote on Tue, 18 October 2011 01:37If you then play with 0 starting credits, no donate and no other shitty modifications, then the win-loss % is around 50 % (BI once tested this, BTW).
Black-Intel never had enough players to accurately test ideal ren in my opinion (somewhere between 10v10 to 20v20, 32 total players being the ideal)
what i go by is when we had it on Jelly 1, which had over 10 players per side every day on average
it was pretty filthy

Nod had Complex, Hourglass, Islands, Mesa, Walls_Flying, and Canyon by the balls

Complex and Islands were a Nod win nearly 4/5 of the time

GDI maps included (surprisingly) City and City_Flying, and Walls

Volcano was nearly dead even, which is why i like it so much

Omar007 wrote on Tue, 18 October 2011 02:45
Don't you mean 'Mutation Redux'???

Also, when the list is made, are there any plans of making it a mappack?
no, i meant what i typed
i know Snow, Fjords, and Mutation_Redux are all cool already so i didn't bother adding them to that list
First, it's BlackIntel, thank you.
Second, we've had the ENTIRE RENLADDER database for this test.
Third, you're making the mistake of presuming that renegade games are only fun when there are 10 or more people playing on either side.
Fourth, you're basing your facts only of one server, one where players claim to have too little credits when the pointfix is applied. (Yes you can argue against point fix, but then you should change it so health gives the same --ridiculous-- amount of moneys as armour).

Conclusion: if you do not stick your head up your ass and look to all numbers of player counts, Renegade is EXTREMELY balanced. Obviously the balance favours certain amounts of players per map, but that's also due to the vehicle limit that does not scale with player limit.
Would the vehicles be limited to ABS(<players per team>/2-1) (which is the case with the "maximum" of 16 players per team) then the game would scale extremely well.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by liquidv2 on Fri, 21 Oct 2011 00:38:43 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

the entire renegade ladder used the pointmod? i'm going off of the closest to ideal renegade stats i can find for the pointmod (10 to 20 players per side since renegade had 16 per side in mind, no weapons drop, no starting credits, pointmod on)

the higher the number of players the more accurate the stats will be because the team's full strengths and weaknesses are brought out since one or two players' individual skill is not enough to change the outcome of most games

---

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by Jerad2142 on Fri, 21 Oct 2011 06:14:58 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Truthfully, I have to admit I've been killed by more MRLSs then I have by Artilleries.

They can be sneaky and shoot around corners and shit ya know.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by Sean on Fri, 21 Oct 2011 08:02:05 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Jerad Gray wrote on Thu, 20 October 2011 23:14Truthfully, I have to admit I've been killed by more MRLSs then I have by Artilleries.

They can be sneaky and shoot around corners and shit ya know.

Finally someone that knows how to play.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by Caveman on Fri, 21 Oct 2011 08:33:05 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Azazel wrote on Fri, 21 October 2011 09:02Jerad Gray wrote on Thu, 20 October 2011 23:14Truthfully, I have to admit I've been killed by more MRLSs then I have by Artilleries.

They can be sneaky and shoot around corners and shit ya know.

Finally someone that knows how to play.

...

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by ehhh on Fri, 21 Oct 2011 15:09:00 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

If someone's going to agree with azazel, it's going to be someone who plays renegade-sims.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by GEORGE ZIMMER on Sat, 22 Oct 2011 01:35:20 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Aircraftkiller wrote on Thu, 20 October 2011 17:24You're arguing that the game is balanced overall because certain units make others nearly worthless. Maybe "balance" means something else to you than it does to me. Perhaps you might like imagining a scale where Havoc and Sakura

weigh the same amount as Buggies, Humm-vees, Orcas, Apaches, Transport Helicopters, all infantry, MRLS and Artillery. The fact that one type of unit can counter so many different things, with little fear of retaliation, is not balanced. I don't really give a shit about the win/loss ratios in this case.

/if your respect is so easily lost because I disagree with you on a slightly controversial subject, your respect is something I don't need
//slashies
I actually agree, Renegade isn't "balanced" so much as it is "able to be played if you know what to do". It's like having an FPS where you have 100 weapon options, but only 2-3 are actually any good and can kill people instantaneously. It's not imbalanced in the eyes of players because anyone can choose those 2-3 weapons, but that's still arbitrary and retarded as hell.

MMORPG's suffer from this problem as well. Actually, a lot of modern games do, and it's saddening.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by Aircraftkiller on Sat, 22 Oct 2011 02:01:00 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

This is something I've tried to rectify in Fjords, and I believe I've succeeded. It needs tweaking over time, as anything would, but it's laying the foundation for the Tiberium Garden project's gameplay standards.

I don't know about anyone else here, but I enjoy seeing Transport Helicopters make it to a base without being shredded by some gigantic cannon in less than five seconds. I like seeing rockets destroy Apaches, Orcas, and Transports. I like seeing Recon Bikes stave off Orcas, and MRLS holding Apaches at bay. I like watching Mammoth Tanks fire missiles at Apaches that don't manage to stay on top of them. I like seeing Stealth Tanks actually hit Orcas reliably.

I like seeing snipers focus entirely on light vehicles like Humm-vees, Recon Bikes, and Buggies. I like not having to worry about my Orca being destroyed in three seconds because someone across the map can kill me with hit-scan weapons without any fear of me coming close to them. I like that Gunner and Rocket Soldiers are useful in more than niche situations. I like seeing SAM Sites tear up aircraft, and I enjoy watching the AGT being focused on missiles while Guard Towers fire guns.

Maybe my problem is that I enjoy C&C, not this Unreal-styled version of C&C that we call Renegade.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by liquidv2 on Sat, 22 Oct 2011 02:05:36 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

they did what they could to make it like a fps, which is why infantry have ammo and whatnot

i think it sucks that humvees and buggies can still get slaughtered from a mile away by a clip or two of ramjet / sniper fire
in c&c 1 the commando did slight damage to light armored vehicles, but not anything like it did or does in renegade

basically i think it's good that aircraft are safe from snipers, but that it's terrible that the light vehicles still fall victim to their unexplained wrath

and to the people that feel havocs/saks are no longer useful, maybe you're just too used to them being too useful
they're meant to kill other infantry, and if that's what they have to focus on from now on (in ACKworld at least) then it gives the other 1000 characters more of a practical use or importance

---

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by EvilWhiteDragon on Sat, 22 Oct 2011 12:18:33 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

While I see why one would nerf things like Havocs and such, I think it wouldn't help much. Don't forget that you're paying 1000 credits for something that can be instantly killed with a 500 credits unit, and can be killed FAST by a vehicle.
If you look at the costs then any of the 1000 credits characters is a pretty bad choice compared to the vehicles available.

Edit:
Conclusion: if you're going to change the damage a unit does you should at the very least rebalance the costs aspect as well. Which basically means refactoring the entire reneconomy.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by Goztow on Sat, 22 Oct 2011 13:07:43 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

If you take in account how long it takes you to get 1.000 credits with the points fix, which was the way it was ment to be, then it's no wonder a character that costs 1.000 credits (which is more than any tank, bar the mammy) is quite good in what it aims to do.

Westwood could have been a bit more imaginative, and have another character counter the heli's, but the havoc works pretty fine wrt game balance.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by Starbuzz on Sat, 22 Oct 2011 13:15:54 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

And not to mention that the Ramjet is not just for sniping infantry only...the Rene manual says it's an anti-material rifle that fires a rocket-engined round; hence the blue exhaust (tracer). Makes no sense that I can't damage flying eggshells with it.

I have no problems with the default system in stock Renegade but if anyone want to test it, a more realistic modification would be to reduce Ramjet damage/effectiveness in the context of range (against light armour only). So a Ramjet vs an Orca that is way far off would take much lesser damage than when it is directly overhead. This way I don't have to deal with having to force my mind to doublethink on Fjords.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by Aircraftkiller on Sat, 22 Oct 2011 15:38:21 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I really don't give a shit what the Renegade manual says to be completely honest with you. I remember specifically being told during the flying beta by Devinoch that they ran out of time to get rockets working as the proper AA weaponry.

It is not fine with game balance. The fact that they utterly dominate so many different types of vehicles forces you into using specific units to win if you want to win reliably. This is one of several reasons why Nod can't ever use their fucking brain beyond "HAY GUZ STANKKKKKKKZZZZZZZZZZ GEAT THEM!!"

Once you get four minutes into the game, you can easily destroy all of the vehicles I listed earlier. If you're particularly skilled you can keep them from ever doing anything on the battlefield unless they bring support to repair them. In which case, hey, guess what: You're a "sniper", so you can snipe their support and destroy the vehicles too.

If you don't have a problem with this, it's because you forgot how Command & Conquer plays.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by ehhh on Sat, 22 Oct 2011 16:06:28 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Damn it you need teamwork to counter a ramjet, It's not that difficult.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by Aircraftkiller on Sat, 22 Oct 2011 22:22:09 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"Guys you need teamwork to kill that thing which can easily kill us if they aim in our general direction!"

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by ehhh on Sun, 23 Oct 2011 00:29:14 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Well it's not very hard to kill a sniper.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by Aircraftkiller on Sun, 23 Oct 2011 02:33:08 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

You're right, it's not hard to kill another sniper... Unless you're using a unit that doesn't happen to be a sniper.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by TankClash on Sun, 23 Oct 2011 03:47:24 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Or nuclear bomb...

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by MUDKIPS on Sun, 23 Oct 2011 07:58:16 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Aircraftkiller wrote on Sat, 22 October 2011 19:33You're right, it's not hard to kill another sniper...
Unless you're using a unit that doesn't happen to be a sniper.

gunner and sbh > sniper

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by Goztow on Sun, 23 Oct 2011 18:31:11 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

How come you hardly never see any ramjets in clanwars then?

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by Spoony on Mon, 24 Oct 2011 08:36:50 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Playing this game competitively would be a real education for some of you

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by grant89uk on Mon, 24 Oct 2011 10:21:00 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Aircraftkiller wrote on Sat, 22 October 2011 03:01This is something I've tried to rectify in Fjords, and I believe I've succeeded. It needs tweaking over time, as anything would, but it's laying the foundation for the Tiberium Garden project's gameplay standards.

I don't know about anyone else here, but I enjoy seeing Transport Helicopters make it to a base without being shredded by some gigantic cannon in less than five seconds. I like seeing rockets destroy Apaches, Orcas, and Transports. I like seeing Recon Bikes stave off Orcas, and MRLS holding Apaches at bay. I like watching Mammoth Tanks fire missiles at Apaches that don't manage to stay on top of them. I like seeing Stealth Tanks actually hit Orcas reliably.

I like seeing snipers focus entirely on light vehicles like Humm-vees, Recon Bikes, and Buggies. I like not having to worry about my Orca being destroyed in three seconds because someone across the map can kill me with hit-scan weapons without any fear of me coming close to them. I like that Gunner and Rocket Soldiers are useful in more than niche situations. I like seeing SAM Sites tear up aircraft, and I enjoy watching the AGT being focused on missiles while Guard Towers fire guns.

Maybe my problem is that I enjoy C&C, not this Unreal-styled version of C&C that we call Renegade.

I think I see a pattern.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by GEORGE ZIMMER on Thu, 27 Oct 2011 12:33:00 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Maybe because it'd be rather arrogant to assume that's absolutely how things should be (seeing as how he himself created those changes he listed, anyway). But I guess you're used to someone's opinion automatically meaning it's what they believe to be 100% factual.

Also,

JUST BECAUSE SOMETHING CAN DIE DOESN'T MEAN IT'S BALANCED

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by iRANian on Thu, 27 Oct 2011 12:37:48 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

So what exactly is the problem with using "I" when you're expressing an opinion instead of factual matter??

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by grant89uk on Thu, 27 Oct 2011 13:29:53 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

He is stating that renegade is unbalanced and those things he likes would make it balanced.

Whilst its his opinion(which hes certainly entitled to), I wouldnt say other people completely feel the same.

You will never please everyone but by the stats over so long its apparent that no such drastic changes need to be made.

Then again if he makes them in his own maps then hes completely free to do so. I just wouldnt expect everyone to jump for joy at the gameplay changes. They would probly appreciate the map more without those changes imo...

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by Spoony on Thu, 27 Oct 2011 14:10:37 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I like the alternative gameplay dynamic on Fjords, especially as far as aircraft go. but the stock version on flying maps is actually very balanced and a skilful endeavour (so long as you remove the point bug and have infinite infantry ammo); perhaps it takes some experience of competitive play to see that for what it is.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by GEORGE ZIMMER on Thu, 27 Oct 2011 14:12:24 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Just because something yields evidence towards one end doesn't justify the entire thing in question (this is called anecdotal evidence... in this case, the statistical average of GDI wins vs Nod wins).

Furthermore, if the alternate idea being presented results in roughly the same numbers that the cherry picked "evidence" does- and more- why on Earth is it bad to change it?

TL;DR: ACK's changes are actually a good thing and is a step in the right direction for Renegade, and I'd love to see more maps that use his balancing methods (Remade fanmaps using his stats and such would be wonderful).

Although, I'd like to see the numbers of GDI wins vs Nod wins on Fjord. Even though it won't mean much if it's a bit imbalanced (it's one mod map system that's still in progress vs an entire game that is apparently "super balanced"), it'd still be nice to see.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by iRANian on Thu, 27 Oct 2011 14:55:24 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

FjordsTS feels really balanced. The only thing that's unbalanced and that Aircraftkiller already addressed is Orca rushes.

I made a modified C&C_Snow map with some of the changes I wanted to test out for st0rm. It includes FjordsTS' models (with ACK's permission), but I did nerf the Flame Tank, Mammoth Tank and MRLS a bit because they're really nasty on FjordsTS, still are on the modified map. St0rm still needs to put the map in their rotation, although they did put an earlier version with only Arty splash and screenshake reduced in their rotation.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by Aircraftkiller on Sat, 29 Oct 2011 18:55:17 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

All of the arguments I've ever seen against the changes I've developed always center around "Havoc must destroy anything he can see."

It makes me question the lack of coherent thought involved.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by GEORGE ZIMMER on Sat, 29 Oct 2011 20:12:12 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Aircraftkiller wrote on Sat, 29 October 2011 11:55All of the arguments I've ever seen against the changes I've developed always center around "Havoc must destroy anything he can see."

It makes me question the lack of coherent thought involved.
but that would mean you'd have to choose a character based on what you want to accomplish instead of being a massive faggot

are you suggesting we, the players of Renegade, change our faggy ways?

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by ELiT3FLyR on Mon, 31 Oct 2011 19:06:19 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

ita a pretty fun standalone map.. shame about the ego tho

Subject: Re: Map rating

Posted by iRANian on Mon, 31 Oct 2011 19:07:54 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

i haven't actually seen anyone use sakuras/havocs effectively on fjords..it's like the APB sniper. Might as well remove them.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by Aircraftkiller on Mon, 31 Oct 2011 19:45:00 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

ELiT3FLyR wrote on Mon, 31 October 2011 15:06shame about the ego tho

Is this one of those times where you use a word whose definition you're completely unfamiliar with?

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by Spoony on Mon, 31 Oct 2011 20:09:05 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

iRANian wrote on Mon, 31 October 2011 12:07i haven't actually seen anyone use sakuras/havocs effectively on fjords..it's like the APB sniper. Might as well remove them.
if the map had infinite infantry ammo, then rocket soldiers/gunners would be well worth using, plus rav/PIC/etc as units to hold the field. in which case, snipers would be much more useful as a counter to them.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by ELiT3FLyR on Mon, 31 Oct 2011 22:34:32 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

it was the friendliest word i could think of after all ur talk about shitty balance and this should have been how ren was released.

personally i dont think ur map is balanced at all and it takes away from indivdual skill, but hey i like any map that has recon bikes and enough space to get them to max speed.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by ehhh on Mon, 31 Oct 2011 22:54:23 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Holding the field? Everytime i've played it, it's who rushes the most wins...

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by Aircraftkiller on Mon, 31 Oct 2011 22:57:20 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Like it or not, this is how Renegade was originally envisioned. It was meant to be more than this UT-style game we see now. Also, you keep using that word called "balance". It does not mean what you think it means.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by TankClash on Tue, 01 Nov 2011 00:14:46 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I'm sure I'm not the only one who prefer battling on the field, way more fun than "shitting in your base" waiting for a rush to take place but..

Stock Renegade levels make it hard for good tank battles because it's a blank open space with bases so close together it's like "why bother having vehicles?".

Most of them only have 1 way to get out with a vehicle anyway, the only cover being maybe 1 or 2 trees, a tiny hump in the ground that some call a "hill" and small shack like thing in the middle of it all.

Basically, almost feels like I'm battling on a parking lot. Or Mech Warrior 2 mercenaries terrain...

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by GEORGE ZIMMER on Tue, 01 Nov 2011 10:53:33 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

ELiT3FLyR wrote on Mon, 31 October 2011 15:34it was the friendliest word i could think of after all ur talk about shitty balance and this should have been how ren was released.

personally i dont think ur map is balanced at all and it takes away from indivdual skill, but hey i like any map that has recon bikes and enough space to get them to max speed.
lol.. if you feel so strongly, why not keep with the discussion instead of making baseless stupid quips?

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by Goztow on Wed, 02 Nov 2011 13:28:09 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

TankClash wrote on Tue, 01 November 2011 01:14
Stock Renegade levels make it hard for good tank battles because it's a blank open space with bases so close together it's like "why bother having vehicles?".

You're taking the piss, right?

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by Aircraftkiller on Wed, 02 Nov 2011 16:23:35 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

He's absolutely correct. They are far too small for vehicles.

Subject: Re: Map rating
Posted by liquidv2 on Wed, 02 Nov 2011 19:58:09 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

depends on the number of players in the game but in some cases i completely agree

---