Subject: Lightmapping... Posted by deadmoap on Thu, 03 Jun 2004 22:36:42 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I'm not too into the whole 3D graphics thoery, but does renegade support lightmapping? I have a few programs that do lightmapping... but file conversions are what I'm worried about. Gmax wont export texture, for one thing. But I think a lightmap is like a texture that just brightens or darkens certain areas. I think I could get away with doing this:

Export the map from gmax to gile[s] (my favorite lightmapper) Render the lightmap Export to 3ds Import in gmax Apply textures to my map

Would this work? I know that the 3ds format supports lightmapping, otherwise I don't think gile[s] would export to it. But I'm mainly wondering if I have to apply the texture before lightmapping.

But even if it did work, does the w3d format support lightmaps? In fact does renegade support lightmaps?

Subject: Lightmapping... Posted by Sanada78 on Thu, 03 Jun 2004 22:52:45 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I'd like to know if it's also possible to do lightmapping for mod maps. The official maps have it, but they used some sort of max plug-in I think.

Lightmaps make the maps look ten times better than with crappy vertex light.

Subject: Lightmapping... Posted by Aircraftkiller on Thu, 03 Jun 2004 23:56:51 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

They also take up three times the processing power on your video chipset.

Subject: Lightmapping... Posted by Sanada78 on Fri, 04 Jun 2004 00:00:51 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

But I'd say it's worth the extra performance cost.

Oh I didn't know they take up more processing power. Maybe they'd be okay for a single player map, but when you're playing with 79 other people, you need all the performance you can get.

Subject: Lightmapping... Posted by maytridy on Fri, 04 Jun 2004 00:15:34 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Then how did WS get away with it?

Subject: Lightmapping... Posted by Aircraftkiller on Fri, 04 Jun 2004 00:18:08 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

They didn't get away with anything. The multi-pass lightmapping, in conjunction with the close proximity of the bases and the way the levels were designed, ended up causing most of the frame rate issues in the game.

Subject: Lightmapping... Posted by SuperFlyingEngi on Fri, 04 Jun 2004 00:28:33 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

...but we must always remember that it was always EA's fault.

Subject: Lightmapping... Posted by Aircraftkiller on Fri, 04 Jun 2004 00:40:16 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

EA owns WS, or what's left of it... So, by extension, you're saying WS is at fault. And you're entirely correct.

Subject: Lightmapping... Posted by deadmoap on Fri, 04 Jun 2004 18:42:08 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I still say it's EA's fault because they're stupid and I hate them. Those dirty bastards.

deadmoapl still say it's EA's fault because they're stupid and I hate them. Those dirty bastards.So true.

Subject: Lightmapping... Posted by NeoX on Fri, 04 Jun 2004 19:41:52 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

deadmoapl still say it's EA's fault because they're stupid and I hate them. Those dirty bastards.

Subject: Lightmapping... Posted by PiMuRho on Sat, 12 Jun 2004 05:39:33 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

AircraftkillerThey also take up three times the processing power on your video chipset.

From Jani Penttinen - engine programmer for Renegade:

I have no idea what this means, but lightmaps are just an extra texture stage which modulates the primary texture. Lightmaps cause regularly no performance hit, though it is true that they tend to add the number of textures in the scene, which slows things down a little (not much, if everything is designed pretty well). On older video cards it is sometimes needed to render the lightmap as an extra pass (rather than a secondary stage), which obviously consumes more fillrate.

Lightmaps are always 100%

precomputed, so they don't make things slower. Lightmaps are usually really low resolution, because the lighting information doesn't need to be accurate. Especially when you combine with the high resolution primary texture, the results are pretty good looking.

AircraftkillerThey didn't get away with anything. The multi-pass lightmapping, in conjunction with the close proximity of the bases and the way the levels were designed, ended up causing most of the frame rate issues in the game.

Not true at all. What caused most of the performance problems was that the assets had been mostly designed for older generation of 3D cards, and not really optimized for new hardware (new being GeForce2 in this case). After the game shipped I created guidelines for new art and we succesfully created levels with moren than 500k polygons visible, running a steady 60 fps on ATI

R200 (GF3 era card). Do some googling and search for Renegade 2 screenshots, you should be able to find some that were leaked after the studio was shut down. This was running with the same core technology, just with better designed art assets.

Subject: Lightmapping... Posted by Aircraftkiller on Sat, 12 Jun 2004 05:56:01 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

That doesn't make much sense considering things shouldn't go slower when they're less detailed, unless something REALLY went wrong.

I was told that the lightmapping caused a lot of processing hits due to the second pass, or detail texture, it added across the board on the entire level by Mike Amerson, who was working with the Islands level and had mapped it out himself. Just going by what he said with that one.

Page 4 of 4 ---- Generated from Command and Conquer: Renegade Official Forums