Subject: Suggestion for the forums
Posted by Spoony on Tue, 13 Feb 2007 13:09:01 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Have a sub-forum dedicated to the public-server ladder.... general discussion of it, ppl can post suggestions about the points system and whatnot.

I suppose it could technically count as the "BHS Products" section but that might not be immediately obvious.

Subject: Re: Suggestion for the forums
Posted by Goztow on Tue, 13 Feb 2007 13:26:52 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I'd wait with this until it comes out of the beta though. First get the old system back up, then discuss possible changes/problems/bragging/... It'll also be part of rencomm then .

Subject: Re: Suggestion for the forums
Posted by Crimson on Tue, 13 Feb 2007 13:50:39 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I am planning on forming a team of something like 10-12 community members to come up with a solution. I think having the whole community weigh in would be counterproductive in the end. People have very different ideas on what measures true skill.

Subject: Re: Suggestion for the forums
Posted by Ryu on Tue, 13 Feb 2007 14:23:14 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Crimson wrote on Tue, 13 February 2007 07:50 People have very different ideas on what measures true skill.

True.

Subject: Re: Suggestion for the forums
Posted by CarrierII on Tue, 13 Feb 2007 20:34:13 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

AlmightyHydra wrote on Sun, 26 June 2005 17:11The ladder scoring system on Renegade sucks, to be honest; people who turn up about halfway through a game, say when Refinery and one factory have already been destroyed, but try hard always get lumped with huge negative values; people who turn up in the last 5 minutes and win the game for their team using a beacon or

something get bugga all, while someone who just sits there sniping a nod solder every now and then gets lots simply for being in longer.

I suggest a new scoring system:

Note: PSCORE = the player's score; GTIME = total length of game; PTIME = time player was in game; PTEAM = team player was on; WINNINGTEAM and LOSINGTEAM are self-explanatory

For each player:
calc PADJUSTEDSCORE = PSCORE * GTIME / PTIME
(this is how much they would have earnt if they scored at that rate for the whole game; if they were in the whole game, GTIME/PTIME = 1 so no change)

Then, order the PADJUSTEDSCOREs for each team. This gives you PRANK for each player, with 1 being the worst score on that team and the higher the number, the better.

Define X as the number of players in the game divided by 8. (Round up if necessary). Work out PSIGNEDSCORE as follows:

If (PTEAM = WINNINGTEAM) and (PRANK <= X) or (PTEAM = LOSINGTEAM) and (PRANK > (NUMPLAYERS_ON_LOSINGTEAM - X) then PSIGNEDSCORE = PADJUSTEDSCORE else PSIGNEDSCORE = PADJUSTEDSCORE * -1 (i.e. make negative)

(This means that the top 25% of the losing team will get +ve ladder points; the bottom 25% of the winning team will get -ve ladder points)

Then simply order the PSIGNEDSCOREs for both teams together. Reverse the order of anyone with a negative score. (to ensure that the best losing team player doesn't get the worst punishment!)

Finally, award ladder points on the current 1-3-6-10... system, with two zeros for the lowest positive and highest negative scores, highest positive score gets most +ve ladder points, lowest negative score gets most -ve ladder points.

For example, say there are 8 players, 4 GDI 4 NOD. GDI win the game. (The scores are ridiculously small, sorry)

GDI:
Player Score Percentage of game played
G1   100   80% (would have scored 125)
G2   500   100%
G3   50   100%
G4   70   50% (would have scored 140)

Nod:
Player Score Percentage of game played
N1   250   100%
N2   25   25% (would have scored 100)

N3   100   50% (would have scored 200)
N4   75   100%

The order for GDI is G3, G1, G4, G2 and for NOD N4, N2, N3, N1.
X is defined as 1 (8/8 = 1)

Thus G3, whose PRANK is 1, has -50; G1, G2 and G4 keep their scores of 125, 500 and 140; N1, whose PRANK is 4 > [(4-1)=3] gets +250, while N2, N3 and N4 get -25, -100 and -75. The negative people have their order reversed, ending up as N3, N4, G3, N2.

So the final ranking table is

Player	Signed (Actual) Score	Ladder Points
G2	500 (500)	6
N1	250 (250)	3
G4	140 (140)	1
G1	125 (125)	0
N3	-100 (100)	0
N4	-75 (75)	-1
G3	-50 (50)	-3
N2	-25 (25)	-6

Here you can see how G4, who scored a reasonably quick 70, would have actually been rewarded instead of receiving 0; G3 who played appallingly got -3; and N1, who got a very good score, receives 3 points although his team lost.

Under this system, the MVP will ALWAYS get the highest number of ladder points - even when on the losing team!

This seems a much fairer reward system; is it possible to mod renegade to implement this or a similar system?

AlmightyHydra

My brother's better idea for the ranking system, felt it was relevant.

_____

Subject: Re: Suggestion for the forums
Posted by JPNOD on Tue, 13 Feb 2007 20:37:27 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Good idea.
Though I don't think top clans spend any less time on this game then I did when I was ladderwhoring. Plus about clanning that is that you can then really count yourself into the best Renegade players.   Afterall it will still come to how much time you put into this game. As long as the ladder will be into the WOL Style-layout, I'm verry excited to see this comming back.

_____

Subject: Re: Suggestion for the forums
Posted by Cpo64 on Wed, 14 Feb 2007 00:26:45 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Okay so a player comes in in the last min of a game, gets 100 points by jumping into a APC and doing a engie run at the end of the game. Game lasted 30 min before he showed up so he gets an adjusted score of 3000? While say another player who has been working hard all game has a score of maybe 2000? How is that fair?

Obvosly these numbers are random, but there are flaws in your brothers proposal. Rewarding people full points for a game they only participated in for a short time is not any more correct then the current system, however most of the rest of it, is pretty much alright.

Subject: Re: Suggestion for the forums
Posted by Spoony on Wed, 14 Feb 2007 03:58:06 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

My input:

If you want the ladder to define skill as best as possible, forget individual score, forget k/d. Only two things are important and everything else is trivial by comparison:
1. whether your team won
2. who you're playing vs.

Therefore, I think all players on the winning team should get equal points, which should be determined by the highest ranking opponent (or maybe an average rank of the opponents, but that'd be tricky to do, presumably). I also think you should only receive points if you were there at the start AND the end of the game (or maybe for at least 80% of the game's duration). Otherwise chances are you weren't really the reason your team won. However, you should still lose points if you were on the losing team at any point during the game.

No points whatsoever for co-op games, that's like getting points on an RTS ladder for beating a Medium Army.

Subject: Re: Suggestion for the forums
Posted by Goztow on Wed, 14 Feb 2007 07:35:20 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

MaidenTy1 wrote on Wed, 14 February 2007 04:58My input:

If you want the ladder to define skill as best as possible, forget individual score, forget k/d. Only two things are important and everything else is trivial by comparison:
1. whether your team won
2. who you're playing vs.

Therefore, I think all players on the winning team should get equal points, which should be

determined by the highest ranking opponent (or maybe an average rank of the opponents, but that'd be tricky to do, presumably). I also think you should only receive points if you were there at the start AND the end of the game (or maybe for at least 80% of the game's duration). Otherwise chances are you weren't really the reason your team won. However, you should still lose points if you were on the losing team at any point during the game.

No points whatsoever for co-op games, that's like getting points on an RTS ladder for beating a Medium Army.
Hmmm intresting. TK2's I-CW (a sort of training) has a similar system that I thought out. Here's how that ranking system works:

Quote:How does the ranking system work?
There are some basic rules for the ranks:

30 points to win per team, per map. We divide 30 by the number of buildings. On islands, for exemple, there are 3 buildings so that will be 10 points per destroyed building. If NOD destroys 2 buildings and gdi one, all gdi players get 10 points and all nod players get 20 points.

On Field there are 4 buildings, so that means 7,5 points per destroyed building. The system is easy and fair.

A ped nuker will cause all his team members to get 30 points (ped nuke destroys all buildings).

Last but not least: the team that wins on points will get 5 extra points. That's one point less than u can get by destroying a building on a map with 5 buildings.
You can find some more info here:
http://www.thekoss2.org/article.php?menu=i-cw&cat=Rules/FAQ

It would also be intresting that the amount of points (30 in our I-CW) u can win per game would be theoretically the same in a 10 player as in a 50 plkayers game. Basing the max amount of points distributed on the enemy team's composure (as u proposed) could do just that.

Subject: Re: Suggestion for the forums
Posted by Spoony on Wed, 14 Feb 2007 09:29:11 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Other stuff needs working out too obviously...

e.g.

- Code of Conduct for servers, maybe servers who are severely assholes get DQ'd from the ladder or something
- definition of which games constitute valid ladder games.... e.g. AOW/CCM, sniping... and RA:APB, Reborn...?
- maybe a forum to report cheaters, if there is conclusive proof (screenshots, fraps, server logs...) then they get banned/points removed and whatnot, from the ladder (anyone else remember keetxx?)

- hall of fame somewhere?

Subject: Re: Suggestion for the forums
Posted by i0ncl0ud9 on Thu, 15 Feb 2007 05:45:36 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

MaidenTy1 wrote on Tue, 13 February 2007 22:58My input:

If you want the ladder to define skill as best as possible, forget individual score, forget k/d. Only two things are important and everything else is trivial by comparison:
1. whether your team won
2. who you're playing vs.

Therefore, I think all players on the winning team should get equal points, which should be determined by the highest ranking opponent (or maybe an average rank of the opponents, but that'd be tricky to do, presumably). I also think you should only receive points if you were there at the start AND the end of the game (or maybe for at least 80% of the game's duration). Otherwise chances are you weren't really the reason your team won. However, you should still lose points if you were on the losing team at any point during the game.

No points whatsoever for co-op games, that's like getting points on an RTS ladder for beating a Medium Army.

I think this could be a good start to forming an ideal ladder for public servers..More important than formulating a new equation for the ladder would be to manipulate some of the ways you can get points in game... Icyy did this, and with what he was able to change, did a decent job. The only problem with this idea is that he told me that a lot of the things were not changeable... If you were somehow able to reduce the amount of points for hitting a building, possibly by as much as 3/4, but probably just half, and reduce the amount of points you get for repairing a building proportionally, so that its still 1/2 of what is earned for hitting a building, it would be much harder for building whores and repair whores to be successful... Also, in my opinion, the amount you get from hitting any enemy tank, should double. The way Icyy attempted it, he increased the points you got for killing an enemy vehicle. However, this was a problem because people would just wait and steal vehicle kills in his server. Another thing that should be adjusted is the amount of points recieved from killing characters... Right now, it ranges from 3 to 99. I think that if this was changed to 25 to 250, (without providing an exact table of values for specific characters at this point) the incentive to use infantry would increase. In return, take away the points that a ramjet, regular, sniper, soldier, etc are able to get for hitting vehicles with doing basically any damage...   Theres a lot of other things to think about, but I dont have time to write them all right now. If anyone has any idea on how to change some of the things I talked about, speak up. If its not possible, then something else needs to be thought of.

Subject: Re: Suggestion for the forums
Posted by Spoony on Thu, 15 Feb 2007 16:01:21 GMT

btw. losing a significant number of points for each loss is important too, means winratio > volume of games.

Subject: Re: Suggestion for the forums
Posted by Crimson on Thu, 15 Feb 2007 19:05:14 GMT

We spent a very significant amount of time in the beta test balancing the points system. The current point system awards the aggressor in battle. Reducing points for hitting buildings and increasing points for tanks would just encourage camping. We already tried that. Camping should NOT be encouraged because it makes for a boring game.

Subject: Re: Suggestion for the forums
Posted by JPNOD on Thu, 15 Feb 2007 19:19:49 GMT

Quote:increasing points for tanks would just encourage camping.

Care to eleborate? In my opinion if you using are a tank in the field to take out other tanks your doing a better job then using a n00bjet in the tunnel and killwhoring. The team that uses teamwork to take the field and has the better tankers deserves to move up and start hitting a building. Camping is sitting in a MRLS hitting a building hoping at the end you get the most points by bassicly putting a duck tape on the mouse.

Subject: Re: Suggestion for the forums
Posted by T0RN on Thu, 15 Feb 2007 20:13:16 GMT

JPNOD wrote on Thu, 15 February 2007 14:19Quote:increasing points for tanks would just encourage camping.

Care to eleborate? In my opinion if you using are a tank in the field to take out other tanks your doing a better job then using a n00bjet in the tunnel and killwhoring. The team that uses teamwork to take the field and has the better tankers deserves to move up and start hitting a building. Camping is sitting in a MRLS hitting a building hoping at the end you get the most points by bassicly putting a duck tape on the mouse.

I agree.On islands yesterday,I got 3 destroyed 5 heavy armored vehicle recs with my light for a total of around 20 vehicle kills, helping to hold the field.But ofcourse at the end of the game,the artys that whored the ref all game got 3 times the points and ladder i did.
Dosent seem right.

Subject: Re: Suggestion for the forums
Posted by i0ncl0ud9 on Thu, 15 Feb 2007 20:37:05 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Crimson wrote on Thu, 15 February 2007 14:05We spent a very significant amount of time in the beta test balancing the points system. The current point system awards the aggressor in battle. Reducing points for hitting buildings and increasing points for tanks would just encourage camping. We already tried that. Camping should NOT be encouraged because it makes for a boring game.

The majority of people are not familiar with the points system enough to understand that it is already possible to easily win by camping if you are on gdi on field or nod on under or hourglass...

Yes, and whoring buildings definitely a better idea. If a team is camping, the other team should be able to notice this and not move up... forcing the team camping to come out, which would in turn result in nice tank battles in the field, where skill is truly shown...

Just a thought also, I wish the recruit thing or whatever it was could be fixed to display different ranks, that way people in game may actually listen to others that know what they are talking about...

Once again, the problem doesn't lie with the formula for ladder, its the point structure ingame.

Subject: Re: Suggestion for the forums
Posted by Crimson on Fri, 16 Feb 2007 09:47:05 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Increasing the points for tanks encourages camping because while you are camping, you are destroying tanks... duh. Furthermore, the suggestion ALSO included reducing the amount of points for hitting a building so what would happen is no one would hit buildings and every map would be a tank battle for points. We already tried this in the beta and it wasn't fun.

Subject: Re: Suggestion for the forums
Posted by Goztow on Fri, 16 Feb 2007 10:03:15 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

In Spoony's proposal, it all doesn't matter. The one thing that matters is if your team wins. You will not get more or less points than the rest of your team. In my proposal, based on TK2's I-CW, I go one step further: all that matters is if u destroy buildings without loosing yours. Camping can give your team only 5 points out of the 35 that are availlable (a mere 14 percent). If you and your team want points, then killing buildings is what u need to do. Moreover, a team that is in defence most of the time because of campers but manages to sneak in and kill enemy buildings will actually get more ladder points allthough it may have lost the game.

Keep in mind that the points I show are distributed to each member of your team, not to

individuals who'd kill a building. No need to wait with remotes until the building is yellow to get the building kill: everyone of your team will get the same amount of points.

Other advantage: it doesn't matter if u play in 4v4 or 30v30, u can gain the same amount of points. One note though: 2v2 games or less shouldn't be accepted in the ladder: too easy to manipulate.

Marathon servers could possibly give out more points because all buildings need to go down before the game ends. Then again, those games often take a lot of time on maps like Under. In the time a marathon game on under may end, you could have played multiple games on another server with time limit.

To make it all a bit more fair u'll have to link the amount of points gained to the amount of time in the game. E.g. team wins 20 points, I was in-game half of the time the game took --> I get 10 points.

Needs tweaking, the "30 points" will prolly need to be 300 points or something so it needs tweaking but IMO the idea is fair.

Subject: Re: Suggestion for the forums
Posted by i0ncl0ud9 on Fri, 16 Feb 2007 18:28:23 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Crimson wrote on Fri, 16 February 2007 04:47Increasing the points for tanks encourages camping because while you are camping, you are destroying tanks... duh. Furthermore, the suggestion ALSO included reducing the amount of points for hitting a building so what would happen is no one would hit buildings and every map would be a tank battle for points. We already tried this in the beta and it wasn't fun.

Once again, a simple change in the mind of the person playing the game would easily fix this problem... For example, lets say that on field, gdi is camping...   How are they going to get points?   The only way with my point system that they would really be able to get points is by doing damage to a tank that had moved up. Since the base entrances are not exactly huge, Gdi would only be able to have at most 3 meds maybe hitting the people in the field, when there would like be almost 7 tanks in the field moved up on the gdi base. 7 tanks hitting 3 tanks will give more points then 3 tanks hitting 7 tanks... If they continue to hit the building because they are too unskilled to hit a moving object then they deserve to lose. How are tank battles in the field less fun than hitting buildings... are you serious? People would still hit buildings and eventually they would learn to adjust to hit the tanks when they showed themselves...

Subject: Re: Suggestion for the forums
Posted by Spoony on Fri, 16 Feb 2007 18:35:33 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

imho the only thing that's really wrong with the in-game points system is ramjets.

Subject: Re: Suggestion for the forums
Posted by =HT=T-Bird on Fri, 16 Feb 2007 21:20:08 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

MaidenTy1 wrote on Fri, 16 February 2007 12:35imho the only thing that's really wrong with the in-game points system is ramjets.
The rammy definitely needs to be toned down, as pwing tanks and Harvs with it hands out free points way too fast. Hint: If you want "free" points/credits in AOW, go repair your team's tanks/buildings.

Subject: Re: Suggestion for the forums
Posted by JPNOD on Fri, 16 Feb 2007 22:06:38 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

-Ramjets
-People who repair tanks in the field should get alot more points for repairing the tanks. (Buildings is ok)

But these are ingame changes and I doubt anyone would have the time/ abillity to fix all that and making the game maybe a bit better. I think the game is fine the way it is and I am really looking forward to the ladder, just because that has been a part of the game for.

Subject: Re: Suggestion for the forums
Posted by bisen11 on Sat, 17 Feb 2007 06:34:01 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Any points for the actual teamplayers who will rep freindly vehicles and buidlings? Rather than others who will just sit around and let a building die or let the enemy take the feild :/

Subject: Re: Suggestion for the forums
Posted by Crimson on Sat, 17 Feb 2007 07:44:53 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

OK, this is exactly why I do not want a public discussion for the ladder balancing. Too many cooks. After RenGuard 1.04 is released, I'll have Silent Kane's time to finish up LadderServ so we can make it live. After that, I will form a small committee to work on the ladder. These people will have the proper information they need to make an informed decision.