
Subject: W3D Engine Test
Posted by [Madtone](#) on Tue, 06 May 2003 01:30:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

hey guys...

ok heres the bottom line:

im developing a W3D Engine test map to see if the Renegade Engine can handle more than people give credit for.

i know this has been done before, but not on a proper map.

so once its done it will be a high poly deathmatch map.

here it is so far:

<http://modx.renevo.com/showthread.php?s=&threadid=289>

Subject: W3D Engine Test
Posted by [maytridy](#) on Tue, 06 May 2003 01:32:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

This test is gonna be fun! We'll let ya know the results.

Subject: W3D Engine Test
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Tue, 06 May 2003 01:59:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

...

Right...

W3D can handle up to 400,000 polygons, probably more, without any real problems. Materials and textures will cause issues at 400,000, though.

Subject: W3D Engine Test
Posted by [Madtone](#) on Tue, 06 May 2003 02:30:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

hmm, so how do you think you think it would go with only using one texture for the whole map?

EDIT

because i could use UVW Unwrap to do the whole map only using one texture, or use UVW mapping and make it so it use's the whole texture but only shows a part of it, like i used on my

Tactical Enforcer model!

Subject: W3D Engine Test

Posted by [Dante](#) on Tue, 06 May 2003 04:05:33 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

that isn't the issue, 400k poly's is easy to pull off... for a GF4 Ti

once you get into vid cards that people are actually using, you run into problems, i myself have a GF2 MX400, regular Ren maps i get about 60fps on 1024x768 screen, you bump up to a 400k poly map, i will crawl, don't matter if the engine can handle it, my vid card can't, and neither can alot of peoples.

Subject: W3D Engine Test

Posted by [Madtone](#) on Tue, 06 May 2003 04:44:06 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

ok guys, here is another thingy blingy.

Ok, im going to run a test, and i need volunteers.

This test will be to see how many polys each well known Gfx card can handle as well as textures.

Here is how i have thought it would go:

Stage 1 Testing.

A test map is created without textures(already doing) and then each tester downloads and tests it in a 1 player Lan game, records the FPS and any lag that the tester might be experiencing.

Then the testers get together and play it on a 8 player server, each tester records their FPS and any lag issues they may have.

Stage 2 Testing

The same steps as before but with a textured map.

Stage 3 Testing

A few more test maps are created without textures, but lowering the poly count for each map gradually to try and get the best results for the lower quality video cards.

Same steps as above are taken for each map

Stage 4 Testing

Same as above but with Textured maps.

Once all the testing has been complete the results are sent to me and then i make 3-4-5 tiers.
Each tier will include the poly count of the map that each video card got the best results on.

So say something like this (this is only dummy data!!):

```
=====
---Tier 1 - Polys 400,00---
Nvidia GeForce4 Ti
Nvidia GeForce3

---Tier 2 - Polys 100,000---
Nvidia GeForce1 Ti
Nvidia GeForce74 MX

---Tier 3 - Polys 70,000---
Nvidia GeForce1 Ti
Nvidia GeForce74 MX

---Tier 4 - Polys 10,000---
Nvidia GeForce1 Ti
Nvidia GeForce74 MX
=====
```

Then when a modder creates a map/mod, he give it a tier so that everyone knows weather or not their Gfx card can handle it or not.

Then also when a user goes to download the map/mod, he/she can see the tier, look up the tier on the table and then see if their Gfx card is listed and under what tier so they know if its a waste of time downloading it.

I will make a new post recruiting testers soon.....

EDIT

Please also submit any ideas/suggesions you may have!

Subject: W3D Engine Test
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Tue, 06 May 2003 06:06:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Really pointless. Who actually makes maps higher than 70,000 polygons?

I've never made any map that went above 27,000 polygons. There's absolutely no need for it.

Subject: W3D Engine Test

Posted by [Madtone](#) on Tue, 06 May 2003 06:31:04 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

But think of the possibilities....

People would be able to make HUGE maps with High polygonal Eye candy, and spectacular terrains and buildings.

This would enable Modders to create bigger and better things for the peeps with Higher quality vid cards.

Just imagine wondering through a huge map that is great to play on, with lots of things to look at (and to shoot too).

You could go into so much detail!!

Its great that you stick to 27,000 and under, you got a much better chance for more peeps to play on them, but what about the modders who want to create a high polygonal map that is good on the eye?

I for one would like to see what people would be able to do without having to work under a certain limit.

Subject: W3D Engine Test

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Tue, 06 May 2003 06:40:44 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

What possibilities? That's elaborate crap that isn't needed in Renegade.

Everyone has to make maps that are under a certain polygonal limit. Most people have a decent gaming rig, and if you're making maps for anyone but them... You might as well not even bother making maps for Renegade.

You don't need that much detail in Renegade... There is absolutely, truly, no need for it.

Subject: W3D Engine Test

Posted by [JRPereira](#) on Tue, 06 May 2003 07:48:45 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I agree, more polygons and higher resolution textures aren't really necessary, nor can the average machine handle it (at least with direct3D anyways).

If you want to improve Renegade, force EA to rewrite the movement netcode so I'm not constantly dragged to my death and rewrite graphics engine so it uses OpenGL.

Subject: W3D Engine Test
Posted by [PiMuRho](#) on Tue, 06 May 2003 10:09:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

JRPereiral rewrite graphics engine so it uses OpenGL.

Why?

Subject: W3D Engine Test
Posted by [JRPereira](#) on Tue, 06 May 2003 10:52:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

OpenGL is more refined in many ways, and from all of the games I've seen so far, it makes more use of the GPU than d3d -- especially for processing textures (among other things).

Don't forget that d3d was originally designed to work without any hardware acceleration. Microsoft still has a ways to go before they can mix compatability with performance.

Subject: W3D Engine Test
Posted by [PiMuRho](#) on Tue, 06 May 2003 10:58:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

OpenGL development has been stalled for quite a while now. DirectX has continued to evolve way past the original specifications - why do you think that the vast majority of game engines use Direct 3D?

Subject: W3D Engine Test
Posted by [Halo38](#) on Tue, 06 May 2003 16:44:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

A while back s8mirknk (can't remember his name) got in contact with some guy (chuck i think) and he developed a proof of concept using high poly counts and limited textures and material types for ren 2 i'm trying a simalar concept on a DM i have planned.

Subject: W3D Engine Test
Posted by [Madtone](#) on Wed, 07 May 2003 22:54:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Halo38A while back s8mirknk (can't remember his name) got in contact with some guy (chuck i think) and he developed a proof of concept using high poly counts and limited textures and material types for ren 2 i'm trying a simalar concept on a DM i have planned.

Thats exactly what i have done!!!!!!

i have finished the first test map (non-textured version), i will make a new post on it in a few mins!

Subject: W3D Engine Test

Posted by [Carl](#) on Thu, 08 May 2003 00:26:52 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Aircraftkiller...

Right...

W3D can handle up to 400,000 polygons, probably more, without any real problems. Materials and textures will cause issues at 400,000, though.

Hmmm seems your westwood cronies didnt let you in on all the secrets Jonathan.

But you wouldn't care about that now would you.

There are ways to get your good textures on there and keep your fps down. It jsut takes some DEVOTED time. Given the difficulty, and considering i dont even really understand what i have just scratched the surface of, at this point posting it here would be of no use. however if you want to play with it yourself ack, let me know and i will fill you in.

Then again, your more about being popular, not pleasant.

AircraftkillerWhat possibilities? That's elaborate crap that isn't needed in Renegade.

Everyone has to make maps that are under a certain polygonal limit. Most people have a decent gaming rig, and if you're making maps for anyone but them... You might as well not even bother making maps for Renegade.

You don't need that much detail in Renegade... There is absolutely, truly, no need for it.

The sheer narrow-mindedness displayed in this statement is appalling.

What possibilities?

Well, lets say, vast underground maze complexes.not just an unrealistic squar tube. i dont care what you say, but it makes a difference running through a rocky tunnel. It is what we like to call an effect of realism.

Imagine being able to have TRUE grass blades on your map. Talk about an on-edge map. Running around in tall grass where if someone crouches you cant see them. Now that ack is something i have seen MANY games, such as delta-force do extremely well. And the effect it adds to gameplay is insumountable. something so simple, yet so profound in terms of gameplay.

To say that no one needs and/or wants higher poly maps is just like IBM saying people don't need computers in their home.

Subject: W3D Engine Test

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Thu, 08 May 2003 00:37:08 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Please shut up... You're posting my name like you actually know me, and you know jack shit.

Westwood cronies? I speak with people who *made this engine and designed things for it* unlike yourself. So who's right here?

It probably isn't you. Why? You said "You can get your good looking textures blah blah blah..."

I said nothing about the way the textures look. That has nothing to do with it. Each texture is the same regardless... There's no difference between a no-alpha 128x128 texture and another no-alpha 128. They're the same size, they take the same amount of time to load, and they also take the same amount of processing power.

Multiple materials, e.g. what you get when applying a material to an object in Max, will slow down the game engine. It has to process more than just the graduation of light across the verts, it also has to process the way the materials affect the light on the verts and any associated textures belonging to the material.

The textures affect it even more so. 1024x1024 textures will tear the engine apart and bring a GF4 to its knees...

But no, don't listen to me. I don't know anything at all, but you do. After all, you're just scratching the surface of the engine, aren't you? That's how you know *so very much* about W3D and its iterations.

:rolleyes:

Wow, great edit after I posted... Not.

Guess what? You don't *need* polygons to create grass blades, you fucking retard. You can create textures to make foliage in maps. It isn't difficult at all. Have you seen Beach? River Canyon? Both make use of grass that allows you to hide, yet the way the textures are used, they do not strain the engine... Why? Because I know what I'm doing with the engine.

No one needs high-polygon maps. Pi can attest to that... What use are they? We're not working on renders of game levels. We're working on game levels. Guess what? Every game level has low polygonal usage. That's what you have to accept and remember when making maps, because what will you do when you have your pretty little map give people four frames a second because the buildings (About 10,000 polygons and more by themselves), vehicles (Sixteen vehicles is about 12,000 polygons) and players (A full 32 player game has about 16,000 polygons worth of players) and weapons (First person and third amount to about 7,000 polygons) will make for

incredibly shitty framerates. Unless you've magically figured out how to make vis occlude everything without actually rendering more than it should... You're not going to get anything about 4-10 FPS.

So good luck wanting high-polygon maps, except most people with a decent gaming computer cannot even pull off more than 45 FPS on a 30,000 polygon map. Factor in the gameplay elements and special effects, and you've got a recipe for disaster.

But of course, I don't know what I'm talking about.

:rolleyes:

Subject: W3D Engine Test

Posted by [Madtone](#) on Thu, 08 May 2003 00:44:04 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

CarlAircraftkiller...

Right...

W3D can handle up to 400,000 polygons, probably more, without any real problems. Materials and textures will cause issues at 400,000, though.

Hmmm seems your westwood cronies didnt let you in on all the secrets Jonathan.

But you wouldn't care about that now would you.

There are ways to get your good textures on there and keep your fps down. It jsut takes some DEVOTED time. Given the difficulty, and considering i dont even really understand what i have just scratched the surface of, at this point posting it here would be of no use. however if you want to play with it yourself ack, let me know and i will fill you in.

Then again, your more about being popular, not pleasant.

AircraftkillerWhat possibilities? That's elaborate crap that isn't needed in Renegade.

Everyone has to make maps that are under a certain polygonal limit. Most people have a decent gaming rig, and if you're making maps for anyone but them... You might as well not even bother making maps for Renegade.

You don't need that much detail in Renegade... There is absolutely, truly, no need for it.

The sheer narrow-mindedness displayed in this statement is appalling.

What possibilities?

Well, lets say, vast underground maze complexes.not just an unrealistic squar tube. i dont care

what you say, but it makes a difference running through a rocky tunnel. It is what we like to call an effect of realism.

Imagine being able to have TRUE grass blades on your map. Talk about an on-edge map. Running around in tall grass where if someone crouches you cant see them. Now that ack is something i have seen MANY games, such as delta-force do extremely well. And the effect it adds to gameplay is insumountable. something so simple, yet so profound in terms of gameplay.

To say that no one needs and/or wants higher poly maps is just like IBM saying people dont need computers in their home.

Thanks you, im very happy to hear someone also see the possibility!!

ok guys i have uploaded the .3ds of the poly test map, im just getting someone to convert it into a playble map.

if you wanna see a render:
<http://modx.renevo.com/showthread.php?s=&threadid=296>

like i said "Test Map" so yeha it will be basic!

will tell you when its done!

Subject: W3D Engine Test
Posted by [Carl](#) on Thu, 08 May 2003 00:46:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

again ack your idiocy never ceases to amaze me. First of all it has nothign to do with multimaterials in max. Im not stupid enough to thing that those dont kill a GF4. And i wasnt referring to the resolution of textures either. And when i was talking about your textures, i was referring to your badly mapped textures on your maps.

Subject: W3D Engine Test
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Thu, 08 May 2003 00:49:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You're the only one who complains about stock Westwood textures or ones I create myself...

...As you're the texture god around here, with your empty-hands as your show of experience.

I don't care if you're not referring to the texture resolution or the materials. You cannot have a map with textures without using materials, and you cannot have textures in a map without having a texture with a resolution on it.

Therefore, everything I said tied in to what you said...

STFU n00b.

Subject: W3D Engine Test

Posted by [Carl](#) on Thu, 08 May 2003 00:53:22 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

okay you just made a complete ass of yourself. i never said they didnt have resolution and i never said they werent materials. i said they werent MULTImaterials and i said the resolution had nothing to do with what i was talking about.

And i made no complaints about the stock WS textures. I made complaints about the way you map them.

And i never claimed to be the texture god. although i do admit, i am better than you. Nothing to show for it? im not exactly a skilled 3d modeler. Send me a mesh and i will texture the hell out of it. knock your socks off.

Subject: W3D Engine Test

Posted by [Madtone](#) on Thu, 08 May 2003 00:53:53 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Come on guys, i really don't want this to turn into a flame!

Subject: W3D Engine Test

Posted by [Carl](#) on Thu, 08 May 2003 00:58:37 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

it turned into a flame the moment ack entered the thread.

Subject: W3D Engine Test

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Thu, 08 May 2003 01:00:46 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Carlokay you just made a complete ass of yourself. i never said they didnt have resolution and i never said they werent materials. i said they werent MULTImaterials and i said the resolution had nothing to do with what i was talking about.

And i made no complaints about the stock WS textures. I made complaints about the way you map them.

And i never claimed to be the texture god. although i do admit, i am better than you. Nothing to

Take it up with him. I'm defending myself.

I'm not saying you can't...well.....I guess I am.

Ok, all I really like to see is that it's taken to some place else, irc room, diff topic here, PM, whatever, so the topic doesn't turn into a total flame fest and people can still discuss about the topic at hand.

Subject: W3D Engine Test

Posted by [Madtone](#) on Thu, 08 May 2003 01:08:32 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

[REHTSpirit]AircraftkillerWhy? I'm not backing down because some shit-for-brains motherfucker comes in here and starts preaching about things he doesn't know jack-shit about...

Take it up with him. I'm defending myself.

I'm not saying you can't...well.....I guess I am.

Ok, all I really like to see is that it's taken to some place else, irc room, diff topic here, PM, whatever, so the topic doesn't turn into a total flame fest and people can still discuss about the topic at hand.

Couldn't of put it better my self!

Subject: W3D Engine Test

Posted by [Carl](#) on Thu, 08 May 2003 01:11:54 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

AircraftkillerCarlo okay you just made a complete ass of yourself. i never said they didnt have resolution and i never said they werent materials. i said they werent MULTImaterials and i said the resolution had nothing to do with what i was talking about.

And i made no complaints about the stock WS textures. I made complaints about the way you map them.

And i never claimed to be the texture god. although i do admit, i am better than you. Nothing to show for it? im not exactly a skilled 3d modeler. Send me a mesh and i will texture the hell out of it. knock your socks off.

Yes, I made an ass of myself... Just remember that you're the one who knows nothing about W3D, yet you're sitting here preaching to me about how you're barely figuring out textures and how they're mapped.

I have figured out quite a few diff ways for texturing and im not sure whats the best so far, will soon see!

Subject: W3D Engine Test

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Thu, 08 May 2003 02:05:02 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yes, this mysterious method Carl has...

You didn't come up with a concept. Holding a carrot in front of someone with their eyes blindfolded isn't a concept. That's being a jackass, and that's exactly what you are.

You began all of this by attacking me... So don't start what you can't finish, assrammer.

Subject: W3D Engine Test

Posted by [Madtone](#) on Thu, 08 May 2003 02:09:10 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

AircraftkillerYes, this mysterious method Carl has...

You didn't come up with a concept. Holding a carrot in front of someone with their eyes blindfolded isn't a concept. That's being a jackass, and that's exactly what you are.

You began all of this by attacking me... So don't start what you can't finish, assrammer.

Would you stop if i gave you a cookie? Trust me its a uberly nice, one of a kind Choc Chip cookie!!!

How does that sound?

Subject: W3D Engine Test

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Thu, 08 May 2003 02:31:19 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

:rolleyes:

Subject: W3D Engine Test

Posted by [JRPereira](#) on Thu, 08 May 2003 03:12:27 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Just give him a box of tiberios. They're mutogenically delicious!

Subject: W3D Engine Test

Posted by [PiMuRho](#) on Thu, 08 May 2003 07:34:26 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ack is correct. Raw polygons themselves are pretty meaningless - your video card will slow down when there's a whole load of textures waiting to be drawn to the screen - it's memory bandwidth we're talking about here. What's even worse than that is multi-pass textures, where any polys have to be redrawn for each material pass.

It doesn't matter what method you use for texturing - UVW maps are basically just projections. Each texture you have stored in the frame buffer (video memory) slows you down when it's drawn. The bigger the texture, the slower it draws (keep them under 512x512)

Ack is also right about the non-map polycounts - you have to bear in mind that your 30,000 polygon map is going to be filled with people and tanks, with a combined polycount that almost equals that of your map (and could even exceed it on larger servers)

Another reason you want to avoid high-poly maps in Renegade is the VIS system. It's not very good. In an engine like UT2003, you can have two rooms each with 20,000 polys, and the engine will only draw one. In Renegade, it's quite possible that it'll draw both...

This whole thing is moot anyway - you're not testing the engine's ability at all, but that of people's systems. W3D has no hard-coded polygon limit. If you want to make a high-detail map, get clever. Brute force is the worst way to do it. There's a whole load of little techniques you can use to make areas look more detailed than they actually are.

Subject: W3D Engine Test

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Thu, 08 May 2003 08:00:00 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Lets see Carl argue with that.

But aren't you wrong too? After all, Carl's mysterious method is the best! It cannot possibly be wrong!

:rolleyes:

Regardless, you can make Renegade's vis system operate rather well if you become very familiar with it. It all depends on how you construct the vis sectors and how you place manual correction points. The better you work with it, the more you learn and the more effective the vis system becomes.

It's entirely possible to make the vis work exactly the way you want it to... It'll just take some ass-whipping to get it into shape.

Subject: W3D Engine Test

Posted by [PiMuRho](#) on Thu, 08 May 2003 09:45:55 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

That's probably right about vis, but unless I get a huge chunk of free time anytime soon, I won't be making any more Renegade maps, which is a shame as I've got one about 80% done that I just haven't got time to finish off.

Subject: W3D Engine Test

Posted by [Javafx](#) on Thu, 08 May 2003 11:13:21 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Aircraftkiller It'll just take some ass-whipping to get it into shape.

Same with your mom.

Subject: W3D Engine Test

Posted by [Carl](#) on Thu, 08 May 2003 16:12:50 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

trying to use my not telling everyone what is is as an excuse is bullshit.

I said in my VERY FIRST post that i wouldn't post it publicly because its still just being played with, and i dont have anything written down. I DID however say that, if YOU ACK wanted to know more about it, all you need do is ask, and when i find spare time in my busy life, between school, and my 8 hour a day job, i will tell you what i can.

But instead of asking me what was up, you automatically naysay everything i say.

Thats fine ack, you will be the one shitting your pants when you see it.

Subject: W3D Engine Test

Posted by [Carl](#) on Thu, 08 May 2003 16:16:37 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Aircraftkiller You didn't come up with a concept. Holding a carrot in front of someone with their eyes blindfolded isn't a concept. That's being a jackass, and that's exactly what you are.

Wow, seems you just described yourself. I remember people having to give you EXTREME

amounts of grief before you released YOUR E3 HoN. And you always talk about how you know so many perfect ways to do vis, and all this other stuff. So why dont YOU start sharing?

Oh but wait. Then there might be people who actually make stuff BETTER than you.

Subject: W3D Engine Test

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Thu, 08 May 2003 19:53:30 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

PiMuRhoThat's probably right about vis, but unless I get a huge chunk of free time anytime soon, I won't be making any more Renegade maps, which is a shame as I've got one about 80% done that I just haven't got time to finish off.

Send it my way and I'll check it out... If you want to, that is.

Point, meet Carl. Carl, meet Point. You two should get acquainted.

Subject: W3D Engine Test

Posted by [lmdgr8one](#) on Thu, 08 May 2003 21:12:09 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Cuss Count: 93
