
Subject: Some balance things I've been thinking about
Posted by [iRANian](#) on Thu, 13 Apr 2017 16:40:02 GMT

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

wrong subforum

moved to: http://www.renegadeforums.com/index.php?t=msg&goto=492184&#msg_492184

Subject: Re: Some balance things I've been thinking about
Posted by [dblaney1](#) on Thu, 13 Apr 2017 17:43:40 GMT

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

The 1/4th damage thing you can fix in your servers ddb file. Just change the collision multiplier from 0.25 to 1.0. Thats what I did on my server. Doesn't affect range of damage at all. The issue is that theres an object in the way of the explosion and the player so the collision multiplier kicks in.

Screenshake is enabled. There is just the option for servers to turn it off.

None of this is really TT issues though. You can change almost all of this with a custom objects.ddb or with server plugins. If you include that objects.ddb in a tfts package it even applies the changes client side so things like screenshake etc apply as well. You can even make the scopes standardized by including the hud_sniper.dds in your tfts package if you really want to. I have one on my server actually. Its a semi clearscope though. clear middle with dimmed sides around the circle.

Subject: Re: Some balance things I've been thinking about
Posted by [iRANian](#) on Thu, 13 Apr 2017 17:53:33 GMT

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

Yeah I know about that. Only issue is non-4.0 players...you'll have to test with non-4.0 so the server doesn't think they're damage hacking if you accidentally modify non-splash damage. Although you can change the client-side damage server-side with a server damage hook.

There's also issues with changing HP on units (won't update on their client) and with changing unit speed (causes lag?) with non-4.0. Also things like range won't update for non-4.0 players. But it's do-able. If you enable screenshake but disable it for arties with a objects.ddb tfts then obviously that won't update for non-4.0.

Got a lot more things I've been thinking about, gonna type them out at a later date.

Subject: Re: Some balance things I've been thinking about
Posted by [dblaney1](#) on Thu, 13 Apr 2017 17:54:48 GMT

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

Non 4.0 players need to get scripts. There is very few of them left anyway. Especially considering almost every server runs a few non stock maps.

Subject: Re: Some balance things I've been thinking about
Posted by [iRANian](#) on Thu, 13 Apr 2017 17:55:23 GMT

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

dblaney1 wrote on Thu, 13 April 2017 10:54Non 4.0 players need to get scripts. There is very few of them left anyway. Especially considering almost every server runs a few non stock maps. Yeah true. I just want them to be able to join the servers, don't care that they're disadvantaged a little bit.

BTW I know everything I typed is do-able server-side mostly with extras for client-side which non-4.0 will lack a bit. Just didn't want to point it out.

Subject: Re: Some balance things I've been thinking about
Posted by [dblaney1](#) on Thu, 13 Apr 2017 17:56:38 GMT

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

iRANian wrote on Thu, 13 April 2017 10:55dblaney1 wrote on Thu, 13 April 2017 10:54Non 4.0 players need to get scripts. There is very few of them left anyway. Especially considering almost every server runs a few non stock maps. Yeah true. I just want them to be able to join the servers, don't care that they're disadvantaged a little bit.

They should still be able to join just fine as long as you don't add presets and have those presets spawned.

Subject: Re: Some balance things I've been thinking about
Posted by [iRANian](#) on Thu, 13 Apr 2017 18:03:11 GMT

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

Yeah indeed...main issue is that your need to test everything with 1.037 stock and with scripts 3.3.4 to check if there aren't any odd things. For example 1.037 stock, 3.3.4 and 4.0 all behave differently when modifying weapon clips and weapon ammo. Other things like changing unit speed and range need to be tested too etc..

Tank turrets move almost instantly on scripts 3.3.4 which is extremely gay..was fixed in 4.0 after I pointed it out but it's one big exploit.

Subject: Re: Some balance things I've been thinking about

Posted by [iRANian](#) on Thu, 13 Apr 2017 18:09:31 GMT

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

Oh oops i posted this in the wrong forum....can someone move this to the Tactics & Strategy forums?

I didn't mean to suggest these changes for 4.0...LOL

Subject: Re: Some balance things I've been thinking about

Posted by [XD_ERROR_XD](#) on Fri, 14 Apr 2017 07:47:07 GMT

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

Okay...

mine related discussion:

iRANian wrote on Thu, 13 April 2017 09:40Proxy c4 ought to have 1 or 2 proxies before refill...so you can't just place proxies inside enemy buildings or around the field...using proxy c4 offensively is so lame.

The bug where Proxy C4 has a lot of range above characters need to be fixed..I've fixed it before by patching the detonate code for proxy C4 and lowering the Z-height distance check. This can prevent the gay shit where people place mines above doors.

Another issue is that if you hug a wall you take like 1/4th of the damage from a proxy C4...that ought to be fixed by lowering the range of Proxy C4 and boosting the damage output.

Remote C4 and Proxy C4 mine limit ought to be separated. Remote C4 limit ought to be per player instead of per team...4 remotes per player or something. C4 mine limit needs to be map dependent and higher than it is now. Ought to be able to mine all doors (+ stairs on flying maps) with 5 proxy c4's over. There ought to be a timed c4 limit of say 6 per player to prevent people 'vomiting' timed c4.

Proxy C4 planted on vehicles ought to be immediately disarmed. The game designers didn't think people would place ANY c4 on vehicles...as before TT scripts 4.0 (when WD fixed it) C4 would disappear if the planting location would be too far away from the current location (attached to vehicle).

When you plant a remote, timed c4 or proxy c4 it should show you the limit the c4 limits for that player/team. When you shoot a friendly c4 or press E on it, it should show you the player name of who planted it and the position of the proxy c4 in the mine limit queue (whether it was planted early or late).

You should be able to disarm your own c4 by shooting it or pressing 'E' on it.

When a player leaves the server his proxy c4 shouldn't disarm.

Lowering mine capacity makes the mining a chore. Checking when each mine is going to disappear as not to make important mines disappear is a chore. Pressing E to disarm your own mines however is definitely not a chore! Chores \neq fun, games should be played to be fun and engaging, chores are not engaging, they take you away from the core gameplay. Flaming vehicles is disallowed and I haven't seen anyone do it in RC for weeks. Remote and Proxy C4 separation is already possible, and is being applied on RC, but remotes are not per-player. I have no objection against making remotes per-player, just increase the limit to 6 because mummies and possibly the demolition kit crate. Hasn't recently a plugin been released that allows mines of people that left to remain in the game?

Mining the top of the doors can be circumvented... by making them blow behind cover, while retaining the maximum distance possible. Jumping right next to the door will kill you, jumping as far away from the door, blowing each mine 1 by 1 theoretically should make you take the same amount of damage, but it doesn't, you're safe actually. This is where two of your suggestions kind of nullify each other. You need proxies to deal less damage behind cover, otherwise cleverly placed mines become a bit **too** powerful... Why am I saying this while the multiplier is 0.25? Observations. And I can't provide solid proof, only experience. My observations tell me that it doesn't matter how close you are to a mine that's on the floor, that blows behind cover, it always deals roughly the same damage. Mines that blow that are closer to your chest/head will deal proportionally more damage, the closer you are while detonation. But don't mines always blow at the same distance? Maybe it's related to your Z-axis fix, I dunno. Is the pythagorean theorem a possible explanation? I'm not sure. Is it something TT can patch? absolutely, but it needs to be done cleverly.

pointsmod related discussion:

iRANian wrote on Thu, 13 April 2017 09:40

pointsmod is very lame and makes the game less fun, you get rewarded for repairing, shooting enemy buildings and destroying vehicles. Problem is most of the time you are teaming up with other players to destroy a vehicle and you won't get the credits for destroying it. Another issue is that if enemy tanks have Techs repairing them you won't be able to destroy them and you basically get no creds and no points lol. Creds are extremely slow on pointsmod servers which is why they run 2.5 creds a sec.

Another huge problem is that if your team has field and isn't destroying enemy tanks and isn't hitting enemy buildings...your team will start losing on points if the enemy get more vehicles kills than you. Pointsmod doesn't reward your team for field control, it always needs to be field control + shooting enemy buildings. You get almost no points/creds when using tanks defensively or not destroying enemy tanks lol.

With pointsmod, ramjet rifles need to be modded so they don't give insane creds/points...easy to do server-side. I'd also mod mammoth tank to give less points.

Okay... just to make sure, points*mod* Is the **fix** to the oversight(?) that certain warheads have a much higher credits multiplier, than points multiplier on armour, no? Or is it the addition that points made by destroying stuff is shared equally amongst players?

I don't really see your point here. If you have the advantage, and decide to jerk off with it and do

nothing (if you have the field, you can shoot buildings pretty reliably unless we're talking Under, period), aren't you supposed to lose to points? If you have the field, but you lose tanks and the defender has more tanks to assault than you, shouldn't you eventually lose the field? This is not balance related, it's teamplay related, which sometimes is severely lacking in public games. Some of your complaints is what AOW makes AOW. Defending in AOW is not always a disadvantage, you can have more tanks to defend than the assaulter but he keeps the field because they put 4 techs on 2 tanks. All of this is related to strategy and teamplay, which is what Renegade makes Renegade. Too bad competitive play is dead, this would solve most of your issues.

Don't trade shots if you take two shots in return for every shot you take. Don't trade shots if you can't kill that arty in your med, he'll deal more damage per shot and win by points. Don't trade shots if you're a sakura worth 100 points and fight a shotgunner worth 3 points. If he kills you once for every 30 kills, you still lose by points.

more discussion:

iRANian wrote on Thu, 13 April 2017 09:40

Creds should be about 2 creds per tick with PP. The Game should show the floating point value up to 2 numbers after the dot. so instead of showing "150" creds it should show "150.55" for example. Little nitpick of mine.

The following changes are really needed for marathon and longer than 40 min AOW games:

If PP is dead...cred income should be about 1.5 creds per tick and the Harvester ought to move slower by about 30-40%. 1 creds per tick is way too low if your team doesn't have field control. You're basically fucked if you don't have field control and pp is down.

If refinery is dead, you should be getting 0.5 creds per tick instead of 0 per tick.

If Barracks is dead you ought to be able to buy Gunner/LCG for 1600, tech char with less health (200 HP?) for 1500, 1 shot sniper/ramjet for 1500-2000. They can't pick up any weapons and neither can basic infantry if barracks is dead.

If wf/air is dead you ought to be able to buy vehicles for triple the price every 2 minutes or so...they will be transported in by Chinook.

I'd add extra versions of map server-side Guard Towers/Turret to every rush map plus some base defense maps like Hourglass (and disable agt/Obelisk on those maps).

Sounds like Renegade X would be right up your alley with these suggestions. Of course there are other things that I guess would ruin the game for you...

I do agree that some buildings punish you too harshly if you lose it. I hate how destroying the PP kills off the AGT and Obelisk entirely + destroys economy, It has too large of an effect. I would keep the guns of the AGT online and take the missile offline (because machineguns require less power? I dunno), and either drastically reduce the obby damage, or increase the charge time. Or, just make it less heavy on economy.

map variations:

iRANian wrote on Thu, 13 April 2017 09:40

****NOTE:** I would increase the HP of Turrets and Guard Towers by 4-5 times.

I'd think it would be pretty interesting to play variations of rush maps with guard tower/turret and play base defence maps without agt/ob but with Guard Towers and Ob (or with no base defenses at all). So 2 variations of rush maps (no BD && Guard Tower/Turret) and 3 for base defence maps (BD, no BD && Guard Tower/Turret).

I would always disable AGT/OB on Hourglass, with two variations with no BD at all and AGT/OB. For HourGlass I would add server-side code which prevents players from hitting ref/pp from hill....but allow them to hit the other buildings from hill.

An interesting variation of HourGlass could be holing off the sides of the map with containers so you can only go on hill and on tunnel. Another variation could be holing off the hill so you can only go sides. Would be a funny clusterfuck.

I would have a variation of Volcano where players take no damage from Tib Field. I would have a variation of City_Fly/City without Stanks. I would also have a variation of Walls flying without flying units.

Another variation of City Fly/City would be holing off the WF and Hand sides so you can't rush WF and hand from them. Another variation would be to holing off bridge so you can't use it.

Glacier flying should be changed so that all the gay back-entries are disabled...by placing some containers in the tunnels to block them off. This can be another variation as well. Plus a variation with no tunnels and no BD and a variation with no tunnels and only guard tower/turret.

A variation of Under could be holing off the hill area or the far side area where the bunkers are. Another variation could be where tib field does no damage.

Other variations could be adding invincible repair bays to maps.

Variations, why not! But who's going to make it, and who's going to make sure that it'll work for people who don't run TT 4.0+? I'm not saying this for the Bryans amongst us, but for the potentially new players that Renegade is a cool game to try out but doesn't know what scripts is *yet*. Effectively blocking new players from both servers that actually gets players puts them completely in the dark, which will definitely put a dent in the playercount in the long run. Yes, new players *still* do reach this game.

Other gameplay discussion:

iRANian wrote on Thu, 13 April 2017 09:40

The logic to destroy vehicles that have been flipped ought to be removed, I really don't see the benefit.

Screenshake needs to be enabled but Arty screenshake needs to be reduced.

pic/railgun are cheap as fuck against vehicles, no skill required...especially if you have light tank + railgun and you just repshoot.

Crates should always spawn in the middle (with multiple sites in middle) and the first crate(s) in the game need to be money. No death crate and no spy crate..

When game starts, there should be a 30 second countdown so everyone can load the game...and the first spawn on map load should be in the middle of the base outside so you don't get gay shit where people spawn in the back of the base and even after suiciding spawn in back of base.

Suicide should take about 5-10 seconds and not take all your money.

Tanks (except Arty) don't have enough range on their splash so it's incredibly hard to kill infantry (especially techs/hotwire).

The emitters for rocket and shell impact, flamethrower, chemsprayer etc is way too bright and white...there's a fix for it but most servers don't allow it.

I think clearscope ought to be banned...sniping is way too easy with clearscope.

SBH make the game a lot less fun...ought to be removed. Alternative would be to increase the cost, remove ability to enter vehicle, remove ability to pick up weapons and crates, reduce HP (200?) and remove timed C4 and maybe pistol. If fake beacons are removed it should be okay.

I'm currently in a position where I can't enable screenshake, but do think it's a cool effect because of nostalgic value and video making. I'd love to make some trailers and parodies including screenshake, but 4.0 simply doesn't have a client-side option to enable screenshake. I find this very disappointing. So I have to download Scripts 3.4.4 to enable Screenshake, and (hopefully) again access to the HUD console command. But, there's no download that I can find on google, only a repository I know exists and I have no idea how to find it.

Pics/railguns are cheap as fuck on some maps, especially with tanks. But there's a server-side option to disable tank reloading when the vehicle is empty. RC hasn't enabled this. Limited ammo has also been disabled, which is okay for quick-and-dirty games but turns BD maps in such a huge stalemate... it's too easy to hold a field and not get rushed.

Splash is a double-edged sword. Change it, and you make some people happy, others unhappy. Just save everyone the effort and keep it as it is. Also, fuck white smoke to hell. completely covers your screen in anything more than a 1v1.

Clearscope... I use a mod that removes the green night-vision effect but keeps the black outline with a very small opacity. removing the black and night-vision entirely... I don't have too much of an opinion on that.

Flipped tank destruction can already be disabled, in I believe DA? RC doesn't do this however.

SBH is too big of a subject to discuss, and would be a very opinionated discussion. Too many gray lines.

Subject: Re: Some balance things I've been thinking about

Posted by [iRANian](#) on Fri, 14 Apr 2017 11:03:40 GMT

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

Flipped tank destruction can be disabled in TT server in the TT.INI file or whatever it's called.

The screenshake thing can be done with tfts objects.ddb...basically 4.0 clients download a server specific objects.ddb file when joining the server..it has all the screenshake enabled except for arty.

With splash range it shouldn't be that much of an issue. The main problem is that it will still be hard to kill Hotwires behind mammoth tanks.

The proxy c4 not disarming when leaving plugin was released by me a few years ago, WhiteDragon and I worked on it and WhiteDragon pointed out something crucial to get it working.

C4 is based on distance yes but it's only checked once per server frame, if SFPS is 60 it's about every 16.6ms.

The map variations can be done server-side...because you're just adding objects (Guard Tower/Turret, container etc) which are already part of the game, you just spawn them at game start.

pointsmod changes the way the game calculates points (and you get credits from getting points), normally you get a lot of points for damaging green health, less when damaging yellow health and even less when damaging red health. But with pointsmod it's a constant low amount of points.

I don't see how lowering proxy c4 ammo to 2 makes mining a chore...you just refill almost immediately. I guess when mining stairs it's a bit of an issue.

I've fixed the proxy c4 door issue before on my test server years back by reimplementing the logic for proxy c4 detonation so the Z-height (vertical height check) is decreased..that fixed it.

I don't want to be concerned about there being mines i can't see above doors that's why i want to have it fixed.

You can only constantly shoot enemy buildings if you have field if the enemy team sucks really bad...which is why the original score system gives you a lot of points for shooting green health vehicles...so you get points damaging enemy tanks defending. With pointsmod you can just camp your entrance with teched up tanks and win on points if you block your harvester.

Yeah it's possible to disable tank reload on neutral vehicles with TT...but that's not an issue. The issue is that PIC and railgun are instant hit and do 80 hp damage. I'd rather have a rocket launcher do a lot of damage because they actually take SOME skill to use. If you fight tanks you can dodge their shells but against PIC/railgun it's instahit??? fucking dumb.

Well for scope u need to have both the green and the black outline imo. Infinite ammo is pretty dumb on pic/railgun and snipers.

Subject: Re: Some balance things I've been thinking about
Posted by [XD_ERROR_XD](#) on Fri, 14 Apr 2017 11:25:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

pointsmod only affected certain warheads, this excludes vehicle shells from getting disproportionate points and credits. Automatic rifles, chainguns, flechettes, sniper rifles and other infantry weapons were affected. It's absolutely crazy that a ramjet can earn 22.5 credits per shot on a Stank which has armour remaining because the game thought it dealt 200 damage instead of 5.

You're suggesting that pointsmod fixes economy, and while it definitely did help speed up the game's economy, it does force you to deal shit damage against armoured vehicles to earn any kind of credits, which negatively affects the gameplay. After all, you're just shooting a medium tank with an autorifle, instead of doing other things.

The need for an economy fix was what made points"bug" useful in Marathon games where both teams had no ref and were pretty much broke. But there's more ways to fix a single problem. per example, you can either make building destruction less harsh, or you can make killing free infantry more rewarding, so instead of 3 credits/points you would get 10 credits/points per kill. Yes, it's not much, but if you have nothing else to shoot...

Lowering mines to 2 is not always a chore, like when the PT is next to the door you want to mine. But what if you want to mine base entrances? You'd easily spend 5 minutes putting 30 mines on the Walls base entrance.

You can't disarm mines on the door by using Third Person mode. But, you can using First Person mode and crouching! Try it at your own building, it works wonders. No time to disarm, or too lazy? Use my trick instead! You may lose half your health or more but it'll get the job done in less than 10 seconds.

Subject: Re: Some balance things I've been thinking about
Posted by [iRANian](#) on Fri, 14 Apr 2017 12:16:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I think you are completely misreading the pointsmod text LOL. I already mentioned fixing the ramjet points issue..which I've done before years back on my test server by adding a server side damage hook.

I don't understand your text about the proxy c4 mining above doors exploit...why not just fix it?

You're...not supposed to mine base entrance. Your supposed to mine the doors. This is why having SBHs is such an issue with the game of course.

Subject: Re: Some balance things I've been thinking about
Posted by [XD_ERROR_XD](#) on Fri, 14 Apr 2017 13:25:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

XD_ERROR_XD wrote on Fri, 14 April 2017 04:25pointsmod only affected certain warheads, this excludes vehicle shells from getting disproportionate points and credits. Automatic rifles, chainguns, flechettes, sniper rifles and other infantry weapons were affected. It's absolutely crazy that a ramjet can earn 22.5 credits per shot on a Stank which has armour remaining because the game thought it dealt 200 damage instead of 5.

You're suggesting that pointsmod fixes economy, and while it definitely did help speed up the game's economy, it does force you to deal shit damage against armoured vehicles to earn any kind of credits, which negatively affects the gameplay. After all, you're just shooting a medium tank with an autorifle, instead of doing other things.

The need for an economy fix was what made points"bug" useful in Marathon games where both teams had no ref and were pretty much broke. But there's more ways to fix a single problem. per example, you can either make building destruction less harsh, or you can make killing free infantry more rewarding, so instead of 3 credits/points you would get 10 credits/points per kill. Yes, it's not much, but if you have nothing else to shoot...

Lowering mines to 2 is not always a chore, like when the PT is next to the door you want to mine. But what if you want to mine base entrances? You'd easily spend 5 minutes putting 30 mines on the Walls base entrance.

You can't disarm disarm mines on the door by using Third Person mode. But, you can using First Person mode and crouching! Try it at your own building, it works wonders. No time to disarm, or too lazy? Use my trick instead! You may lose half your health or more but it'll get the job done in less than 10 seconds.

Okay, so you're saying that it's okay to disable pointsfix as long as the weapon most abused will remain fixed? That may help mitigate the issue, but that issue is still there. You're using a bug, to solve an economy problem. But wouldn't you be more likely to use this bug when you're low on money, so you can't afford a ramjet rifle? By far, most of the time you use an autorifle instead to earn money for let's say, a tank. So you make the game think you'll deal 7 damage per shot on a Light tank worth 600, which means 700 damage worth every 10 seconds + 2 seconds reload which brings us to:

$(700/600) \times (60/2) = 35$ credits per 12 seconds, or 175 credits per minute maximum, if you're on GDI. That's the equivalent of killing 7 Sakura's every 4 minutes... How is this not abuse? Because both teams do it? You'd never buy a tank simply because it earns the enemy a shit ton of money. And THAT is what makes pointsfix important to keep the gameplay intact.

Just make another change... like making free characters worth more to kill, or make every kill worth more, or making the punishment of building destruction less harsh.

C4 above doors can be disarmed. That's because they stick out. You know, the walls aren't thick enough to completely cover the proxies. So you press F to switch to first person mode, which makes the camera positioned lower, combine this with crouching and the camera is low enough

that you can look up, towards the proxies. And now you can disarm them safely.

And i'm not discussing SBH. Too much of a gray area, we could go on with that for days. They're a tad broken but that's just a design flaw inherent to the character. And there are maps where you do mine base entrances, walls and uphill are good examples for this. You use the same amount of mines, and now they can't enter the base at all --> no nukes at building exteriors. The mines require a bit more maintenance, but that's worth the trade-off.

Subject: Re: Some balance things I've been thinking about
Posted by [iRANian](#) on Fri, 14 Apr 2017 13:38:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It's not a bug, it's how the game is designed like.

Subject: Re: Some balance things I've been thinking about
Posted by [XD_ERROR_XD](#) on Fri, 14 Apr 2017 18:40:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

yeah

<http://www.renegadeforums.com/index.php?t=msg&th=28502&prevloaded=1& &start=75>

Subject: Re: Some balance things I've been thinking about
Posted by [iRANian](#) on Fri, 14 Apr 2017 19:01:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yeah so some random developer says he doesn't remember if it's a bug and then it's a bug ok.

On a side note, here are some screenshots that come with the Renegade demo...shows some very different prices..wonder about the difference between the unit behavior themselves.

File Attachments

1) [Scrn_GDI_Characters.jpg](#), downloaded 1259 times



2) [Scrn_NOD_Characters.jpg](#), downloaded 1236 times



3) [Scrn_NOD_Vehicles.jpg](#), downloaded 1271 times



4) [Scrn_GDI_Vehicles.jpg](#), downloaded 1247 times



Subject: Re: Some balance things I've been thinking about

Posted by [jonwil](#) on Fri, 14 Apr 2017 20:09:08 GMT

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

Unless we have specific confirmation from the relevant dev that the behavior of the original damage code was intentional, I think we can safely say it's a bug.

Subject: Re: Some balance things I've been thinking about

Posted by [dblaney1](#) on Fri, 14 Apr 2017 20:45:45 GMT

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

Are we really back to debating the points fix again? There is no way in hell that the broken code was intentional. It makes zero sense. Someone at Westwood just made a sloppy error.

Subject: Re: Some balance things I've been thinking about

Posted by [iRANian](#) on Fri, 14 Apr 2017 21:37:35 GMT

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

Then why did they decide to balance the game with their points system? with pointsmod the game is completely broken, you can just defend by sitting at base entrance with teched tanks and you'll win on points.

If pp or ref dies the game is over and on marathon servers it's then extremely boring as you get no money.

I think the jury is out and its pretty shit way to change the game, even after heavily modifying the game by doing things like increasing credit tick per sec

It's the same thing as 2 credits a tick also being a "bug" because they cast the floating point value to int.

or being able to access purchase terminal from outside a building

Subject: Re: Some balance things I've been thinking about

Posted by [dblaney1](#) on Fri, 14 Apr 2017 22:12:21 GMT

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

I was saying that the points bug was clearly not intentional. The fixed version with the points fix was clearly the desired behavior. Someone just screwed up and missed a division operation on the shield section of `apply_damage()` or put the points awarding before it applied the warhead scale.

Subject: Re: Some balance things I've been thinking about

Posted by [ehhh](#) on Sat, 15 Apr 2017 17:53:32 GMT

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

iRANian wrote on Fri, 14 April 2017 22:37 Then why did they decide to balance the game with their points system? with pointsmod the game is completely broken, you can just defend by sitting at base entrance with teched tanks and you'll win on points.

If pp or ref dies the game is over and on marathon servers it's then extremely boring as you get no money.

I think the jury is out and its pretty shit way to change the game, even after heavily modifying the game by doing things like increasing credit tick per sec

It's the same thing as 2 credits a tick also being a "bug" because they cast the floating point value to int.

or being able to access purchase terminal from outside a building

because the game was badly balanced lol?
and with pointsbug, you can just defend and snipe tanks all game and win on points. (not mara ofc)

both point systems are bad, we just never created a middleground.

Subject: Re: Some balance things I've been thinking about

Posted by [iRANian](#) on Sat, 15 Apr 2017 18:02:58 GMT

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

Hence why I said you can just fix the sniping tanks thing lol. Which I've already done before on my test server

Subject: Re: Some balance things I've been thinking about

Posted by [ehhh](#) on Sun, 16 Apr 2017 02:10:40 GMT

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

must have glanced over that, sound

did you make any other changes?

i still get triggered over how many points you'd get for stopping a stank rush back on pointbug

Subject: Re: Some balance things I've been thinking about

Posted by [Goztow](#) on Sun, 16 Apr 2017 07:03:38 GMT

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

The preferred tactic on field aow with pointbug was to let warf go after a few minutes 1nd then you were almost sure to win the game on points. Does that sound familiar? Evil white dragon's signature summarises the issue quite clearly.

As for your other points, I'd say about 20 pct of them would be useful to me (for example mining top of doors fix) but generally speaking renegade is well balanced. I especially do not understand why you want to punish the defending team less when it lost a building. It's the core of renegade gameplay. You loose a building, suck it up, you should have defended better.

Subject: Re: Some balance things I've been thinking about
Posted by [ehhh](#) on Sun, 16 Apr 2017 15:35:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

you can defuse above door mines by going into 1st person btw

Subject: Re: Some balance things I've been thinking about
Posted by [iRANian](#) on Sun, 16 Apr 2017 15:38:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You can yes but i dont feel like i have to sit around and check if there are mines above every door the whole time
