
Subject: An opinion piece - in regard to the public-server ladder

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Fri, 04 May 2007 20:42:26 GMT

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

First off let me offer BHS my genuine admiration what looks to be a very promising project.

So, we'll have some people determining the points system sometime soon. All well and good, but there's much more than that needs doing - some fundamental rules need laying down too. Most of them are obvious, but this post is to talk about something which may not be. That is...

Team Changing

in other words, using moderator powers to arbitrarily alter your or a friend's team.

There's one word that describes this act in a public server, in my opinion:

Cheating

A mild form of cheating, perhaps, but cheating nonetheless.

I'd never dream of stepping on somebody's right to do this on their own server. If you pay for it, do as you please when you play there. What I question is the legitimacy of the ladder in relation to it.

When Westwood made the original Renegade public server ladder, they specifically designed it so that games cannot be ladderred if team-changing is on. There's no mistake in that decision.

That's what a public server IS - teams are allocated randomly. If every player doesn't have the right to select their team, neither should a moderator. (To repeat, I'm not saying ban moderators from doing it)

If you want to play a ladderred game whereby you choose your team, then I can answer you in two words:

Clan match. That is what a clan game IS - a game in which you can specifically choose your teammates. Here's why clan games can legitimately be ladderred: your opponents also have the precisely equal right to choose their teammates as you do. Thus, it is fair.

So here's the point. My opinion is that if this ladder is to be considered legitimate, one of the following needs to be true

- a server which permits its moderators to change team at will should be prohibited from its results counting on the ladder

- individual players who change team at will should be prohibited from their stats counting on the ladder, i.e. each time you do it, your stats get reset.

^ the second one is more viable, surely.

Discuss

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - in regard to the public-server ladder

Posted by [Viking](#) on Fri, 04 May 2007 21:04:48 GMT

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

What? You lost me?

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - in regard to the public-server ladder

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Fri, 04 May 2007 21:08:59 GMT

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

I can't disagree with this. Implementing either method, however... becomes tricky. :\ I would prefer that if you team change on a particular map, you should be disqualified from earning or losing ladder points for that map. That's how most games work.

But to implement such a feature would involve an FDS change to send a ladder point score of 0 for players who changed teams.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - in regard to the public-server ladder

Posted by [Viking](#) on Fri, 04 May 2007 21:12:24 GMT

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

What if at the begging you get like 2 minutes to change teams before it dose that?

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - in regard to the public-server ladder

Posted by [jnz](#) on Fri, 04 May 2007 21:26:16 GMT

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

Completely OT: A new and unique protocol for the ladder must be created, this would not only solve that problem, but the formula can be stored there. It could be loaded into the FDS as a dll. If the server owner doesn't have the dll they cannot report to the ladder. You could also use it to detect if the server owner is modifying player information (which is possible although by-passable by gurus).

On topic: I think, if *ANYTHING* is changed to a player when they join the game (the game should automaticly pick the team). They should not get their points counted. This includes team changing.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - in regard to the public-server ladder

Posted by [MexPirate](#) on Fri, 04 May 2007 21:26:58 GMT

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

over complicating something that shouldn't really be a real problem imo, does anyone really care?

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - in regard to the public-server ladder
Posted by [Goztow](#) on Fri, 04 May 2007 21:30:40 GMT

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

Currently the ladder already depends on the server owners changing a file. Change the renegadefds ladder system and have server owners implement it .

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - in regard to the public-server ladder
Posted by [StealthEye](#) on Fri, 04 May 2007 22:01:16 GMT

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

First, I think there are far more important issues relating the ladder that have to be fixed.

Then, you should consider that team changing isn't always unfair. If there is a 2-player-difference, at BI we allow moderators to teamchange theirself/someone else who wants. Also, for testing someone, some moderators use it. Also, I really doubt that it will seriously change much to your ladder points in the end... I think this issue could better be ignored, also because it is technically hard.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - in regard to the public-server ladder
Posted by [i0ncl0ud9](#) on Fri, 04 May 2007 22:11:59 GMT

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

Crimson wrote on Fri, 04 May 2007 17:08I can't disagree with this. Implementing either method, however... becomes tricky. :\ I would prefer that if you team change on a particular map, you should be disqualified from earning or losing ladder points for that map. That's how most games work.

But to implement such a feature would involve an FDS change to send a ladder point score of 0 for players who changed teams.

That would be good but a problem with that would be if someone on a losing team decided to change over to the winning team at the end of a map... They wouldn't lose any ladder.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - in regard to the public-server ladder
Posted by [Renx](#) on Fri, 04 May 2007 22:27:06 GMT

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

And what if you're playing with another person in the same room? If you end up on different teams, you can hear everything going on on the other team, or you and your buddy can just tell each other what's going on.

Unless some sort of mod is made to put people with the same IP on the same team at the start of every map, I don't think that team changing for this situation should be punished.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - in regard to the public-server ladder
Posted by [Carrierll](#) on Fri, 04 May 2007 23:03:47 GMT

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

I play often in the situation that RenX just proposed, and I might as well be cheating with the advantage I get from it (I don't feed the information to my team-mates however)

Gamemodding's idea of using a custom DLL to run the ladder lends flexibility, and jonwil etc know a lot about the game's internal functions, so almost anything is possible, we need to know what is wanted.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - in regard to the public-server ladder
Posted by [cmatt42](#) on Fri, 04 May 2007 23:05:13 GMT

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

I think team changing should have an impact on game's ladder scores, and I want it to count. After all, they still participated in the game and should get something out of it, even if it's a fraction of what they could have received normally.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - in regard to the public-server ladder
Posted by [trooprm02](#) on Sat, 05 May 2007 03:22:21 GMT

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

Disagree, changing teams with the way thats it done now is to even out the teams, rather than a ruin a decent game by 20 people leaveing. You shouldnt get your stats reset for evening up the teams...

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - in regard to the public-server ladder
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Sat, 05 May 2007 04:35:22 GMT

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

on the other hand, if nothing is done about this issue, what's stopping moderators from changing teams at the end of a game to keep from losing ladder points?

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - in regard to the public-server ladder

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Sat, 05 May 2007 06:42:30 GMT

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

Renx wrote on Fri, 04 May 2007 17:27: And what if you're playing with another person in the same room? If you end up on different teams, you can hear everything going on on the other team, or you and your buddy can just tell each other what's going on.

...if you choose to. Note the key word, "choose"

You cannot realistically argue that it's OK to circumvent the very basic nature of the public server ladder just because you choose to play in the same room as your buddy.

Once again, there's an option specifically designed for games where you choose your teammates. Public servers are specifically designed so that if you choose your team, it can't be ladder.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - in regard to the public-server ladder

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Sat, 05 May 2007 07:40:18 GMT

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

StealthEye wrote on Fri, 04 May 2007 17:01: First, I think there are far more important issues relating the ladder that have to be fixed.

Then, you should consider that team changing isn't always unfair. If there is a 2-player-difference, at BI we allow moderators to teamchange theirself/someone else who wants. Also, for testing someone, some moderators use it. Also, I really doubt that it will seriously change much to your ladder points in the end... I think this issue could better be ignored, also because it is technically hard.

Ask yourself why there would be a difference in the number of players.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - in regard to the public-server ladder

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sat, 05 May 2007 09:34:11 GMT

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

This happens rather frequently when people leave after the start of the next map.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - in regard to the public-server ladder

Posted by [m1a1_abrams](#) on Sat, 05 May 2007 10:28:27 GMT

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

You might say that having to play a game with literally uneven teams is like ending up with all the good players on one side. They're both unfair situations, but it's just the nature of the game really.

My point being that while you could ensure that the teams are numerically even, you can never ensure an evenly matched game, so is it really that pressing an issue? The smaller team might

turn out to have all the best players anyway, so you could be giving them even more of an advantage. I just don't see the point of moderators, or whoever else, trying to make the game fairer, when the entire system is bound not to be.

Besides, the ladder is an individual points ranking anyway, so you can lose a few to bad luck. If you're really bothered about it, all you've got to do is make sure you're near the top of the losing side and you're fine. You'd be extremely unlucky to be in the situation enough times that it has a noticeable affect on your ladder score.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - in regard to the public-server ladder

Posted by [futura83](#) on Sat, 05 May 2007 11:47:41 GMT

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

I think if mods are used then it shouldnt be allowed on the ladder;

on crazy CTF servers, for killing a hotwire or technician (super units that have one-hit kill weapons) you get 4000 points for it, which (obviously) is far too many points for killing one unit, and people who play exclusively these games will most likely be on top...

Also, what stops people using hacks from getting points on the ladder?

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - in regard to the public-server ladder

Posted by [CarrierII](#) on Sat, 05 May 2007 12:35:17 GMT

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

Renguard 1.0322 and BIATCH.

I think any server submitting to the ladder should be verified that it's an AOW or similar, not a role-play or some other modification.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - in regard to the public-server ladder

Posted by [Kanezor](#) on Sat, 05 May 2007 13:54:31 GMT

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

MaidenTy1 wrote on Sat, 05 May 2007 01:42Renx wrote on Fri, 04 May 2007 17:27And what if you're playing with another person in the same room? If you end up on different teams, you can hear everything going on on the other team, or you and your buddy can just tell each other what's going on.

...if you choose to. Note the key word, "choose"

You cannot realistically argue that it's OK to circumvent the very basic nature of the public server ladder just because you choose to play in the same room as your buddy.

Once again, there's an option specifically designed for games where you choose your teammates.

Public servers are specifically designed so that if you choose your team, it can't be ladderred.
You, sir, fail.

You fail at understanding the common reasonings behind playing in the same room:

Some people are not allowed to have computers in their bedrooms (eg, two underage siblings, etc)

Some rooms are shared by multiple people (eg, dorms)

Practicality reasons might prohibit the computers from behing in separate rooms (wireless access points are very finicky, some rooms have a lot more screen glare, etc)

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - in regard to the public-server ladder

Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Sat, 05 May 2007 15:30:13 GMT

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

I'd expect that the percentage of renegade players playing in the same room, in the same game, as another renegade player is pretty small.

However, allowing team changing is just asking to be exploited by moderators. I don't know if any of you have ever actually played this game before, but it's not like corrupt mods don't exist.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - in regard to the public-server ladder

Posted by [jnz](#) on Sat, 05 May 2007 15:58:17 GMT

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

CarrierII wrote on Sat, 05 May 2007 13:35Renguard 1.0322 and BIATCH.

I think any server submitting to the ladder should be verified that it's an AOW or similar, not a role-play or some other modification.

biatch and rengaurd wouldn't help at all. what if a server owner decided to make his own points really high with the engine call "Set_Points" (server-side).

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - in regard to the public-server ladder

Posted by [futura83](#) on Sat, 05 May 2007 16:07:38 GMT

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

gamemodding wrote on Sat, 05 May 2007 16:58CarrierII wrote on Sat, 05 May 2007 13:35Renguard 1.0322 and BIATCH.

I think any server submitting to the ladder should be verified that it's an AOW or similar, not a role-play or some other modification.

biatch and rengaurd wouldn't help at all. what if a server owner decided to make his own points really high with the engine call "Set_Points" (server-side).
Then maybe server owners should be warned that being caught doing this would result in points being negated off his score which is twice that which he/she raised it.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - in regard to the public-server ladder
Posted by [jnz](#) on Sat, 05 May 2007 19:36:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

How can they detect if the points got raised? Short answer, without a separate dll that they must download. They can't.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - in regard to the public-server ladder
Posted by [Carrierll](#) on Sat, 05 May 2007 20:11:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

My mentioning of the anti cheat stuff was in response to the17docter's "What stops people hacking to gain points" (Not an exact quote).

As a moderator, when I see the word "Hacking" I think "A program -client side- that changes something.

As an ex-member of Xphaze, currupt server owners are something I have experience in.

I agree, a seperate DLL would be a good way forward here.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - in regard to the public-server ladder
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Sat, 05 May 2007 21:02:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Kanezor wrote on Sat, 05 May 2007 08:54
You, sir, fail.

You fail at understanding the common reasonings behind playing in the same room:

Some people are not allowed to have computers in their bedrooms (eg, two underage siblings, etc)

Some rooms are shared by multiple people (eg, dorms)

Practicality reasons might prohibit the computers from behing in separate rooms (wireless access points are very finicky, some rooms have a lot more screen glare, etc)

None of that justifies why those players should be allowed to choose their team when the general gaming populace are not.

Once again, Westwood specifically designed there to be an option whereby you can choose your team. It's called a clan game - the game you yourself said on teamspeak are "stupid". Maybe that's because your opponents would have a fair, equal choice too, instead of just yourself.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - in regard to the public-server ladder
Posted by [futura83](#) on Sat, 05 May 2007 21:06:24 GMT

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

Also, if you could chose your team, alot of people would chose NOD on maps where there is no base defences...

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - in regard to the public-server ladder
Posted by [Sir Kane](#) on Sat, 05 May 2007 21:52:40 GMT

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

I believe they simply disallowed teamchanging from ladder games to prevent excessive teamstacking (playercount wise).

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - in regard to the public-server ladder
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sun, 06 May 2007 00:53:06 GMT

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

Also, not all of us are teenagers. I don't have to set up my computer in my master bedroom because we have a separate bedroom set up as an office. We have three workstations which are used at least once a week for 3 people to play Renegade simultaneously. We have also been known to set up a 4th computer in here to play.

Most of these questions are ones that should be answered by the committee put together to balance the ladder. I am trying to figure out why sometimes you can go in-game and no one's ladder rankings are there. There is also an important update that Silent Kane wants to release which fixes two rather important ladder-related bugs (names truncated at 9 characters and wrong map reported). It is important to me to have a rather fair ladder because I am still expecting any day now to receive a big box from EA with prizes to give out for the ladder.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - in regard to the public-server ladder
Posted by [jnz](#) on Sun, 06 May 2007 23:01:56 GMT

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

Not all teenagers only have a family computer.

For the ladder a formulae (as you well know) needs to be figured out. The way i would do it is:

Look at how much repairing the person has done.

Look at how much damage the person has done (to building, vehicles and people)

Look at how many people this person has killed.

Look at how many buildings/vehicles this person has destroyed.

Look at how many mines the player has disarmed.

^^All these are easily possible in the FDS server side.

Then, if any of those numbers are much bigger than the rest. the player shouldn't get very many points. If it is evenly spread out, the player should get a nice amount of points.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - in regard to the public-server ladder

Posted by [Goztow](#) on Mon, 07 May 2007 06:27:26 GMT

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

gamemodding wrote on Mon, 07 May 2007 01:01Not all teenagers only have a family computer.
For the ladder a formulae (as you well know) needs to be figured out. The way i would do it is:

Look at how much repairing the person has done.

Look at how much damage the person has done (to building, vehicles and people)

Look at how many people this person has killed.

Look at how many buildings/vehicles this person has destroyed.

Look at how many mines the player has disarmed.

^^All these are easily possible in the FDS server side.

Then, if any of those numbers are much bigger than the rest. the player shouldn't get very many points. If it is evenly spread out, the player should get a nice amount of points.

Let's not get back on this formulae in a public topic yet again. Your reasoning doesn't work: someone repairing arts a wholme game is more useful than someone that changes his task all game long anyway.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - in regard to the public-server ladder

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Tue, 08 May 2007 12:49:18 GMT

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

The solution is obvious, I think - enforce it manually. Presumably the ladder will have a place where players can report cheaters and the like (hands up if you want another Keetxx, lol) and admin(s) specifically devoted to dealing with them. Post screenshots/logs of someone teamchanging, admins review it and dish out a flat penalty of, say, -500 or -1000 (as long as it's

more than you're ever likely to get from a standard game)

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - in regard to the public-server ladder

Posted by [Crusader](#) on Tue, 08 May 2007 13:58:00 GMT

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

the17doctor wrote on Sat, 05 May 2007 17:06Also, if you could chose your team, alot of people would chose NOD on maps where there is no base defences...

Yes, but sometimes there are people who are dedicated to only one team. When I say dedicated, they hate the other side. I am one of those people...I am Nod by default but I don't get to be Nod on every map.

I know it's tough for me to be GDI on Field cuz I love my Light tank in that map. But I don't fuss about it...sometimes I get frustrated when that happens (when I spawn as GDI on any map) but I don't complain.

If that is annoying, I leave the game. Also, before entering a game, check to see how many players are on each team. I jump right in if Nod has less players cuz that guarantees that I spawn as Nod.

IMO, teamchanging is a nasty business and regulations must be made to control it and eventually stop the practice unless it's for special circumstances.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - in regard to the public-server ladder

Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Tue, 08 May 2007 16:20:00 GMT

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

IronBalls wrote on Tue, 08 May 2007 09:58Yes, but sometimes there are people who are dedicated to only one team. When I say dedicated, they hate the other side.

No offense, but that's pretty stupid.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - in regard to the public-server ladder

Posted by [JPNOD](#) on Tue, 08 May 2007 18:31:11 GMT

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

IronBalls wrote on Tue, 08 May 2007 09:58the17doctor wrote on Sat, 05 May 2007 17:06Also, if you could chose your team, alot of people would chose NOD on maps where there is no base defences...

Yes, but sometimes there are people who are dedicated to only one team. When I say dedicated,

they hate the other side. I am one of those people...I am Nod by default but I don't get to be Nod on every map.

I know it's tough for me to be GDI on Field cuz I love my Light tank in that map. But I don't fuss about it...sometimes I get frustrated when that happens (when I spawn as GDI on any map) but I don't complain.

If that is annoying, I leave the game. Also, before entering a game, check to see how many players are on each team. I jump right in if Nod has less players cuz that guarantees that I spawn as Nod.

IMO, teamchanging is a nasty business and regulations must be made to control it and eventually stop the practice unless it's for special circumstances.

The idea of picking your alliance for the game = awesome, but I don't think it should be and can be enforced in ladder servers.

Con's

People pick there side which all there buddies are on (stacked teams anyone)

Pro's

Loyal to the brotherhood of nob

One ranked one on nob and one on gdi

I think they shouldn't have added the option of "preffered side"

Because it doesn't work? or its not noticable and being Nod would be awesome. Plus you could get a rank 1 for Nod and GDI.. at the other hand in terms of ladder you had this already WOL (Overall rank 1 and ranked 1 nod and gdi combined most pts would be rank 1

Either way I would like to see a testout of this, doubt it ever happens thoug, maybe a good concept for renegade 2

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - in regard to the public-server ladder

Posted by [JPNOD](#) on Tue, 08 May 2007 18:47:49 GMT

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

MaidenTy1 wrote on Tue, 08 May 2007 08:49The solution is obvious, I think - enforce it manually. Presumably the ladder will have a place where players can report cheaters and the like (hands up if you want another Keetxx, lol) and admin(s) specifically devoted to dealing with them. Post screenshots/logs of someone teamchanging, admins review it and dish out a flat penalty of, say, -500 or -1000 (as long as it's more than you're ever likely to get from a standard game)

Me and Lurker used to teamstack but we just did it because we enjoy playing on the same team,

and can pull of teamwork others cant.

I have seen abuse by not just players but alot of mods aswell.. If the ladder wants to become serious bussines again then it shouldnt be just the people that ""teamstack" or teamchange but also the mods that kick for repairing/ flame apc. Because these things alter the gameplay aswell which makes another team win. WOL ladder went downwards after 2003 anyways.. when people got mod rights people started kicking just to win for there own selfish desire.

I prefer the old days were you needed to shout in teamchat to get a rush going and show that as a "worthypointwhore" that not you could just pointwhore but also could lead a rush with teched arty's or apc's and nukes. And convince your team that experience after playing countless of games payed off afterall.

Now its more the kicking if someone doesn't join a rush or if someone on the other side has a mod and the others dont.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - in regard to the public-server ladder

Posted by [Goztow](#) on Wed, 09 May 2007 06:51:04 GMT

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

JPNOD wrote on Tue, 08 May 2007 20:47MaidenTy1 wrote on Tue, 08 May 2007 08:49The solution is obvious, I think - enforce it manually. Presumably the ladder will have a place where players can report cheaters and the like (hands up if you want another Keetxx, lol) and admin(s) specifically devoted to dealing with them. Post screenshots/logs of someone teamchanging, admins review it and dish out a flat penalty of, say, -500 or -1000 (as long as it's more than you're ever likely to get from a standard game)

Me and Lurker used to teamstack but we just did it because we enjoy playing on the same team, and can pull of teamwork others cant.

I have seen abuse by not just players but alot of mods aswell.. If the ladder wants to become serious bussines again then it shouldnt be just the people that ""teamstack" or teamchange but also the mods that kick for repairing/ flame apc. Because these things alter the gameplay aswell which makes another team win. WOL ladder went downwards after 2003 anyways.. when people got mod rights people started kicking just to win for there own selfish desire.

I prefer the old days were you needed to shout in teamchat to get a rush going and show that as a "worthypointwhore" that not you could just pointwhore but also could lead a rush with teched arty's or apc's and nukes. And convince your team that experience after playing countless of games payed off afterall.

Now its more the kicking if someone doesn't join a rush or if someone on the other side has a mod and the others dont.

Sorry but that depends what server you play on. I've never seen one of our mods kick someone because they didn't join a rush. I have seen people kicked for obvious teamhampering, though, after explaining what they did wrong.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - in regard to the public-server ladder

Posted by [Crusader](#) on Wed, 09 May 2007 13:39:41 GMT

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

mrpirate wrote on Tue, 08 May 2007 12:20IronBalls wrote on Tue, 08 May 2007 09:58Yes, but sometimes there are people who are dedicated to only one team. When I say dedicated, they hate the other side.

No offense, but that's pretty stupid.

Ok...here's the translation:

I always prefer Nod over GDI no matter what. I can't stand GDI.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - in regard to the public-server ladder

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Wed, 09 May 2007 14:30:21 GMT

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

Fastconn used to be the most prime example of kicking people who didn't do what the moderators wanted. There was a time when I'd agree with it, now I don't unless they're intentionally hampering. It all comes back to the point I'm making in the first place: it's a public server, thus: teams are random. if you want choice of teammates, play a clangame, because that's what a clan game is.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - in regard to the public-server ladder

Posted by [Goztow](#) on Wed, 09 May 2007 14:47:08 GMT

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

A preferred side would be cool indd .

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - in regard to the public-server ladder

Posted by [JPNOD](#) on Wed, 09 May 2007 18:14:52 GMT

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

Goztow wrote on Wed, 09 May 2007 10:47A preferred side would be cool indd .

For the Brotherhoooooooooooooood

of No.!

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - in regard to the public-server ladder

Posted by [Blazer](#) on Wed, 09 May 2007 18:54:54 GMT

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

It sounds like the best solution is to make it so that you can only change teams within the first 2 minutes of a game. After that, if you change teams, you should get NO ladder points.

Implementing this would be tricky but not impossible, it would probably require jonwil adding a new console command via scripts.dll, that would toggle a players ladder-points accumulation - This way regulation bots can set a specific player(s) ladder points to zero.

It may also be possible with the code that SK wrote, so that it has a console command to simply flag a player, and once flagged it would report them with zero points to the ladder server.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - in regard to the public-server ladder

Posted by [JPNOD](#) on Wed, 09 May 2007 20:19:05 GMT

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

by that time the harv is dead?

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - in regard to the public-server ladder

Posted by [futura83](#) on Wed, 09 May 2007 20:41:44 GMT

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

Blazer wrote on Wed, 09 May 2007 19:54It sounds like the best solution is to make it so that you can only change teams within the first 2 minutes of a game. After that, if you change teams, you should get NO ladder points.

Implementing this would be tricky but not impossible, it would probably require jonwil adding a new console command via scripts.dll, that would toggle a players ladder-points accumulation - This way regulation bots can set a specific player(s) ladder points to zero.

It may also be possible with the code that SK wrote, so that it has a console command to simply flag a player, and once flagged it would report them with zero points to the ladder server.

But should you do it so that it adds the points they have accumulated prior to that change?

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - in regard to the public-server ladder

Posted by [jnz](#) on Wed, 09 May 2007 21:13:25 GMT

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

Do it so they can't change team if they have started playing and have points.
