

Tue Nov 12, 2002 8:46 pm
Lasse Nyholm Jensen

Hi guys, welcome to the congress. I'd like to say that just because I started this group it doesn't mean that I'm somehow the leader of this congress, it was only to take the next step in the process and get us started.
I hope we'll get a thorough discussion on the needed topics, and would like you to bring up every concern you might have so we can work our way through it carefully and hopefully find a solution to the problems that have occurred the last couple of years.

Let's see what this congress will lead to - Lanyjé

Tue Nov 12, 2002 11:02 pm
Marc Schouten

Re: Here we go
Thanks, Lasse. I'm in.

Wed Nov 13, 2002 1:23 am
inthalloffame

Re: Here we go
As soon as all the members join, let's get to work immediately on the state of the int. world record. I think the bulk of the arguments have already been put out there and I'm sure the members here all have a deep understanding of the issues at hand so hopefully we can get right down to a decision after a brief debate.

Wed Nov 13, 2002 6:55 am
stephanbechtel

Re: Here we go
I'm ready as well.

Wed Nov 20, 2002 5:17 pm
kaminwx

Re: Here we go
Hi all.

Wed Nov 27, 2002 1:55 pm
stephanbechtel

As in my opinion all invited members have submitted we should maybe start to decide something, e.g. starting with the handling of dreamboard times in int.

Wed Nov 27, 2002 2:03 pm
Lasse Nyholm Jensen

Re: When do we start?
I agree. It doesn't seem like Damien is going to show up, I've sent him two invitations and have mailed to him besides that, and haven't gotten an answer as to whether he wants to partake or not. So we could either just start or we could find a new seventh member if we need to be seven, or we can do both.

Fri Nov 29, 2002 1:14 pm
Damien Moore

sorry i have taken so long to show...i apologize if the only delay has been in waiting for me.

as i understand, the motivation for this group came from the problems over roland's intermediate board, but i think we will be able to cover other things as they come up. some things have already come up in the past but need better intelligent discussion, such as the beg boards, the timer bug as opposed to the bug-free xp, slow-down of some video play, the purpose of an official version if one is needed, competitions, online scorelists, scores vs. stats, etc.

as a side-note, my absence from most discussions recently has been because i do not want people to think that i believe i can have a say in anything just because i have a website. btw, i will be buying the domain off my dad since he doesn't want it anymore, and so the possibility of benny's ideas for automated scorelists and some moderating input will finally start becoming a possibility. also, while i realise it is my site, its purpose has always been service not self-publicity; as such, this congress has the power to influence how it may need to adapt. i'll suggest soem ideas later.

thanks for your patience.

**Mon Dec 9, 2002 1:09 am
inthalloffame**

OK, kind of dry here, so I guess Ill start up the hopefully short-lived yet successful debate about Rolands 9.

As much as I hate seeing my record go down, I have to step back and view the situation from a viewpoint that is unaffected by jealousy or dissapointment. After careful thought, the plain and simple truth to me is that Roli did nothing out of the context of the game to obtain his record unfairly. Sure his methods were unorthodox, but so were mine and my score was accepted. Simply by that fact alone, I feel that accepting his 9 is necessary.

We cant overlook the fact that he spent a great amount of effort in planning for the dreamboard and mapping out the best way possible to play it. I guess the debate about this is whether or not it is cheating. At first, I replied with a vehement "YES!" but when I look at it now after calming down a bit, Roli did nothing wrong within the context of the game and the definition of cheating. However disdainful his method is, it is indeed a lawful method and simply planning for a board is not cheating. I feel that the game has been taken down a level and the thrill of intermedaite records is no longer as, well, thrilling.

My final vote is to accept his 9 as the new world record mainly because my 10 was accepted under similar contexts.

Hopefully we can get this vote going. On another subject, when we do vote on issues, should the votes be anonymous or should our names be under our votes?

**Mon Dec 9, 2002 7:23 am
Lasse Nyholm Jensen**

I agree with Matt some of the way. I too think that we should accept Roli's 9, but not because I don't think he didn't do anything wrong, but because I don't think it's fair to make retrospective laws. I definately think we should come up with some sort of rule that would

prevent people from going further with the Roli-method, cause I just think it would tear the intermediate-level apart even more than it is already.

I think if we do come up with a clear rule, there is a chance that the 9 will be broken sometime using more usual playing-style, and thereby re-establish the integrity of the level. That rule, however it should sound, should be there at the same time we

accept the 9 officialy, else it's my fear that someone will go even further in, what I think is, the wrong direction.

Mon Dec 9, 2002 8:55 am
stephanbechtel

roli's 9

Five minutes ago, I would still have voted for not accepting Roli's 9. But Lasse's argument of existing "law" made me change my point of view. Roland's method of playing only for getting the DB as often as possible is surely not the method that should be standard as then, int level is losing its last thrill. But at the time he did it that way, no rule and sth. similar prohibited doing so.

In my eyes, the problem is that I don't know how a rule should look like. When we accept Roli's 9, we must even accept Roli's way of playing, and then, every other player could copy that style. Unfortunately, I do not know any solution to this conflict.

Of course, by accepting Roli's 9, additional questions of treatment are coming up. E.g., Steffen Stachna did a 12 on the DB some weeks after Roland did his 9. He didn't play extraordinarily, but after a few seconds he made a blind click into the right half as he knew exactly where an opening is situated on the DB. As most players know the DB by heart more or less, I predict that further DB-records will come up soon. And that makes all intermediate rankings quite worthless.

Btw, Matt, I would prefer named votes as, in my opinion, it would help to avoid secret accusations.

Mon Dec 9, 2002 9:01 am
Marc Schouten

Re: roli's 9

I think we should probably accept Roland's 9, but for yet another reason than Matt's or Lasse's.

Ideally, people in the Minesweeping community wouldn't even think about playing for boards the way Roland has. It's just not in the spirit of the game.

Then again, who am I to dictate what the spirit of the game should be? The game gives us dreamboards... Nowhere is it written people can't play for them. So that's where I agree with Lasse and Matt.

But the most important reason for me is that it's just not practical to exclude his score. We could make a separate record list for people who play in this manner, but then we'd have to judge each submitted board individually. We'd have to decide whether or not Matt's record would be on it and we would create a potentially nasty debate as to which style of play is 'better'.

As much as I dislike Roland's style of play, I just don't think it's viable to exclude his

scores. As such, I also don't think it's viable to set rules for future dreamboard records, as Lasse proposed. Let people play the way they want.

However, I am in favor of some sort of indication on the record list (a simple '*' would suffice) that shows us which times were achieved using knowledge of the board. That would mean Roland's 9, but also Matt's 10. Perhaps that would give people at least some encouragement to play 'as intended'.

No vote yet... Let's have some discussion first.

Mon Dec 9, 2002 9:04 am
Marc Schouten

Re: roli's 9

Ah yes... Forgot about that.

I'm also in favor of 'named' votes. We all know and respect each other and each other's opinions. No need for secrecy.

Mon Dec 9, 2002 4:15 pm
kaminwx

Re: roli's 9

I think it is fair to say Matt's 10 is now accepted because he has proven to be that fast. If I get a 10 on the dreamboard it would no doubt be accepted because I've proven to be fast. However, even I wouldn't feel like my 10 would mean anything, just as I don't see Roli's 9 meaning anything.

The only way we can have meaningful intermediate records is to move to a new version of the game that uses truly random board layouts with no repeats, such as Stefan Pettersson's GlobalMines.

It looks like there are already four votes for accepting Roli's 9. At this point I don't really care if his 9 becomes the record because everyone knows he isn't that fast without prior knowledge of the board and therefore the record means jack squat.

We will have to discuss Stefan Pettersson's Global Mines. His version should have no timer jump bug, no slow timer, and no repeat boards. The slow timer bug is the most important for expert level. I do have mixed feelings about starting new world record lists and requiring the use of a new minesweeper version to be able to get on the new list. Lasse and some others might have a 1 to 2 second advantage over me on expert, but I'm not confident I'll be able to get another 44. Also, a new version of minesweeper would force the hundreds of players on the current record lists to play again if they want their names on the new record lists. No doubt there are many players on the current lists that don't play minesweeper anymore.

Tue Dec 10, 2002 2:09 am
inthalloffame

Re: roli's 9

I think the idea of asterisks next to scores acquired with previous knowledge is a bit overkill. Even so, how would we know if they had previous knowledge? Certainly not everyone can provide videos and limiting the lists to only those who can is just

not fair.

I can see how this is kind of like the top 20 list on my site where I have "nf" next to players like Vincent who play no-flagging. I like how you can then see how relatively fast they are compared to others who play differently. Implementing this kind of system into the int lists, except with subscripts denoting previous knowledge or even if the record was achieved with the db, can have its advantages, but overall I think it would be tiresome.

**Tue Dec 10, 2002 5:36 am
Damien Moore**

the idea of retrospective law has bothered me before...as an analogy, i have seen my provincial government make a law to enable it to jail someone they couldn't legally before, but who was by general standards in the wrong. a few of you may have had experience

with narkomania...one of its features is that every board is given a serial number beside it on the scorelists which you can type into the menu to play again...doing so two years ago i got an 11, then 9 then 8 on the same board. i forget (sorin?) who wrote a program that

only generated the dreamboard so he could practice it (until a 6 was achieved) and none of us nor him accepts that. roland practiced the dreamboard, just he did so without a self-programmed generator; he used the game's generator and manipulated it intentionally to increase dreamboard frequency.

as to time-lag about making rules, when did we make a a ruling about 9x9 boards? it was after khor, on video, got a 1 on the new board. before that, nothing had been mentioned.

it's the same as beginner; for instance, some boards, like kovarik's 1, require one click for an opening then a second click to finish it. i know of one player who achieved a 1 starting games on the second click and then clicking into the middle (i have that video too). is there a rule against it? no, but it seems obvious that the second player just doesn't stack up against the other. Is that 'playing' minesweeper?

the reason david deleted his board-cycling program is because he realised someone could too easily manipulate it. for example, some asked that roland provide the video with the few previous games attached. what does that prove? david pointed out someone could easily set the generator to skip to a couple games before and, since the board cycle isn't perfect, if we asked for several minutes of previous play we could never tell if the previous bit is just spliced material.

currently, as a community, we don't have established rules. The active ranking site only allows window's version and no xp beginner, on the other hand, there are at least 40 xp beginners on my list as i have only held back 1sec boards so far. (i will

have to go through
my mail again for the last year to find them). in addition, i let one linux version on
the site. we, as a group, are here to establish some guidelines and to evaluate past
and current events in light of them.

so, i respectfully disagree with lasse and stephan that we are not in a position to
deal with roland's 9. i would like to see his board sidelined and given special
recognition, but not recognized as the record. i would rather except sorin's 6.

Tue Dec 10, 2002 5:58 am
Damien Moore

roli's 9
sorry for forgetting the subject line last message.

just some thoughts about making dreamboard rules:

accepting or rejecting based on previous knowledge is, like dan and matt said,
ludicrous and impossible. the best to be done there is to reject one or two obvious
ones.

one could just reject roli, one could reject all dreamboards (but then others will
appear), one could accept all dreamboards (but roli and all repeaters, including
himself in the future, are included), one could accept gernot's two boards and
maybe matt's and reject all others (but then a handful of players like brandon, keith,
and dan ('s 23) would object who earned theirs before the controversy and some
like eammanuel and marc would be thrown in the middle), or every dreamboard
could just get an * with a comment on the whole matter but each player's second
best score would be used in the all- time ranking lists.

personally i'm in favour of the last option. probably there are still others.

Tue Dec 10, 2002 11:52 pm
Sorin Manea

Re: roli's 9
First: hidden identities? what for?.

I don't know in what circumstances Matt's 10 was accepted but I don't think we
should accept the 9 just because the 10 was accepted then. Sure, Matt proved he
can do a 10, (missed one at the last click.. or something ..if I recall right), but that
doesn't mean
that the score should be accepted just because the player could do another one...
or not in Roli's case. At least not for a long time.

I proved that one could achieve a 5 on the dramboard. I could really do it if I wanted
to, without cheating, just like Roli did. Would that be a record? Maybe for some. But
if I show the game to someone that doesn't play minesweeper he will ask me: "Why
did you clicked
there? How did you know that?" I will say:"Well, I memorized the board". He will
then say:"What a stupid game. Why the hell are you wasting your time on this? Any

foul could do that." If I did that and claimed the record i don't see why to keep on playing. There's no room for improvement. Why does Roli keep on playing? I thinks he wants better stats. Something like 100 sub 20' a day like Damien does. He will probably be very happy if he gets a 12 tomorrow.

David made a board cycle program? I didn't knew about that. I know it can be done. I did a test once and it worked. Maybe someone will use a method like this someday. Of course that is cheating but there's no way of proving it. You can start playing 300 boards before the DB, know exactly when it's coming and solve it fast. Capture all on video too. You can't prove that's cheating...nor that it isn't.

I still can't decide whether to accept the 9 or not. If we do we'll have something like Formula 1. All the players know the course and whoever does it faster wins. That's not the kind of competition I'd like here. If we do accept it, then there'll be others. I can't agree with accepting it and then make a rule to deny similar "records".

The solution with the *? I don't like it. Nobody will even bother to look at that time if it has the * sign. Then what's the use of puting the score there?

That's all for now

Thu Dec 12, 2002 10:21 pm
inthalloffame

(No subject)

--- In winmine_congress@yahoogroups.com, "Damien Moore wrote:
> i would like to see his board sidelined and given special recognition, but not recognized
>as the record. i would rather except sorin's 6.

I cant tell if youre being sarcastic there. I hope so.

Mon Dec 16, 2002 12:59pm
stephanbechtel

Just a question: I don't get any daily digest from this group. Do you have the same problem? I still get addicts-newsletters.

Thu Dec 19, 2002 10:19 am
stephanbechtel

Marc's board & Re: no newsletter

Yesterday I got a digest from this group, so it should be okay now. One more question: Do we go on with the discussion on Marc's new board or do we go on right here?

Thu Feb 20, 2003 1:09 pm
Marc Schouten

Hi all,

There's been some talk about the dreamboard lately, so I thought I'd try and see if we can get the discussion going again.

To start it off, I propose a vote. Very preliminary and not at all binding and all. Just

to see where we stand at this point in time. We've discussed before, but that was some time ago. Opinions may have changed. So if you would all answer the following questions:

- 1) Are you for or against accepting Roland's 9?
- 2) For practical or principal reasons?
- 3) Very shortly, in a few sentences, what is the reason you voted the way you have?

Let's not yet respond to others' votes or discuss them. Let's do that after all 7 have answered, ok?

Here are my answers:

- 1) For
- 2) Practical
- 3) Because I think the alternative is worse. Not accepting will lead to future discussion and exclusions and possibly cheating/lying. How do we decide which boards count and under which circumstances?

Thu Feb 20, 2003 11:40 pm
Lasse Nyholm Jensen

Re: It's quiet here

- 1) Are you for or against accepting Roland's 9?
- 2) For practical or principal reasons?
- 3) Very shortly, in a few sentences, what is the reason you voted the way you have?

here's my answers:

- 1) for
- 2) both
- 3) don't believe in retrospective laws

Sun Feb 23, 2003 1:36 pm
stephanbechtel

Re: It's quiet here

- 1) Are you for or against accepting Roland's 9?
- 2) For practical or principal reasons?
- 3) Very shortly, in a few sentences, what is the reason you voted > the way you have?

- 1) For
- 2) Practical
- 3) Because I think we don't really have the choice. When he did the 9, he used not existing laws for his purposes. It's a tricky situation, but I don't know how to solve it. We can't judge any player that gets the DB and plays it with knowing where the openings are.

Sun Feb 23, 2003 4:30 pm

Re: It's quiet here

kaminwx

- 1) Are you for or against accepting Roland's 9?
- 2) For practical or principal reasons?
- 3) Very shortly, in a few sentences, what is the reason you voted the way you have?

Here are my answers:

- 1) Against
- 2) Both
- 3) I don't care if there is no written rule for what is accepted and what is not accepted. Using prior knowledge of a board to finish it faster should not be allowed. I don't know how we can police the minesweeper community, but Roli's 9 is an obvious red flag.

Stephan, you just got an 11 on the dreamboard and you said you recognized the board 1-2 seconds into the game. Even I can't help but recognize the dreamboard about 6-8 seconds into the game. We may not intentionally abuse that board, but any prior knowledge can only help us. If I get a 9 or 10 on the dreamboard tomorrow, I don't think it should be accepted for the all-time ranking or possibly even the active ranking.

Mon Mar 10, 2003 10:13 pm
marcx77

Re: It's quiet here

It's been 3 weeks since my last e-mail with the questions about Roland's board. We haven't heard from Sorin, Matt or Damien yet. Thought I'd remind you guys, especially since Steffen just got a 9 the same way that Roland got his.

Mon Mar 10, 2003 11:15 pm
Sorin Manea

Re: It's quiet here

Sorry about not replying sooner. I put a lot of thought into this. It seems to me that whatever we choose, intermediate will become even more insignificant.

answers:

- 1)no for WR / yes for personal bests
- 2)both
- 3)We cannot tell someone we can't accept their records; they will keep posting them (as personal records). But as far as WRs are concerned I think certain measures must be taken. It's like athletics: if you get a WR time but the wind is too strong then the record isn't considered. But you win the race anyway.

Thu Mar 13, 2003 11:38 pm
inthalloffame

I honestly cannot form an opinion right now.

I used to be for accepting it but now after thinking about it for a little while, I can see Dan's arguments more coherently and see how accepting it would lead to a de-valued int level. (In other words, dreamboard scores would no longer hold any significance). By that fact alone, I see that by not accepting the two 9's, we aren't really changing peoples perspectives on int or the dreamboard. If we accept them,

the true players will no longer hold int level to a high standard and the game will loose a lot of value and the true test will come down to expert scores. If we do not accept them, then we have to make up guidelines as to what we will and will not accept. Outlawing the dreamboard is silly, but with the level of abuse it has seen, that might be a step in the right direction.

Playing devil's advocate here with the people who think that outlawing the dreamboard will only force another dreamboard to surface: Obviously, the dreamboard is the easiest board to play and with all the popularity it has gotten, Im sure a lot of people have memorized it. But out of all the other fast boards out there (maybe 10 or so with 3bvs under 35?), can you honestly pick one out that is the fastest? Is there another fast board (possibly with a 3bv lower than that of the dreamboard) that has a definite advantage and has been the base for which a lot of players have had their best score on (like the dream board is)? I cant see one.

By that fact alone, outlawing the dreamboard doesnt seem too far- fetched. If we do outlaw the DB, then Dan and Damien will top the int world, like they both repsectively deserve. Many others will be set back (like me, from 10 to 12x5) but we will have opportunities to grab hold of a 29 3bv board and play it without knowledge and hopefully get back our best times.

On a non-DB, I missed a 10 when I went past a square too quickly and had to find it at the end. Getting a 9 is still possible, but if we force out the open opportunity to memorize an easy board, then that 9 will more than likely be achieved under true playing conditions.

If we outlaw the DB, int will not be so drastically changed.

Im not saying yet whether or not I agree with outlawing the DB...I'm still unsure as to how I feel about accepting the 9's. Im just trying to spark some beneficial debate about the prospect of outlawing the DB.

Sat Mar 15, 2003 3:46 pm
inthalloffame"

Anyone there, I want a debate!

Sat Mar 15, 2003 6:56 pm
stephanbechtel

Re: It really is quiet here
I thought Marc's suggestion was to wait until everyone has replied to the questions. And Damien still has not replied...

Sun Mar 16, 2003 4:25 am
Damien Moore

sorry for taking my time, i just dislike trying to give an opinion when i don't have a clear solution to a problem. so far, sorin's opinion is my strongest point; may i repost your reply sorin with an addition of my own?

- 1)no for WR / yes for personal bests
- 2)both

3) We cannot tell someone we can't accept their records; they will keep posting them (as personal records). But as far as WRs are concerned I think certain measures must be taken. It's like athletics: if you get a WR time but the wind is too strong then the record isn't considered. But you win the race anyway."

I disagree with Lasse's stance on retrospective law; after all, who sat down ahead of time and outlawed 9x9 boards? Khor got a 1 on a 9x9 board over a month before anyone talked of banning it, but we have rejected it and others retrospectively.

**Wed Mar 19, 2003 12:12pm
stephanbechtel**

As I see, everyone has replied to Marc's three questions or at least put out his opinion. In order to come to a decision that definitely IS necessary after Steffen's 9, I'll start with the further discussion of the arguments. As I wanted to get some kind of overview, I re-read all 31 messages of this yahoo group, and I put the main statements into an excel spreadsheet (now available at the files section).

Matt said that he can't see an obvious successor of the dreamboard (DB), if we outlawed the DB. I must contradict: I saved 9 different sub-30 3BV int boards and nearly 50 different int boards with 3BV 35 or lower. As a non-flagger, I'm probably not the man to decide

whether any board "has a definite advantage and has been the base for which a lot of players have had their best score on", like Matt said. However, to serve as examples, Dan got an 11 (which would be world record in a non-DB world) on a 29 3BV board, and Ben van Calster got a 14 on a 30 3BV board. Both of them, I found in my own screenshots

screwed up at 11 with 5 squares to reveal. That examples should show that obviously, there are boards out there that might be record boards for both double-clickers and non-flaggers. Therefore, if we outlaw the DB (btw, what about the 26 3BV shift of the DB where I have a 12 by Matt on my hard disk), any player that has the intention to cheat (I prefer to call the method of Steffen and Roland cheating) could use the technique of steadily hitting F2 to go through the board cycle, learn a new board that is likely to be the easiest non-DB and probably easily achieve a 11 or 10. So, the record lists would be degenerated as now. And every now and then, we would have to ban another board (I think that's kind of Marc's point of view). That can't be the solution.

Sorin's athletics example of distinguishing between personal and world record is not bad. Maybe I like it as I got that 11 on the DB some weeks ago. Then, I had posted in Damien's GB that I recognized the board being the DB after 2 seconds. And although the board

appeared by chance and although I didn't play unfair in the sense of calculated hitting at the openings, I probably played faster than I would have played without having ever seen the DB, as I knew some patterns like the "4x42" in the top right corner, the "x3xxx" in the

first column and the "xx/33/1x/33/xx" in the left bottom. But thinking over the situation, I'd prefer to claim that 11 as a personal record as it wasn't my fault that

that board appeared then. And as far as 1) there are lots of web pages with posted screenshots and videos and 2) I've been playing this game for more than 10 years, a certain measure of prior board knowledge is hardly to be excepted. Even the only prior knowledge where to click in a 50/50 guess might be useful to achieve a personal best. And I guess that this is the case for every member of this congress on at least one board (as we're all long-term players).

In my eyes, the main problem is the fact that the original game version includes those cycles. I must admit that I still can't understand those people that intentionally used those cycles for the only purpose of getting a doubtful record (and maybe destroying the game). And of course, I won't defend them despite of two of them being Germans. Minesweeper definitively is part of my life's meaning (at least has been during the past 10 years).

Nevertheless, those cycles are around and always, some players will have the intention to take an advantage out of it. A solution might be a new game version (say GlobalMines or something else), but I'm not a fan of it. Dan brought up the argument that everyone would have to redo his records. So, years of playing would immediately be useless. Might be a punishment that is too hard for all those who are innocent of the actual proceedings. And accepting only records done with the new version would create a small community playing that game whereas the whole world keeps playing the normal minesweeper. As Microsoft is not likely to care at all, the Windows standard version won't get rid of its bugs (cycles, 1-sec-timer-bug etc.).

Lasse's argument of not believing in retrospective laws was my favourite for a long time, but Damien's argument about the 9x9 history shows that a retrospective rule is possible and probably even accepted by wide parts of the community (more or less reluctantly).

So, I still can't offer a useful proposal how a decision should look like. Maybe Sorin's yes/no voting is the best one combined with outlawing the DB and with the silent hope that no other DBs won't crystallize out.

One last thing: Steffen told me that one reason for his latest activities was the impression that the congress doesn't decide anything and therefore, Roli's 9 is going to be accepted slowly but surely. And at least in one single point, he is right: anyone who is not a member of the current congress has absolutely no idea what we have done and what we do now. Shouldn't we publish some preliminary results (if we have some) or at least tell the community about the current state?

Wed Mar 19, 2003 12:13pm
winmine_congress

New file uploaded to winmine_congress

This email message is a notification to let you know that a file has been uploaded to the Files area of the winmine_congress group.

File : /congress.xls
Uploaded by : stephanbechtel
Description : Summary on the statements in message 1-31

Wed Mar 19, 2003 12:14pm
winmine_congress

New file uploaded to winmine_congress
This email message is a notification to let you know that a file has been uploaded to the Files area of the winmine_congress group.
File : /pot12_30.png
Uploaded by : stephanbechtel
Description : possible new dreamboard - example 2 (3BV 30, Ben's 14)

Wed Mar 19, 2003 12:15 pm
winmine_congress

New file uploaded to winmine_congress
This email message is a notification to let you know that a file has been uploaded to the Files area of the winmine_congress group.
File : /pot13_29.png
Uploaded by : stephanbechtel
Description : possible new dreamboard - example 1 (3BV 29, Dan's 11)

Wed Mar 19, 2003 1:56 pm
marcx77

Re: starting the discussion...
Nice work, Stephan. Thanks!

Here are some more of my thoughts. (warning: long message ahead :)

Damien and Sorin propose to reject Roli's and Steffen's 9s for the WR, but not for personal bests. How is this going to work? What does a personal best mean when you can't compare it to other people's scores? Will they only be excluded from the rankings on intermediate? Or also from the best player's list?

About retrospective laws: I don't think the argument holds true completely. I agree that you can't punish someone for doing something that wasn't "outlawed" before. But I don't think that rejecting scores in this case would be punishing. Punishing would be removing scores from the lists that have been there and recognized for some time before. So far, Roli's and Steffen's times haven't been recognized yet. Rejecting them therefore wouldn't be punishing them directly, although they may perceive it as such. I'm not entire sure about this yet. It's a shady area.

Banning only the DB will lead to all sorts of problems, some of which have already been mentioned.

- * People without prior knowledge of the board may get and have gotten totally legitimate records.
- * People may have gotten their record on the DB but not made it known.
- * Although some don't think so, new DBs will probably arise if this one is banned, leading to the same discussion all over again.
- * People may post records without telling it's the DB, as they may disagree with any

ban.

Using a new version that doesn't have cycles is not an option in my view, unless we somehow manage to get Microsoft to adopt it.

Let me say again, to be completely clear: I find what Roli and Steffen (particularly Steffen) have done highly objectionable. I don't think it's in the spirit of the game and it corrupts competition and thereby lessens the experience of playing intermediate for all.

But I see so many objections to banning the DB, or banning a way of playing or banning whatever, that I don't think it's possible to come up with a strict rule (or, in this case, ruling) that will satisfy and appease everyone.

We do have, in my view, another option. As I see it, this whole issue boils down to ethics. It's a moral problem: should someone play this way? Should we judge them for doing so? Who are we to dictate how the game should be played, if none of the things we dictate have been formalised by the game designer? So, I think we should address the "perpetrators" sense of ethics and morals and leave it up to them.

I would imagine a statement from us to that effect would be something like:

"The congress finds using prior knowledge of boards or board cycles to get better times highly reprehensible and any such practice should be heavily discouraged. Future attempts to use this practice can be expected to be met with scorn and contempt (optional ;))

However, we don't think that banning any scores or boards is viable. We therefore leave it up to the players. Anyone that has used this practice in the past to get his or her record must state whether or not they want their record to be adopted into the various scorelists.

This statement is irrevocable. If someone wishes to exclude his or her record gotten in this manner -which the congress strongly encourages-, they forfeit the right to get any times gotten through this practice acknowledged in the future."

This way, we put a lot of pressure on the people who have done this. If they distance themselves from their scores, people will respect them for it and they will be commended. If they don't, they become social outcasts. They will still have their names at the top of the scorelists, but many people will not value them as they would a traditional record. I don't think people would want that.

We also have quite a strong tool to induce people to distance themselves from their dubious scores: the Active Ranking.

Since the AR is made up by us, the players, we can set any rule we see fit. We could say that any player that uses prior knowledge is excluded from the active ranking. For a certain amount of time, or forever. I think that for many people (especially Steffen, who is #4 in the AR at this time), this will be reason enough to give up their scores or not try to use prior knowledge in the future. Many of us play for competition. The active ranking is the most direct competition we have. I think the prospect of being excluded from that can be quite deterring.

The only problem this leaves is people who know about the dreamboard and its layout, thereby getting an unintended advantage. I think that in this case, we should leave it up to the players themselves. If they can honestly say that they didn't play any faster than they would have, had they never seen the board before, then their scores should be accepted. No questions asked. Well, just that one ;). This is no different from accepting a 1 on beginner, for instance.

If they feel that they did have an advantage because they'd seen the board before, then they should not submit it. But they shouldn't be excluded from ever submitting a record on the DB ever again. I know, from experience, that it is possible to play the board without recognizing it, when you've recognized it in the past. I got a 16 the first time, a 12 the second time, where I recognized the board before I was halfway through, and a 14 the third time, where I didn't recognize it until afterwards.

I can honestly say that I didn't have an advantage from recognizing the board the second time. How? Because I don't know exactly how the mines are placed. I couldn't draw the board if you put a gun to my head. Therefore, it's impossible for me to play any other way than the way I normally play. If anything, recognizing the board may have slowed me down a bit, because I got somewhat nervous.

But I'm drifting. So, to sum up:

We give people a one time opportunity to decide for themselves whether or not they want their scores adopted into the record lists We discourage them to do so by

- * moral pressure
- * peer pressure
- * possible exclusion from the AR

I think this option is the most viable, because:

- * it solves practical problems and, to some extent, principal objections
- * it's not oppressive and therefore more likely to be generally accepted
- * it appeals to people's sense of honesty, which is and has been one of the cornerstones of this community.

In my view, this is the most viable, fair and diplomatic solution. Please, share your comments, views, objections, additions.

Oh, and by the way: if you're wondering why I didn't bring this up before: I just thought it up ;)

Wed Mar 19, 2003 4:42 pm
Lasse Nyholm Jensen

I agree with Marc's suggestion, to use moral instead of direct punishment.

Besides that I think it's time to allow 9x9-boards on beginner, since it's part of the official version of winmine. I don't see any problem in accepting scores from 9x9-boards, because 1)it's logical that the easiest level of the game has a less density of mines than the inter-level and is not just smaller and 2)in time more and more people and new players will play the 9x9-version and 3)it doesn't really matter that much whether 100 or 1000 people has the world record in a level, when it's impossible to improve.

Wed Mar 19, 2003 5:32 pm
marcx77

Re: reply and 9x9
Two more things:

1) I'm particularly interested in what Matt would do should my proposal be acceptable, since his record was also done with prior knowledge (wasn't it? I think you said so, but I'm not quite sure... It still might have been a misclick/mistake...)

2) I'm not going to be involved in the discussion about 9x9 boards, since my record on a 9x9 is 1 while my 8x8 record is 2.

Thu Mar 20, 2003 12:42 am
inthalloffame

Re: reply and 9x9

I did have prior knowledge of the breamboard before I got my 10. However, I did not use any sort of method to manipulate my chances of getting the DB. I have a great visual memory, and there are probably many many boards on intermediate that I would recognize

about halfway through the game. Thats not to say that I have memorized any of these boards or that I know any of the patterns found on that board, just that many of the fast boards on int are very familiar to me after I finish them. We are all very intelligent people here, so Im sure Im not the only one who notices that.

If I got the DB again, I would not play it. Just a personal thing that Im sure others could agree to.

Some of Marc's points of banning the DB and my rebuttals:

* People without prior knowledge of the board may get and have gotten totally legitimate records.

The more you play, the better your chances are of you getting the DB. So it only

makes sense, that the people who get the DB for the first time are not going to get a 9 or an 8 simply because they will probably not have been playing long enough to improve to that level. There are exceptions to this, but not many. Most people who get the DB for the first time score 18+ so in the grand scheme of world records, those scores play no role.

* People may have gotten their record on the DB but not made it known.

True. I agree that people will try to be sneaky, and that is something that we have to deal with. I'd like to believe that most people who are advanced enough in the game to score a WR time on the DB will be honest enough and close enough to the community that they will not try to deceive anyone. Also, as technology becomes better and better, more and more sweepers will have access to video software, and not taking a screenshot of your record will be almost impossible to claim immunity to.

* Although some don't think so, new DBs will probably arise if this one is banned, leading to the same discussion all over again.

I honestly don't think so. There are many many other fast boards out there, probably 2 or 3 which are capable of producing 9's given the skill of the sweeper. No one is better than another like the DB obviously is.

* People may post records without telling it's the DB, as they may disagree with any ban.

Read my response about ethics in the upper quadrant of the sweeping ladder after the second statement.

If we do outlaw DB scores, I will be fine with my PB being 12.

**Fri Mar 21, 2003 9:05 pm
stephanbechtel**

Re: reply and 9x9

After some reflection on Marc's proposal, I still agree with his idea on principle, but I got some points to think about (again not the shortest message at all...):

1. For every honest community member, that moral thing won't be the problem. But for a player who has no scruple to use the internal bugs of the game for his own purposes to jumble up the record lists, maybe that moral aspect won't count too much (with the consequence that those players don't really care if they become outcasts).

2. I guess I know Roli and Steffen better than every other community member as I had some mail contact in former and recent times with them. Therefore, I tried to figure out how they will react if Marc's idea is our final decision.

a) Roland: he told me that his main goal is to get best in every game he starts

playing. In minesweeper, the intermediate level was his only possibility to get no.1. Even if he seems to like the long-term competition with Elmar and others, I'm not sure at all what his decision would be. It's possible that he keeps his 9 as his best. b) Steffen: he told me that his main goal was to let Roli not have the int WR. So, without Roli, I'm sure, Steffen would go back to his recent 12 (16.03.2003). When Roli keeps his 9, I'm not so sure. Maybe, even Steffen would stay at 9 and accept the "outcasting process", although, as he is kind of "gambler", he won't like the idea of dropping out of the AR.

Those thoughts lead to some additions to Marc's proposal:

- * Some players, especially Roli/Steffen, would have to ban more than one score. Would we allow for only banning the one and keeping the other?
- * Every decision should not depend on what others decide. Therefore, there could be a fixed period of time, say one week, to decide. Each player sends his personal decision to an independent "decision administrator" who collects the assessments and publishes them not earlier than the period of time is over. That administrator could be someone like Dan who doesn't have to decide obviously.
- * I'm still quite sceptical of possibly having uncleaned lists afterwards. As the world rankings are maintained by the community, we could strengthen the pressure to "the right decision" by announcing that every player who doesn't exclude his prior-knowledge-scores will be listed not in black, but in grey font color (or in italics or something ugly instead).
- * If the last thing is too hard in someone's eyes, the alternative could be – as Marc already suggested – the exclusion of the AR. I'd like to suggest another possibility: a so-called prior-knowledge- penalti, e.g. during 2-3 periods a 10-second penalty for int and exp (which is a total of 20, so all AR statistics of that player might be destroyed at once...).

For the 9x9 topic, I'd prefer the following option: 9x9 times are accepted, even in the AR. But as, in my eyes, a 2 on 9x9 is much easier than a 2 on 8x8, the world record lists should not mix 8x8 and 9x9 scores. The conclusion is to create a 4th record list so that we have beg 8x8, beg 9x9, int and exp. For the totals, the better score might count. That could be just for all who got a 1 or a 2 on the 8x8 grid.

**Fri Mar 21, 2003 10:46 pm
Damien Moore**

just a bit on 9x9: i've started a 4th list that contains all 9x9's since september...there's about 25 or so i accidentally allowed on the 8x8 list before that, but i can find most of those through my emails. my only considerations were that 9x9 wouldn't count for ranking (serious enough players are more than willing to download the old version to capture a good beg score while beginner players don't care and needn't), and that the standard should be lowered (since its 6s for 8x8, the 9x9 should be 64/81ths that time, so 4 maybe 5s as the limit). suggestions on this last point?

Fri Mar 28, 2003 2:05 pm
stephanbechtel

As Steffen doesn't seem to stop his strategy to make intermediate scores as ridiculously as possible, we should go ahead and keep the discussion living. There haven't been posts in this group during the last 7 days, so I suggest that especially those who didn't reply to Marc's and my last suggestions try to make another statement so that we might find a publishable decision as soon as possible. As far as we don't decide anything, those postings won't stop and, even worse, the scores submitted for the AR, don't follow any rules and therefore might destroy the "normal" hierarchy of the AR.

Fri Mar 28, 2003 3:57 pm
Lasse Nyholm Jensen

Re: situation is getting worse

My opinion on the AR is that the people who is running it, have the right to decide whether a score is legit or not, and therefore does not need a special rule from the congress to make these decisions. The AR is being run by a few people and as these people do a fine job on that, I'm sure it will be respected however the decision should sound. If you come up with a specific rule (for instance that if there's reason to think a score was reached unfairly, and the player does not submit a second score for the given level, the person gets a 10sec penalty or so), I think you should write it into the rules for submission on the AR-page. So in my opinion Stephan, Dan and Roelof has every right to exclude scores or give penalty if they feel it needed to run the AR in a fair way.

Fri Mar 28, 2003 8:09 pm
inthalloffame

Re: situation is getting worse

I am now fully convinced that outlawing the DB from the real record lists is the best path to take.

In response to arguments I know I will get, yes people can memorize other fast boards but IMO there is no one board that is in obvious succession to the DB.

We might have to require videos of fast int. games to prove no pre- recognition and forethought.

Fri Mar 28, 2003 10:57 pm
Sorin Manea

Re: situation is getting worse

I agree with Matt.

There is no other board that allows such a low score. An 8 is relative easy to get on the DB while on other boards it is the best you can get. If we outlaw the DB i think Steffen will either ignore any law or simply switch to another board. I don't like how this sounds, but this is how I see him now.

Sat Mar 29, 2003 12:44 am
marcx77

Re: situation is getting worse

--- In winmine_congress@yahoo.com, "inthalloffame" wrote:

> I am now fully convinced that outlawing the DB from the
> real record lists is the best path to take.

I'm fully convinced that it is not.

> In response to arguments I know I will get, yes people can
> memorize other fast boards >but IMO there is no one board
> that is in obvious succession to the DB.

No one board, but there is nothing that prevents others from learning all possible candidates. Ban one board, be prepared to ban a whole lot more in the future.

"Illegal" records on the DB are not the problem, they are a symptom. The problem is people are willing to cheat. We should address that, not the result of it.

Sat Mar 29, 2003 2:46 am
inthalloffame

Re: situation is getting worse

-- In winmine_congress@yahoo.com, "marcx77" wrote:
> "Illegal" records on the DB are not the problem, they are a
> symptom. The problem is >people are willing to cheat. We
> should address that, not the result of it.

I dont think intangible ostracization will be a solution, we need concrete guidelines and barriers, not a spoken slap-on-the-wrist for people like Steffen.

Sun Mar 30, 2003 3:40 pm
inthalloffame

Re: situation is getting worse

I think the non-congress community is doing a very good job of taking care of our dirty work.

Most of them have lost faith in int and disregarded the DB as an unsuitable board to form records on. At this point, outlawing the DB would come as no great shock to the community and would probably be accepted as the best solution (even though it may not be).

Likewise, I think they would be still be pleased if we went through more work for ourselves and Damien and made separate lists for int.

IMO, the best path to take is to outlaw the DB while leaving everything else the same. We shall require screenshots for fast times to be posted on the int lists. Videos will be strongly recommended. Before any fast int time should be posted on the WR lists, it should come to us for review so we can see if any forethought went into the game (video). Also, the person submitting the fast time should be asked to provide videos of expert games to give us a suitable comparison as to how fast the player is in comparison to the time he is submitting.

I think the review of new scores, as well as the legitimacy of new players, videos, etc. is why this congress was created in the first place and to not use this forum as anything besides philosophical debate is pointless.

If you agree with my idea as a step in the right direction, please say so, if you find faults with it, please say so.

Come on guys, where ya been?

Sun Mar 30, 2003 6:47 pm
marcx77

Re: situation is getting worse

> If you agree with my idea as a step in the right direction,
> please say so, if you find faults with it, please say so.

I disagree (which must come as no surprise ;))

What about that person who has been playing Minesweeper for a while, has no knowledge of the community, much less of any dreamboards or cycles, that suddenly gets a great board and crushes his record. He goes out on the internet, finds Damien's site and proudly announces his achievement. Would you be the one to tell this poor guy his record won't be counted because some people have taken advantage of unintended game mechanics that he wasn't even aware of?

What about the people who already have gotten their records on the DB legitimately? Sriram? Gernot? Me? (yourself??).

As long as there is the possibility of legitimately getting a record on the DB (and I believe this is the case, even if you've been around the community for the past time), outlawing it is something I will never support.

You propose a set of rules (which may not even be possible to meet for some people; Camtasia doesn't run on everyone's PC). In my opinion, having a set of rules will only make people see how far they can stretch it. We don't need a set of rules, we need a set of values. From what I gather, there are very few people in the community who don't feel that this game should be "pure" and the people playing it should be honest about it.

If we make the situation clear to new players to the community, I don't think it will be hard to dissuade them (using the threat of possible sanctions in the manner I proposed earlier) from attempting the same thing Roli and Steffen have. And that only leaves us with the sticky situation we find ourselves in right now.

Perhaps, as a modification of my earlier (long ;)) suggestion, we could pass judgement on Roli's and Steffen's times at this time (i.e. disallow them). Thorough scrutinization of their future times (and Case's and Sorin's and yours, for that matter) will of course be required and I'm not against setting some or all of the rules you propose for everyone who has done the "cycle"-thing in the past. But to outright ban the dreamboard is, in my humble opinion, just plain silly.

P.S.: Let's try and resolve this quickly. People are starting to wonder what the hell

we're doing. Dan? We haven't heard from you in some time...

Sun Mar 30, 2003 7:08 pm
Lasse Nyholm

Re: situation is getting worse

I partly agree with both Marc and Matt. I think one of our tasks is perhaps to make a WR-list that is highly trustworthy and to judge each new record on a case to case basis. This means that it is not necessary to ban the dreamboard, so if one sends in a new WR we will look at the evidence and judge whether or not unfair methods has been used. That be solver-programs slowed down to human speed, use of cycleknowledge and so forth. I think this is the way Damien's list is made, and I can understand why it sometimes takes a while to determine whether a score is achieved unfairly. A list where not just Damien (and I know he has gotten help from other members in the community on several occasions), but seven respected sweepers say yes to the new records would be even more trustworthy than the lists we already have. Georgi's list is definitely very broad, but also perhaps less critical than preferable.

I therefore propose that we don't ban the dreamboard, but still make an official announcement so we don't let players leave the responsibility on the shoulders of the congress. We simply determine on a case to case basis whether a new WR is legit and fair or not. That should allow players to follow their own style, and leave them with the responsibility and the thoughts on which road to follow. Thinking about whether they want to follow a path that get them good scores, but risks their credibility in the community, or whether they want to follow a more natural path as has all of us in this forum. The line you can follow and be respected in the community is not a narrow path, it is infact a broad road that many of us haven't had problems to follow in the previous years. I think we should encourage people to follow that path if they want to be a respected membet of the community. In the past years this has been the natural thing. The community haven't judged people before it had a reason to do so (cases such as Daniella, Joao, Justin deFibo...) and I think it can continue to be that way if we inform newcomers that this is the way it works. It has in past years shown to be unneeded to inform people, but it seems it might be worth trying to state this more officially.

Sun Mar 30, 2003 9:48 pm
stephanbechtel

Re: situation is getting worse

> If you agree with my idea as a step in the right direction, please
> say so, if you find faults with it, please say so.

As it seems as Matt and Marc still have strongly different opinions, I'm on Marc's side. Steffen won't probably stop his style of recent int playing if we only ban the DB, as he might use the cycles to get a 10 on a non-DB. And I find Marc's first argument very obvious: when I found this community, I got a 17 on the DB (21->17) without knowing that it was on a special board. It sucks if you get a record in this way and it wouldn't be accepted.

So, the combined answers of Lasse and Marc are both applicable and acceptable by the community. And if people like Steffen don't stop to submit silly scores, we might ban them from the AR, and if they don't give up, even from the WR lists.

Sun Mar 30, 2003 11:26 pm
Sorin Manea

Re: situation is getting worse

I don't like the idea of banning the DB. The cycles became a problem only when someone used them to get a better score.

The problem here is Steffen. He should be sanctioned - by that I mean removed from the score lists. At least from total scores lists where int and beg are involved. I cannot say anything about his 53 yet.

I agree with us needing to do something quickly. We're debating here but we haven't really voted anything. In this time many more could start following the path Steffen started.

P.S. I don't think Case is "dangerous" in this matter. I don't know why you're questioning me Marc. Maybe because I haven't posted any videos. If someone asks me I will.

Mon Mar 31, 2003 12:45 am
kaminwx

Re: situation is getting worse

I suppose I am leaning in Marc's direction. While the dreamboard is the easiest board to cheat on, surely there are at least a few other boards Steffen and others could get a 10 on. I don't want to start adding a bunch of boards to the banned list. The dreamboard is the only board I currently have knowledge of. I would not recognize any other board while playing it.

Mon Mar 31, 2003 4:24 am
marcx77

Re: situation is getting worse

--- In winmine_congress@yahoogroups.com, Sorin Manea wrote:

- > The problem here is Steffen. He should be sanctioned -
- > by that I mean removed from the score lists. At least
- > from total scores lists where int and beg are
- > involved. I cannot say anything about his 53 yet.

Hmm.. I don't think he should be removed from the lists altogether. Say what you want about Steffen, he has been honest about everything he's done. I think that when he says that a 13 is his best time gotten in a "straight" manner, we should believe him. Being a bit forthcoming like this will also help keep him on "the right path" :) Of course, any record submitted by him should be scrutinized thoroughly.

- > P.S. I don't think Case is "dangerous" in this matter.
- > I don't know why you're questioning me Marc. Maybe
- > because I haven't posted any videos. If someone asks
- > me I will.

Weren't you the one that made a program to practice the DB over and over? That would make any record you got on the DB at least questionable. If you weren't, then disregard what I said, obviously ;)

Mon Mar 31, 2003 10:22 pm
Sorin Manea

Re: situation is getting worse

Yes I agree, it would be nice to turn Steffen the right way. We could ask him to "forget" those scores and never post them again (because they mean nothing). Roli too.

> Weren't you the one that made a program to practice
> the DB over and over? That would make any record
> you got on the DB at least questionable. If you weren't,
> then disregard what I said, obviously ;)

Yes it was me. I wanted to see where the cycles could lead. I found the limit and stoped there. But I didn't do it to get a record on the dreamboard. And anything i'll get on the DB will have no value for me or for anyone.

Tue Apr 1, 2003 12:35 am
inthalloffame

Re: situation is getting worse

So from what Im gathering here, most seem to be for a system of accepting records on a case by case basis rather than making blanket rules and outlaws? Im for that if we get a vote going. If that ends up to be the case, we can look at Roli's 9 and Steffen's 8 seperatety and take other problems one by one and decide on them based on individual cirucmstances. Sounds good.

Btw, sort of off topic, who here would not play the DB if they got? I wouldnt.

Mon Apr 7, 2003 11:03 pm
Sorin Manea

quiet again

I know it's hard to decide but we should at least try!

Several solutions have been posted and we could vote starting with them. We should put them in a more compact form, make a pool and vote it. This is why we are here. If we wanted to express oppinions we could have posted in a guestbook.

The congress has been founded about 6 months ago. That's a long time and we have no results so far.

I know I'm as "guilty" as you (maybe more)for not doing much during these months. But this situation must end.(as much as I'd liked to, this problem won't solve itself)

If anyone has another solution to the problem,apart from the ones discussed here, then please share it with the rest. Otherwise we should start choosing an appropriate solution right NOW!

Wed Apr 9, 2003 10:16 am
stephanbechtel **Re: quiet again**
I don't have any new proposals, but I agree totally with Sorin that we must make to a decision as soon as possible.

Wed Apr 9, 2003 4:01 pm
kaminwx **Re: quiet again**
I'm ready for a vote(s) as well.

Mon Apr 14, 2003 12:42 am
inthalloffame So is everyone agreed that we should handle things on a case-by-case basis?
If so, should we start some polls up? One for Roli's 9 as a WR, same for Steffen's 9/8...

Tue Apr 15, 2003 12:16 pm
Lasse Nyholm Jensen **Re: Poll time**
fine by me!

Tue Apr 15, 2003 5:33 pm
kaminwx **Re: Poll time**
Let's vote!

Wed Apr 16, 2003 3:37 am
winmine_congress Enter your vote today! A new poll has been created for the winmine_congress group:
Should Steffen's 8 be the world record given his method of playing?

o Yes
o No

Wed Apr 16, 2003 9:59 am
stephanbechtel **Re: Poll time**
> So is everyone agreed that we should handle things
> on a case-by-case basis?

As I noticed Matt went ahead and startet the case-by-case polls. As far as I understood, we didn't come to a decisive end whether we should handle things on a case-by-case basis or set up a general "rule". I think, Marc will agree to me. So, I suggest to vote first on a general topic how we're going to act.

If we keep the case-by-case judgments, I'll already see the problems: Steffen has done lots of sub-13 games on the DB. So, we would face several polls, only dedicated to Steffen's scores, and another several polls to Roli's, still not deciding on other players...

Wed Apr 16, 2003 8:19 pm
Lasse Nyholm As I see it, we decide whether or not a record is a world record or not, we shouldn't have to decide what a player's personal record is, though our work might be very limited then.

Thu Apr 17, 2003 3:31 am
Damien Moore thanks stephan for posting...i don't have a problem with one or two case polls, but it is impractical over the long run. personally, i think stephan has been honest, and he has mentioned his willingness to accept permanent scores of 2-13 on the bottom two levels (as those were his scores before this began). i don't think stephan should be penalized in anyway (except maybe on the active rankings if he submits better

than 15 or so) because all he has done is intentionally show us how ridiculous Roli's method is; he just tried to highlight the absurdity by taking it farther than the rest of us had guts to. personally, i considered doing what steffen has done because i wanted to stop 'rolis' in the future, but i was unwilling to destroy intermediate for myself, if you know what i mean.

i have always disliked roli's 9, 10 and other DB scores, and i would be content to limit him to his fastest natural score, a 15 for now (as he hasn't admittedly applied his technique to other boards...yet). just a word on banning DB's: i just had a new guy write in ecstatically for getting his first sub-20 (he doesn't know yet that it's the DB)...i don't want to penalize people like this, so maybe case by case is okay say for sub-20's or sub16's...you know, where accuracy in records are more important to the community.

damien

Thu Apr 17, 2003 11:28 pm
stephanbechtel

Re: Poll time - sorry for length

@Damien: I might have misunderstood something, but I guess that you had some problems in distinguishing StePHAn (me) and SteFFEn Stachna.

> personally, i think stephan has been honest, and he has mentioned
>his willingness to accept permanent scores of 2-13 on the bottom two
>levels (as those were his scores before this began).

I think you meant Steffen in this sentence, didn't you?

> i don't think stephan should be penalized in anyway (except
> maybe on the active rankings if he submits better than 15 or so)
>because all he has done is intentionally show us how ridiculous
>Roli's method is; he just tried to highlight the absurdity by taking
>it farther than the rest of us had guts to. personally, i considered
>doing what steffen has done because i wanted to stop 'rolis' in the
>future, but i was unwilling to destroy intermediate for myself, if
>you know what i mean.

I'm quite sure you meant Steffen Stachna as well in this sentence?

Thanks for the use of the correct spellings in future ;-)

StePHAn

Fri Apr 18, 2003 4:58 am
Damien Moore

sorry, really messed up...rest assured, i know who's who.

Mon Apr 28, 2003 11:49 am
stephanbechtel

Another 10 days gone without any message. We should really come to a decision. On the one hand, there are still two votes missing in the steffens-8-poll created by Matt. On the other hand, there still was no final agreement about our strategy, either to judge every board on a case-by-case basis as mainly suggested by Matt or to formulate a congress statement including a "moral message" as mainly suggested by Marc.

Fri May 9, 2003 11:17 pm
Sorin Manea

Poll
2 votes still missing? Who hasn't voted?

Sun May 18, 2003 2:03 pm

Re: Poll

kaminwx

I voted.

Sun May 18, 2003 2:05 pm
Lasse Nyholm Jensen

I believe Marc is the person missing. And since he didn't submit scores for AR I'm getting a bit worried - Marc, are you out there???

Mon Jun 23, 2003 12:24 pm
Lasse Nyholm Jensen

Has anyone heard from Marc the last couple of months?

Mon Jun 23, 2003 12:49 pm
Marc Schouten

Re: Marc?

--- In winmine_congress@yahoogroups.com, "Lasse Nyholm Jensen" wrote:
> Has anyone heard from Marc the last couple of months?

I'm here.

Some time ago, I suddenly got sick of it all. Computer and internet in general and Minesweeper in particular. It was just eating up so much of my time. There comes a point when it stops being a hobby and starts becoming an addiction. So I took a break for a while. I'm sorry I didn't say anything, but I needed to get away from the whole thing for a while.

I still play and still too much for my own liking (although that 54 a few days ago was fun ;) but I won't be competing in the AR anymore. I'll probably still drop by from time to time, but it's probably best you find someone else to take my spot on the congress.

Again, I'm sorry I didn't post anything for the past weeks/months. I hope you understand.

Good luck all and talk to you later.

Mon Jun 23, 2003 12:55 pm
Lasse Nyholm

I understand Marc, good to hear from you though, I was getting worried something had happened to you. We'll figure out a solution for the congress, though it seems it's silently walking into the land of Has Been.

Wed Jun 25, 2003 10:48 am
stephanbechtel

Re: Marc?

--- In winmine_congress@yahoogroups.com, "Marc Schouten" wrote:
> I'm here. I'll probably still drop by from time to time, but it's probably
> best you find someone else to take my spot on the congress.
> Again, I'm sorry I didn't post anything for the past weeks/months.
> I hope you understand.

I understand Marc as well. Nice to hear that it isn't anything really serious.

The former poll about the congress member suggestions showed up that on rank 8 we have Eduardo and Roelof with 8 votes each. As Roelof has nearly retired, probably Edu would be a really good substitute for Marc. What do the others think?

And, to reply to Lasse's latest post, I still hope that we can find a decision. Regarding the message of Dennis Lütken and Martin's answer in Damien's geustbook, we're still quite at the level of "They didn't reach anything". Should the congress really end up as a nearly "useless" project?

Wed Jun 25, 2003 1:31 pm
Lasse Nyholm Jensen"

Hi guys, I've just done some "equalizing" by giving you all a blue star next to your name on the members-list. Use it with care.

Wed Jun 25, 2003 8:53 pm
kaminwx

Re: member->owner

--- In winmine_congress@yahoogroups.com, "Lasse Nyholm Jensen" wrote:
> Hi guys, I've just done some "equalizing" by giving you all a blue
> star next to your name on the members-list. Use it with care.

With the new powers I just took a look at the results of the poll (minus marc). We have been waiting for marc to vote so we can conclude the poll, yet I see the voting is 6-0 for NO. We should just conclude the poll and move on to a different issue.

Wed Jul 2, 2003 12:35 am
kaminwx

I concluded the lone poll today because with a 6-0 "no" result there is no reason to keep it open.

Fri Nov 21, 2003 6:09 pm
inthalloffame

Hello all,

I have been pretty much absent from minesweeper for the better part of a year now, as I'm sure you here have noticed.

Occasionally I check the guestbook at Damien's site to see if anything worthwhile is happening, but I never saw anything worth my time so I kind of lost interest in the community.

With that said (and with the fact that this community has been dry for the past few months), are there any current issues that the congress needs to be assembled for? So far, I'm guessing that we have only really discussed one issue (the DB's validity as a world record board) and have been intermittent at best with that. Based on Georgi's top player list I receive every so often, I see that Steffen and Roland have been credited with 9's....

Has there been any progress with a clone game that would essentially get rid of pesky board cycles and encourage random board generation? Are there any dubious scores being claimed that we should take a look into?

And how/what is everyone here doing? I'm in my first year at Georgia Tech studying aerospace engineering and am on the swim team. Perhaps we should get discussion budding once again?

Sat Nov 29, 2003 7:14 pm
stephanbechtel

Re: Back again

Although everyone except from Dan should have received Matt's message, no one has answered yet, so I'll start.

> Has there been any progress with a clone game that would
> essentially get rid of pesky board cycles and encourage
> random board generation? Are there any dubious scores
> being claimed that we should take a look into?

First question: I don't think that there was any progress. Second question: The only dubious thing is a expert 38 that is recently discussed in the addicts group, but I don't think that this is a case for the congress.

> And how/what is everyone here doing? Perhaps
> we should get discussion budding once again?

I've finishing my last exams, so I'm about to start my dissertation as last step to my

diploma. I would appreciate if we started discussing again. We didn't have still decided anything. And I still don't like Georgi listing Roland and Steffen with a 9. The DB topic is important as e.g. Matthew Ackerman had an 8 on it which wasn't accepted at all so far.

Sat Nov 29, 2003 8:28 pm
Lasse Nyholm Jensen

Re: Back again

I'm thinking that it may not be the time for anything official in the minesweeper world - not yet anyway. It seems that everything is quite calm now, with everyone making up their own minds as to whether they accept claimed records or not. I think that's fine, I myself do the same. I have no problem with someone claiming a 38 on expert, cause I think there's a timer-problem involved somehow. It's up to the person himself to decide whether he needs video-evidence or screenshots or something to trust a score.

That's all I have to say for the moment - I don't feel the need for "official" discussions, it doesn't seem needed anymore (if it ever did).

Sun Nov 30, 2003 3:26 am
inthalloffame

So is the issue of Roland's and Steffen's 9s one we should discuss as it seems that a number of people have come to accept them as legit records? Are most people here in favor of looking at each individually, and accepting that practice as one we should adopt for future cases?

If we make individual decisions of Roland's and Steffen's scores, should we also make a decision on my 10 (and 11 which was made on a DB with a few mines in different places- the screenshot should be in the dustbin of the AR somewhere as it was the WR for that first year, I think). I have already stated that if the scores mentioned above are disallowed because of prior knowledge, then that also knocks out my 10 and 11, even though I did not manipulate cycles or anything, but rather played the board with familiarity of certain patterns.

Should Damien present any dubious claims emailed to him here for us to decide upon in a poll? I think so.

Has there been a final decision about keeping 9x9 boards out of the beginner lists? I think this separation has worked so far and will continue to work in the future.

There are a few issues we can vote upon and release a decision to the community any time we want to. Can we form a list of issues we can now take a final vote upon?

Sun Nov 30, 2003 3:54 pm
kaminwx

Re: Back again

> "stephanbechtel" <bechtel@u...> wrote:
> Although everyone except from Dan should have received Matt's
> message, no one has answered yet, so I'll start.

I'm not sure what you mean by this.

> I would appreciate if we started discussing again. We didn't have
> still decided anything. And I still don't like Georgi listing Roland
> and Steffen with a 9. The DB topic is important as e.g. Matthew
> Ackerman had an 8 on it which wasn't accepted at all so far.

We had a poll early in the year asking whether one of those 8 second dreamboards should be accepted as the record. When I concluded the poll the vote was 6-0 NO. I'm sure the vote would be similar or the same for all of the 8/9 second dreamboard

games that have been submitted.

Mon Dec 1, 2003 4:07 pm
stephanbechtel

Re: Back again

> > Although everyone except from Dan should have received Matt's
> > message, no one has answered yet, so I'll start.
> I'm not sure what you mean by this.

It's easy: In the members catalogue, there is listed "No Email" at Mail Delivery. So, if you didn't check the group regularly, you probably wouldn't have noticed Matt's post, I thought. Indeed, I was wrong what is even better. Sorry for being unprecise, Dan!

Mon Dec 1, 2003 5:04 pm
kaminwx

Re: Back again

> It's easy: In the members catalogue, there is listed "No Email" at
> Mail Delivery. So, if you didn't check the group regularly, you
> probably wouldn't have noticed Matt's post, I thought. Indeed, I
> was wrong what is even better. Sorry for being unprecise, Dan!

Ah, yes, I forgot about the 'no email' option I chose a long time ago. I do check this site now and then, but to make sure I don't miss anything I just changed my option to allow emails.

Wed Feb 18, 2004 5:56 pm
stephanbechtel

Hi guys,

there was some internal AR discussion about accepting scores that were done on Rodrigo's minesweeper clone. So, I thought, I'm bringing up the topic in this group. Should we make some decision? Maybe, even for this topic it's possible to come to an conclusion that might be published ;-)

In this context, as Marc and Matt retired or at least stopped playing, I also thought about inviting Lance Votroubek and Georgi Kermekchiev to get members of the congress.

Wed Feb 18, 2004 7:20 pm
kaminwx

Re: CLone scores / new members

> In this context, as Marc and Matt retired or at least stopped
> playing, I also thought about inviting Lance Votroubek and Georgi
> Kermekchiev to get members of the congress.

Sure, we can invite Lance and Georgi to join.

Mon Mar 8, 2004 2:29 pm
stephanbechtel

Hi guys,

unfortunately, there wasn't much response to my last post. Nonetheless, I don't really care any more. My mouse is going to stop working properly. Combined with some lack of free time, I stopped playing almost completely during the last week. So, I decided that this might be a good moment to make room for any player that is and will be more active than me. So, I suggest Lance to get my successor. If there aren't any negative votes within the next week, I'll invite him to join the congress group.

Mon Mar 8, 2004 7:14 pm
Lasse Nyholm

I think Lance has already suggested to make a new poll for the congress in the addicts-group. So maybe it's time for a bigger change, perhaps seven new members.

See you around Stephan, regards, Lasse

Mon Mar 8, 2004 10:54 pm
Sorin Manea

RE: Time to say goodbye

We haven't really taken any decision here so I wonder if a council is really necessary. I think it's better to allow everybody to vote using polls on minesweeper-addicts group.

I also 'retire' from the council. I'll be very busy the next few months, so I will not have time to read mails and think about solutions.

If a new council will be formed I think we should have a democratic election.