
Subject: Xptek

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Sun, 21 Dec 2008 16:11:31 GMT

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

I'm going to make a request of you, and I'd prefer it if everyone else kept the thread relatively spam-free (unless they have something worth adding) until xptek has answered.

Consider releasing Linkup.

You said that in your opinion, the community isn't worth any effort and expense on your part. Regardless of what I think about that opinion, I can't change it for you. I can only point out that you're talking about a minority of people here, and what really matters is the players themselves. If you despised everyone who currently posts on this forum with a passion, they would probably still add up to a minority of the people who actually play the game.

Anyway, you wouldn't have to pay for it. Give it to Crimson or whoever, let TT take it from there. You could carry on being involved if you wanted, or you could just dump it in TT's lap and run, up to you.

Let me give you an example of the benefits. Null and havocide kept saying that a clan ladder through Linkup would be so much better than Clanwars.cc. I would be the first to agree that in principle, auto > manual. But that's not all there is to it. If it was, how do we explain Clanwars.cc being more successful than the "official" WOL clan ladder? See, that's why I laughed at null and havocide; it hadn't occurred to them that just because a ladder is auto, it still isn't going to do very well if it's run by someone who knows nothing about how to actually manage a clan ladder. With all modesty aside, I think I do, more than anybody. I certainly have more experience and a better track record. So imagine how good the ladder could be if it was auto AND it was run by someone who actually knows what they're doing. It would be the best clan ladder the game has ever had. This game had an auto ladder in the past, but it was absolutely crap because it wasn't moderated and the people in charge of it didn't care. (Null and Havocide, of course, would know this if they knew a damn thing about clanning in this game) That's why people used mine; it might be manual report, but it was run much better. So imagine an auto ladder run by me, eh?

That's just one great thing that could come out of it. You probably know the other benefits better than I do.

So please consider this. Not for me, not for Crimson, not for TT, not even for you (even though you'd earn an untold amount of respect from the community, and you'd certainly be "the better man")... do it for the game. Do something really good for Renegade. Think practically; what have you got to lose?

Subject: Re: Xptek

Posted by [Goztow](#) on Sun, 21 Dec 2008 16:54:49 GMT

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

Ermmm :s this could have been handled by PM?

Subject: Re: Xptek
Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Sun, 21 Dec 2008 16:59:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Because spoony is making a statement that if Xptek refuses to read/respond/whatever, it'll be pretty clear as to what his intentions are (rather, aren't), since everyone will be able to see it.

Either that, or it's all a clever ruse to make various people lose the game. Bastard.

Subject: Re: Xptek
Posted by [reborn](#) on Sun, 21 Dec 2008 18:03:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I for one would love to get my hands on it. Both APB and Reborn would have many uses for it, both of the afore mentioned communities would benefit emmensly from it.

Subject: Re: Xptek
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Sun, 21 Dec 2008 18:04:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

(replying to Cabal)

No, that statement has already been made, by xptek himself. I'm just asking him to reconsider.

By all means let him carry on thinking we're all hopeless morons. But what a great guy he'd be if, despite hating us all, he did something really great for everybody. I'll even shave my neckbeard. Dover, will you join me?

Goztow is correct, a PM would do just as well, although it wouldn't have done any better, so let's just wait for a response.

Subject: Re: Xptek
Posted by [Hitman](#) on Sun, 21 Dec 2008 18:31:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

in the meanwhile spoony can get his ass back on clanwars to adjust the ban list ATLEAST

also : wtf is linkup?

Subject: Re: Xptek
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Sun, 21 Dec 2008 19:03:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

1. What is an Automated Ladder?
 2. Why is it better for it to be automated?
 3. Does it involve people who do not participate in clans?
-

Subject: Re: Xptek

Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Sun, 21 Dec 2008 20:06:31 GMT

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

R315r4z0r wrote on Sun, 21 December 2008 13:031. What is an Automated Ladder?
Renegade's built in ladder system which, at one point, worked.

R315r4z0r wrote on Sun, 21 December 2008 13:032. Why is it better for it to be automated?
So that having ladder games actually serves a purpose other than disabling extras. That, and because it puts the competitive nature of a video game back into Renegade.

R315r4z0r wrote on Sun, 21 December 2008 13:033. Does it involve people who do not participate in clans?

As far as I know, it should, but only for servers with the ladder option enabled.

Subject: Re: Xptek

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Sun, 21 Dec 2008 20:46:08 GMT

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

R315r4z0r wrote on Sun, 21 December 2008 13:031. What is an Automated Ladder?

2. Why is it better for it to be automated?

3. Does it involve people who do not participate in clans?

In ages past, WOL had two automatic ladders - a public ladder and a clan ladder. Any public server could turn on the 'laddered' option, which would then send the game results to the public ladder. As for clans, it was pretty much the same except a clan needed to register its members first, and then a clan match could be counted on the clan ladder automatically.

that answers 1 and 3. as for 2... well, this is more complicated than most people realise. Back in the old days, clanwars.cc set up a renegade ladder which drew its results from the official WOL ladder (this was long before I became involved with it). It had the advantage of a better points system, and better moderation... i.e. it was run by people who actually cared, whereas the official WOL clan ladder wasn't. For example, there were a lot of clans who would cheat or report fake games or just kick their opponents if they were about to lose - that happened all the time on the WOL clan ladder and nobody did anything about it. (Same goes for the public ladder - anyone remember Keetxx? If my memory serves correct, he won supreme commander on the public-server ladder two months in a row, just by joining servers and blazing away with final ren until he got booted) That's why most serious clans preferred clanwars.cc.

Later on, (some time before the XWIS changeover) the ladder started breaking down A LOT. Games just didn't report a lot of the time (again, at clanwars.cc that was easy to fix, on the WOL ladder there was nobody who'd add your games for you). Even worse, there was a period of a few

months where the clan creation pages completely stopped working, so you couldn't even join or leave a clan. because of all these problems, clanwars.cc converted to a manual report system. Players had to report their own losses, which took a bit of getting used to, but it was still way better than the old auto ladder.

then the XWIS changeover happened (november 2005?) and that was the end of the auto ladder, for good.

so in a nutshell, the best option would be something we've never really had before; namely an auto ladder that was run by admins who really know and care what they're doing. Xptek has the chance to make that happen, and much more besides, just by releasing Linkup to TT or whoever.

(to hitman, I'll see about appointing some new admins, I guess...)

Subject: Re: Xptek
Posted by [Ma1kel](#) on Mon, 22 Dec 2008 00:01:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

iirc they lost the source code

Subject: Re: Xptek
Posted by [spigot](#) on Mon, 22 Dec 2008 19:52:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The old source will not be released (seriously, the hackish nature of the code and obscene memory usage makes me cringe). The current version leaves a lot to be desired in terms of efficiency and the server-to-server protocol. I'm considering rewriting the entire project using the InspIRCd module API with a PostgreSQL backend, but I'm really not sure if there's a high demand for an XWIS alternative. If anyone has some experience with C++, APGAR encryption, or the WOL protocol, send me a PM and we'll see if we can get something started. In the end, I'd like to see the project released open source for mods that don't want to be dependent on XWIS and create a fairly decentralized network of load-balanced servers to ensure the service never goes down entirely and is fairly DDoS-resistant.

If there's a need/interest, a C++ WOL clone would be pretty interesting to work on, but I'm really not interested in developing something that brings countless DDoS attacks and drama my way.

Subject: Re: Xptek
Posted by [Genesis2001](#) on Mon, 22 Dec 2008 21:50:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

spigot wrote on Mon, 22 December 2008 12:52The old source will not be released (seriously, the hackish nature of the code and obscene memory usage makes me cringe). The current version leaves a lot to be desired in terms of efficiency and the server-to-server protocol. I'm considering

rewriting the entire project using the InspIRCd module API with a PostgreSQL backend, but I'm really not sure if there's a high demand for an XWIS alternative. If anyone has some experience with C++, APGAR encryption, or the WOL protocol, send me a PM and we'll see if we can get something started. In the end, I'd like to see the project released open source for mods that don't want to be dependent on XWIS and create a fairly decentralized network of load-balanced servers to ensure the service never goes down entirely and is fairly DDoS-resistant.

If there's a need/interest, a C++ WOL clone would be pretty interesting to work on, but I'm really not interested in developing something that brings countless DDoS attacks and drama my way.

At one point, this was being investigated by my dev. team...We were told there was no point and people wouldn't use it... <.<

EDIT: A friend of mine investigated the WOL protocol for me and then I found "XWISP" or something over here on renforums which allowed me a closer look at the protocol. It'd be interesting to do this WOL Clone especially for TC Mods. Sadly though, I don't know enough C++ to even offer to help

EDIT2: I was actually going to try to do this in C# tbh as, like I said above, I don't know enough about C++ to make a full-blown server application.. :/

Subject: Re: Xptek

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Mon, 22 Dec 2008 22:24:52 GMT

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

Thanks for the reply. You lost me at InspIRCd and it went downhill for me from there, so I'll let someone else carry on from here. I'm just surprised null's thread may actually have led somewhere positive, in its wild flailing way.

Subject: Re: Xptek

Posted by [spigot](#) on Mon, 22 Dec 2008 22:33:34 GMT

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

Zack wrote on Mon, 22 December 2008 15:50spigot wrote on Mon, 22 December 2008 12:52The old source will not be released (seriously, the hackish nature of the code and obscene memory usage makes me cringe). The current version leaves a lot to be desired in terms of efficiency and the server-to-server protocol. I'm considering rewriting the entire project using the InspIRCd module API with a PostgreSQL backend, but I'm really not sure if there's a high demand for an XWIS alternative. If anyone has some experience with C++, APGAR encryption, or the WOL protocol, send me a PM and we'll see if we can get something started. In the end, I'd like to see the project released open source for mods that don't want to be dependent on XWIS and create a fairly decentralized network of load-balanced servers to ensure the service never goes down entirely and is fairly DDoS-resistant.

If there's a need/interest, a C++ WOL clone would be pretty interesting to work on, but I'm really

not interested in developing something that brings countless DDoS attacks and drama my way.

At one point, this was being investigated by my
devhttp://www.renegadeforums.com/index.php?t=post&reply_to=364398"e=true&rid=0&SQ=&. team...We were told there was no point and people wouldn't use it... <.<

EDIT: A friend of mine investigated the WOL protocol for me and then I found "XWISP" or something over here on renforums which allowed me a closer look at the protocol. It'd be interesting to do this WOL Clone especially for TC Mods. Sadly though, I don't know enough C++ to even offer to help

EDIT2: I was actually going to try to do this in C# tbh as, like I said above, I don't know enough about C++ to make a full-blown server application.. :/

Eh, most of the hard stuff (select/epoll/kqueue support, the SQL abstraction layer, user handling, linking, etc.) is already done (<3 the InspIRCd development team). Our main job would be writing modules to handle WOL-specific numerics and commands and coming up with a sane user authentication system. You can see some example modules at http://svn.inspircd.org/index.py/tags/1_2_0b4_release/src/modules/.

edit: Even if players of the vanilla version didn't use something other than XWIS, it would allow total conversion mods to have more control over their players online instead of relying on XWIS.

Subject: Re: Xptek
Posted by [Hitman](#) on Wed, 21 Jan 2009 18:19:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

so whats happening with this?

Subject: Re: Xptek
Posted by [Genesis2001](#) on Wed, 21 Jan 2009 18:21:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

spigot wrote on Mon, 22 December 2008 15:33Zack wrote on Mon, 22 December 2008 15:50spigot wrote on Mon, 22 December 2008 12:52The old source will not be released (seriously, the hackish nature of the code and obscene memory usage makes me cringe). The current version leaves a lot to be desired in terms of efficiency and the server-to-server protocol. I'm considering rewriting the entire project using the InspIRCd module API with a PostgreSQL backend, but I'm really not sure if there's a high demand for an XWIS alternative. If anyone has some experience with C++, APGAR encryption, or the WOL protocol, send me a PM and we'll see if we can get something started. In the end, I'd like to see the project released open source for mods that don't want to be dependent on XWIS and create a fairly decentralized network of load-balanced servers to ensure the service never goes down entirely and is fairly DDoS-resistant.

If there's a need/interest, a C++ WOL clone would be pretty interesting to work on, but I'm really not interested in developing something that brings countless DDoS attacks and drama my way.

At one point, this was being investigated by my
devhttp://www.renegadeforums.com/index.php?t=post&reply_to=364398"e=true&rid=0&SQ=&. team... We were told there was no point and people wouldn't use it... <.<

EDIT: A friend of mine investigated the WOL protocol for me and then I found "XWISP" or something over here on renforums which allowed me a closer look at the protocol. It'd be interesting to do this WOL Clone especially for TC Mods. Sadly though, I don't know enough C++ to even offer to help

EDIT2: I was actually going to try to do this in C# tbh as, like I said above, I don't know enough about C++ to make a full-blown server application.. :/

Eh, most of the hard stuff (select/epoll/kqueue support, the SQL abstraction layer, user handling, linking, etc.) is already done (<3 the InspIRCd development team). Our main job would be writing modules to handle WOL-specific numerics and commands and coming up with a sane user authentication system. You can see some example modules at http://svn.inspircd.org/index.py/tags/1_2_0b4_release/src/modules/.

edit: Even if players of the vanilla version didn't use something other than XWIS, it would allow total conversion mods to have more control over their players online instead of relying on XWIS.

I'd be interested just fyi. I've just not had the time recently to do any work on it. Hopefully, I'd be able to possibly host a server for this WOL-Clone

Subject: Re: Xptek
Posted by [pvtschlag](#) on Wed, 21 Jan 2009 23:19:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I wouldn't mind helping out with the new clone. My abilities with c++ have greatly improved since we worked on Linkup. I also still have most of the stuff leftover from Linkup in a backup somewhere which would save some time on figuring out all the protocol stuff.

Subject: Re: Xptek
Posted by [Canadacdn](#) on Thu, 22 Jan 2009 03:40:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

'Bout time. XWIS for Renegade is fucking terrible.

Subject: Re: Xptek

Posted by [reborn](#) on Thu, 22 Jan 2009 10:45:02 GMT

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

It would actually be really nice to have. It'd get used too. I mean I would make sure all the APB players used it, and the reborn players too by making sure the next releases shipped with there clients modified to join the WOL clone.

For that reason alone it'd be worth having, but it also means there would be an alternative option for renegade server owners and players too.

Subject: Re: Xptek

Posted by [EvilWhiteDragon](#) on Thu, 22 Jan 2009 15:15:26 GMT

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

reborn wrote on Thu, 22 January 2009 11:45It would actually be really nice to have. It'd get used too. I mean I would make sure all the APB players used it, and the reborn players too by making sure the next releases shipped with there clients modified to join the WOL clone.

For that reason alone it'd be worth having, but it also means there would be an alternative option for renegade server owners and players too.

AFAIK the XWIS protocol isn't too complicated. It's pretty much IRC with some extras. Seye has info on at least certain parts of it (serverlisting, and I think most of the player join screen)

Subject: Re: Xptek

Posted by [Goztow](#) on Thu, 22 Jan 2009 15:21:58 GMT

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

There's no point if EA doesn't change the link. And I don't see them do any of that, really. You can say what you want about xwis but it works and is relatively stable.

Subject: Re: Xptek

Posted by [reborn](#) on Thu, 22 Jan 2009 17:35:33 GMT

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

EvilWhiteDragon wrote on Thu, 22 January 2009 10:15reborn wrote on Thu, 22 January 2009 11:45It would actually be really nice to have. It'd get used too. I mean I would make sure all the APB players used it, and the reborn players too by making sure the next releases shipped with there clients modified to join the WOL clone.

For that reason alone it'd be worth having, but it also means there would be an alternative option for renegade server owners and players too.

AFAIK the XWIS protocol isn't too complicated. It's pretty much IRC with some extras. Seye has info on at least certain parts of it (serverlisting, and I think most of the player join screen)

It's still allot of windows network coding. I'm not sure I would be up to the challenge in all honesty.

Goztow wrote on Thu, 22 January 2009 10:21There's no point if EA doesn't change the link. And I

don't see them do any of that, really. You can say what you want about xwis but it works and is relatively stable.

It might cause a split in the already limited renegade player base. However, for APB and reborn it wouldn't at all, the clients would be shipped like it. There is a real use for it. Besides, get your renegade server on there first, and whatever players from renegade do decide to join, they'll be on your server

This would be a good thing.

Subject: Re: Xptek

Posted by [pvtschlag](#) on Thu, 22 Jan 2009 17:50:08 GMT

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

The idea we had originally was to distribute an installer to the people who wanted to use the new clone, much like the way XWIS was before it was swapped to default. Also there would be a FDS mod that would allow server owners to have their server appear on both XWIS and the new clone at the same time.

Goztow wrote on Thu, 22 January 2009 10:21 There's no point if EA doesn't change the link. And I don't see them do any of that, really.

You could of said the same before EA switched it to XWIS, but that didn't stop people from using XWIS.

And of course mods like APB/Reborn could always use it as an alternative to XWIS.

Subject: Re: Xptek

Posted by [Goztow](#) on Thu, 22 Jan 2009 18:52:59 GMT

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

Quote: You could of said the same before EA switched it to XWIS, but that didn't stop people from using XWIS. There was as good as no activity on xwis at all before the link to it changed...

Subject: Re: Xptek

Posted by [reborn](#) on Thu, 22 Jan 2009 19:01:41 GMT

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

Gozzy, I know what you're saying, but for APB and reborn, a WOL clone would be awesome. Players can't use it right now because they have no serial. This would have a real use, rather than just bragging rights.

Subject: Re: Xptek
Posted by [Goztow](#) on Thu, 22 Jan 2009 19:48:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

reborn wrote on Thu, 22 January 2009 20:01Gozzy, I know what you're saying, but for APB and reborn, a WOL clone would be awesome. Players can't use it right now because they have no serial. This would have a real use, rather than just bragging rights.
I agree .

Subject: Re: Xptek
Posted by [pvtschlag](#) on Thu, 22 Jan 2009 21:47:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

There may of been no Renegade activity on XWIS before the switch, but that would of changed had owners been able to have the FDS connect to both. But if I remember correctly RA2 on XWIS had quite a lot of players on it before the switch, simply due to the westwood ladder being messed up.

Don't forget this expands past just Renegade.

Subject: Re: Xptek
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 22 Jan 2009 21:54:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

If the idea of creating an alternative to XWIS was at all feasible, we'd already be doing it. It's not.

Subject: Re: Xptek
Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Thu, 22 Jan 2009 22:02:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Crimson wrote on Thu, 22 January 2009 15:54If the idea of creating an alternative to XWIS was at all feasible, we'd already be doing it. It's not.
Even as something that doesn't REPLACE XWIS as it currently works per se, just something mods like APB and Reborn can use?

Subject: Re: Xptek
Posted by [Canadacdn](#) on Fri, 23 Jan 2009 01:19:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Cabal8616 wrote on Thu, 22 January 2009 16:02Crimson wrote on Thu, 22 January 2009 15:54If the idea of creating an alternative to XWIS was at all feasible, we'd already be doing it. It's not.
Even as something that doesn't REPLACE XWIS as it currently works per se, just something

mods like APB and Reborn can use?

Why should it be used for mods only? If a better WOL clone comes out, all of Ren should be switched over if possible. XWIS doesn't seem to give a shit about Renegade, and the game would be better off having an online system run by people who want to improve the experience and fix bugs.

Subject: Re: Xptek
Posted by [Ethenal](#) on Fri, 23 Jan 2009 05:02:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Canadacdn wrote on Thu, 22 January 2009 19:19Cabal8616 wrote on Thu, 22 January 2009 16:02Crimson wrote on Thu, 22 January 2009 15:54If the idea of creating an alternative to XWIS was at all feasible, we'd already be doing it. It's not.
Even as something that doesn't REPLACE XWIS as it currently works per se, just something mods like APB and Reborn can use?

Why should it be used for mods only? If a better WOL clone comes out, all of Ren should be switched over if possible. XWIS doesn't seem to give a shit about Renegade, and the game would be better off having an online system run by people who want to improve the experience and fix bugs.

QFT

Subject: Re: Xptek
Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Fri, 23 Jan 2009 05:56:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Crimson wrote on Thu, 22 January 2009 16:54If the idea of creating an alternative to XWIS was at all feasible, we'd already be doing it. It's not.

Who are you to say something like that? Why are you being such a defeatist about this? Someone like you should either whole-heartedly support this or just stay out of it. Even though developing this system so late in the games life is pretty much pointless why would you come out and be like that?

Subject: Re: Xptek
Posted by [dr3w2](#) on Fri, 23 Jan 2009 06:00:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

DarkDemin wrote on Thu, 22 January 2009 23:56Crimson wrote on Thu, 22 January 2009 16:54If

the idea of creating an alternative to XWIS was at all feasible, we'd already be doing it. It's not.

Who are you to say something like that? Why are you being such a defeatist about this? Someone like you should either whole-heartedly support this or just stay out of it. Even though developing this system so late in the games life is pretty much pointless why would you come out and be like that?

Maybe because she has a greater foundation and understanding of the current state of renegade, xwis, striketeam, and EA along with the rest of TT then you or majority of the people in this thread (myself included)?

Subject: Re: Xptek

Posted by [Goztow](#) on Fri, 23 Jan 2009 07:44:23 GMT

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

I'd like to know which extra features you will include that will actually convince servers but especially players to make the swap. We can't even get players to download a fanmap that's in our rotation, even though we put an auto announcement every 5 minutes saying it. What convinces you someone would prefer linkup over the obvious xwis.

I'm not being ironic, I'm trying to understand it .

Subject: Re: Xptek

Posted by [EvilWhiteDragon](#) on Fri, 23 Jan 2009 11:29:31 GMT

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

Crimson wrote on Thu, 22 January 2009 22:54 If the idea of creating an alternative to XWIS was at all feasible, we'd already be doing it. It's not.

Crimson, the main reason you seem to disagree is because you like XWIS (perhaps because you're an admin there?). Technically we could code an XWIS server, and put the new ip/url in the TT client. Perhaps with an option to MANUALLY switch back to XWIS.

So it is certainly feasible.

Question is more how much time would it take to create such server, and would that delay TT in any way?

If the answer on the first is fast, and the answer on the second is little to nothing then we should at least consider it.

The last possible problem could be that setting up our own XWIS server would be that it would damage our (much needed) relations with EA. This would probably be the biggest problem, because we need EA to ship out the TT patch.

andr3w282 wrote on Fri, 23 January 2009 07:00 DarkDemin wrote on Thu, 22 January 2009 23:56 Crimson wrote on Thu, 22 January 2009 16:54 If the idea of creating an alternative to XWIS was at all feasible, we'd already be doing it. It's not.

Who are you to say something like that? Why are you being such a defeatist about this? Someone like you should either whole-heartedly support this or just stay out of it. Even though developing this system so late in the games life is pretty much pointless why would you come out and be like that?

Maybe because she has a greater foundation and understanding of the current state of renegade, xwis, striketeam, and EA along with the rest of TT then you or majority of the people in this thread (myself included)?

Well , I will agree that she knows more about Striketeam and EA than me, but I do know she's wrong when she says it's not feasible. It certainly is possible, question is, at what cost?

Subject: Re: Xptek

Posted by [Goztow](#) on Fri, 23 Jan 2009 13:51:19 GMT

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

She could have ment "politically feasible"...

Subject: Re: Xptek

Posted by [EvilWhiteDragon](#) on Fri, 23 Jan 2009 14:10:33 GMT

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

Goztow wrote on Fri, 23 January 2009 14:51She could have ment "politically feasible"...

She could have collaborated what she meant...

Subject: Re: Xptek

Posted by [Genesis2001](#) on Fri, 23 Jan 2009 14:44:04 GMT

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

EvilWhiteDragon wrote on Fri, 23 January 2009 04:29Crimson wrote on Thu, 22 January 2009 22:54If the idea of creating an alternative to XWIS was at all feasible, we'd already be doing it. It's not.

Crimson, the main reason you seem to disagree is because you like XWIS (perhaps because you're an admin there?). Technically we could code an XWIS server, and put the new ip/url in the TT client. Perhaps with an option to MANUALLY switch back to XWIS.

So it is certainly feasible.

Question is more how much time would it take to create such server, and would that delay TT in any way?

If the answer on the first is fast, and the answer on the second is little to nothing then we should at least consider it.

The last possible problem could be that setting up our own XWIS server would be that it would damage our (much needed) relations with EA. This would probably be the biggest problem, because we need EA to ship out the TT patch.

andr3w282 wrote on Fri, 23 January 2009 07:00DarkDemin wrote on Thu, 22 January 2009 23:56Crimson wrote on Thu, 22 January 2009 16:54If the idea of creating an alternative to XWIS was at all feasible, we'd already be doing it. It's not.

Who are you to say something like that? Why are you being such a defeatist about this? Someone like you should either whole-heartedly support this or just stay out of it. Even though developing this system so late in the games life is pretty much pointless why would you come out and be like that?

Maybe because she has a greater foundation and understanding of the current state of renegade, xwis, striketeam, and EA along with the rest of TT then you or majority of the people in this thread (myself included)?

Well , I will agree that she knows more about Striketeam and EA than me, but I do know she's wrong when she says it's not feasible. It certainly is possible, question is, at what cost?

...Maybe don't ship it with TT then because that would probably, like you said, kill our relations with EA...I'm with reborn here. I'd very much like to see this possibility for Total Conversion Mods since we have standalone games...but can't give out serials for XWIS thus relying on Direct Connect to connect to XWIS servers >.< Annoying! lol

EDIT: And also, create a tool that was mentioned in this thread that basically functions like WOLSpy - it forwards your server onto XWIS as well

Subject: Re: Xptek
Posted by [reborn](#) on Fri, 23 Jan 2009 19:04:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I heard years ago that v00d00 had a working WOL clone, where the hell is that dude these days anyway?

Subject: Re: Xptek
Posted by [Memphis](#) on Fri, 23 Jan 2009 20:51:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

reborn wrote on Fri, 23 January 2009 19:04I heard years ago that v00d00 had a working WOL clone, where the hell is that dude these days anyway?

v00d00 went totally AWOL some time ago. I like to think he went hunting bears(in reality he probably got a job or is currently getting rich off of a personal project). I hope nothing untoward has happened to him .

Subject: Re: Xptek

Posted by [luv2pb](#) on Sat, 24 Jan 2009 05:55:02 GMT

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

EvilWhiteDragon wrote on Fri, 23 January 2009 06:29Crimson wrote on Thu, 22 January 2009 22:54If the idea of creating an alternative to XWIS was at all feasible, we'd already be doing it. It's not.

Crimson, the main reason you seem to disagree is because you like XWIS (perhaps because you're an admin there?). Technically we could code an XWIS server, and put the new ip/url in the TT client. Perhaps with an option to MANUALLY switch back to XWIS.

So it is certainly feasible.

Question is more how much time would it take to create such server, and would that delay TT in any way?

If the answer on the first is fast, and the answer on the second is little to nothing then we should at least consider it.

The last possible problem could be that setting up our own XWIS server would be that it would damage our (much needed) relations with EA. This would probably be the biggest problem, because we need EA to ship out the TT patch.

andr3w282 wrote on Fri, 23 January 2009 07:00DarkDemin wrote on Thu, 22 January 2009 23:56Crimson wrote on Thu, 22 January 2009 16:54If the idea of creating an alternative to XWIS was at all feasible, we'd already be doing it. It's not.

Who are you to say something like that? Why are you being such a defeatist about this? Someone like you should either whole-heartedly support this or just stay out of it. Even though developing this system so late in the games life is pretty much pointless why would you come out and be like that?

Maybe because she has a greater foundation and understanding of the current state of renegade, xwis, striketeam, and EA along with the rest of TT then you or majority of the people in this thread (myself included)?

Well , I will agree that she knows more about Striketeam and EA than me, but I do know she's wrong when she says it's not feasible. It certainly is possible, question is, at what cost?

I have to say the option (though taking it away would be better) included in TT would be huge. Taking it away from strike-team would greatly increase the sucess of TT and prolong the life span of Ren.

Subject: Re: Xptek

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sat, 24 Jan 2009 16:47:13 GMT

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

There's a seriously important piece that makes it not feasible. XWIS is connected to EA's serial database. Without the serial database, cheaters can keygen thousands of "valid" serials and they will be virtual un-bannable. Only XWIS has this connection, and only XWIS will get this connection. XWIS went through over a year with EA's legal department to run the WOL replacement and there's no way that EA will go through that again with any other group without a

damn good reason.

I'm not being defeatist, it's just the reality of the situation. If TT were to make a WOL replacement and build it into the patch, server owners would be unable to ban players because they could change all of their identifying information rather easily.

Subject: Re: Xptek
Posted by [Goztow](#) on Sat, 24 Jan 2009 17:48:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Unless you create a TT hash, based on a computer's key features of course .

Subject: Re: Xptek
Posted by [Carrierll](#) on Sat, 24 Jan 2009 18:11:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Goztow wrote on Sat, 24 January 2009 17:48 Unless you create a TT hash, based on a computer's key features of course .

EA will push a fan-made patch that has THIS in it? No.

Subject: Re: Xptek
Posted by [Genesis2001](#) on Sat, 24 Jan 2009 18:23:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Crimson wrote on Sat, 24 January 2009 09:47 There's a seriously important piece that makes it not feasible. XWIS is connected to EA's serial database. Without the serial database, cheaters can keygen thousands of "valid" serials and they will be virtual un-bannable. Only XWIS has this connection, and only XWIS will get this connection. XWIS went through over a year with EA's legal department to run the WOL replacement and there's no way that EA will go through that again with any other group without a damn good reason.

I'm not being defeatist, it's just the reality of the situation. If TT were to make a WOL replacement and build it into the patch, server owners would be unable to ban players because they could change all of their identifying information rather easily.

Understood. But that doesn't make it not feasible for Renegade Mods like APB, Reborn, AR, BFD, and other major mods.

Subject: Re: Xptek
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sat, 24 Jan 2009 20:22:14 GMT

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

Yeah, who would need to be banned by serial from a mod?

Subject: Re: Xptek

Posted by [Genesis2001](#) on Sat, 24 Jan 2009 20:56:19 GMT

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

Crimson wrote on Sat, 24 January 2009 13:22Yeah, who would need to be banned by serial from a mod?

Serials aren't needed by mods...since the game's free we can't send them out with serials for a few reasons:

1. Serials would have to come from EA.
2. Since serials come from EA, you've already said they won't let the mod teams have access to the database.
3. There are other means to ban a user from a server. Just look at YaRR's source. It bans off of IP-node. You can also ban off IP/Range/Nick/DNS/etc.

EDIT: #3's not a reason we can't ship with mods (but it helps rebut your argument earlier)

Subject: Re: Xptek

Posted by [Ethenal](#) on Sat, 24 Jan 2009 22:17:43 GMT

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

Most bans aren't even based on serial anyway? (server bans at least)

Subject: Re: Xptek

Posted by [EvilWhiteDragon](#) on Sat, 24 Jan 2009 22:29:38 GMT

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

Ethenal wrote on Sat, 24 January 2009 23:17Most bans aren't even based on serial anyway? (server bans at least)
nowadays servers can get the serial and ban it. And a lot of servers do actually.

Subject: Re: Xptek

Posted by [Aprime](#) on Sun, 25 Jan 2009 06:43:24 GMT

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

Oh wow, I thought the idea was dead long ago. Hell I can't even believe I'm seeing all the old faces here.

THE TIMES.

Subject: Re: Xptek
Posted by [pvtschlag](#) on Sun, 25 Jan 2009 08:26:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Aprime wrote on Sun, 25 January 2009 01:43THE TIMES.

Indeed.

Subject: Re: Xptek
Posted by [Ma1kel](#) on Sun, 25 Jan 2009 17:13:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Because one can't effectively ban with the use of IP banning!

Subject: Re: Xptek
Posted by [u6795](#) on Sun, 25 Jan 2009 17:20:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ma1kel wrote on Sun, 25 January 2009 12:13Because one can't effectively ban with the use of IP banning!
Not taking sides in this argument, but IP banning is relatively easy to get around for anyone who knows what they're doing.

Subject: Re: Xptek
Posted by [Carrierll](#) on Sun, 25 Jan 2009 21:13:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

People: "Servers need serials to ban with..."

Ma1kel: "...because one can't ban effectively with IPs" (paraphrased)

That's his point.

Subject: Re: Xptek
Posted by [luv2pb](#) on Sun, 25 Jan 2009 21:18:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I never assumed EA would be involved. Just do it - fuck what EA thinks.

Why do we need to worry about keeping cheaters out? I thought one of the big pitches for TT was that it would allow you guys to fix cheats, exploits and bugs? A large majority of our current bans are not serial bans and were doing just fine.

Subject: Re: Xptek
Posted by [Goztow](#) on Sun, 25 Jan 2009 21:33:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

luv2pb wrote on Sun, 25 January 2009 22:18 I never assumed EA would be involved. Just do it - fuck what EA thinks.

Why do we need to worry about keeping cheaters out? I thought one of the big pitches for TT was that it would allow you guys to fix cheats, exploits and bugs? A large majority of our current bans are not serial bans and were doing just fine.
You couldn't possibly catch aimbot users in a 40 players server anyway...

Subject: Re: Xptek
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 26 Jan 2009 13:34:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

There are more reasons to ban than cheating. Not even the best coding can prevent everything someone can do to warrant a ban.

Subject: Re: Xptek
Posted by [luv2pb](#) on Mon, 26 Jan 2009 19:00:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Crimson wrote on Sat, 24 January 2009 11:47 Without the serial database, cheaters can keygen thousands of "valid" serials and they will be virtual un-bannable.
Crimson wrote on Mon, 26 January 2009 08:34 There are more reasons to ban than cheating. Not even the best coding can prevent everything someone can do to warrant a ban.
What now?

Subject: Re: Xptek
Posted by [Carrierll](#) on Mon, 26 Jan 2009 23:02:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Destroying a mass with an artillery, several times?

That's a TH based ban IMO.

Subject: Re: Xptek
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 29 Jan 2009 09:28:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

luv2pb wrote on Mon, 26 January 2009 12:00Crimson wrote on Sat, 24 January 2009 11:47Without the serial database, cheaters can keygen thousands of "valid" serials and they will be virtual un-bannable.
Crimson wrote on Mon, 26 January 2009 08:34There are more reasons to ban than cheating. Not even the best coding can prevent everything someone can do to warrant a ban.
What now?

Grief players can use keygens, too, genius.

Subject: Re: Xptek
Posted by [reborn](#) on Thu, 29 Jan 2009 10:23:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

APB and reborn cannot ban by serials anyway, almost 100% of players use direct connect methods because the mods are standalone.
We could really do with this, it wouldn't be a futile effort. The database means sod all to me.
