
Subject: Question to Crimson

Posted by [nathancnc](#) on Tue, 01 Jul 2008 13:45:22 GMT

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

To Crimson, or whomever is working on Tiberian Technologies:

I am very interested in your patch, maybe you should call it 1.038? Just an idea. Will it be compatible with the first decade version of renegade? (I would assume yes) If so, then I have a question for you. I am (with great help from Nyerguds) making The first Decade Patch 1.03. I have already released an initial version, but now I am looking to release a 2nd revision with many enhancements over the first. It is not meant to be mod, and does not deeply change gameplay or rebalanced any of the games, it is simply to improve them and fix bugs/crashes.

Here is a link to it in the official TFD Forum:

<http://forums.ea.com/mboards/thread.jspa?threadID=370687&tstart=0>

It is planned to be released whenever its ready and I was wondering if I could have you permission to include Tiberian Technologies in my patch 1.03 whenever you complete it.

Thanks!

Subject: Re: Question to Crimson

Posted by [Ghostshaw](#) on Tue, 01 Jul 2008 14:20:30 GMT

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

It will be called 1.038 when we have permission to push it. Also the previous TFD patches tended to break renegade WOL/XWIS.

Subject: Re: Question to Crimson

Posted by [nathancnc](#) on Tue, 01 Jul 2008 18:24:07 GMT

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

Ghostshaw wrote on Tue, 01 July 2008 08:20Also the previous TFD patches tended to break renegade WOL/XWIS.

We have already fixed this problem!

Subject: Re: Question to Crimson

Posted by [StealthEye](#) on Thu, 03 Jul 2008 10:51:46 GMT

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

I don't see any reason why you would not be able to supply TT with that patch, but it's probably not up to me alone.

Subject: Re: Question to Crimson
Posted by [nopol10](#) on Fri, 04 Jul 2008 08:00:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ghostshaw wrote on Tue, 01 July 2008 22:20It will be called 1.038 when we have permission to push it. Also the previous TFD patches tended to break renegade WOL/XWIS.

Isn't 1.038 a small increment for such a large patch?

Subject: Re: Question to Crimson
Posted by [Veyrdite](#) on Fri, 04 Jul 2008 09:37:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

nopol10 wrote on Fri, 04 July 2008 18:00Ghostshaw wrote on Tue, 01 July 2008 22:20It will be called 1.038 when we have permission to push it. Also the previous TFD patches tended to break renegade WOL/XWIS.

Isn't 1.038 a small increment for such a large patch?
Agreed. Why not 1.4?

Subject: Re: Question to Crimson
Posted by [Ghostshaw](#) on Fri, 04 Jul 2008 09:45:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Err no real reason really, we are just calling it 1.038 for now. I guess the real patch number is up to EA anyway.

Subject: Re: Question to Crimson
Posted by [HaOsLsE](#) on Thu, 10 Jul 2008 16:40:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dthdealer wrote on Fri, 04 July 2008 04:37nopol10 wrote on Fri, 04 July 2008 18:00Ghostshaw wrote on Tue, 01 July 2008 22:20It will be called 1.038 when we have permission to push it. Also the previous TFD patches tended to break renegade WOL/XWIS.

Isn't 1.038 a small increment for such a large patch?
Agreed. Why not 1.4?

Exactly what I was thinking...maybe even 2.0 because it is on 1.037...then trying to call TT 1.038? there is a lot of changes. 1.037 to 1.4 sounds funny too...where'd the zero go? heh...2.0tt FTW

Subject: Re: Question to Crimson

Posted by [Ghostshaw](#) on Thu, 10 Jul 2008 16:47:06 GMT

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

I don't really think versioning is very interesting... Ultimately its probably up to EA. For now we will just follow WW's incremental updating scheme and call it 1.038.
