
Subject: Question

Posted by [Hitman](#) on Tue, 16 Dec 2008 13:34:25 GMT

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

if i get this right... this patch is gonna introduce a few more ways how to catch/prevent cheats ingame/in data folder and whatever or is this wrong and is this just a update from renguard basically?

Subject: Re: Question

Posted by [Goztow](#) on Tue, 16 Dec 2008 13:45:44 GMT

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

The makers will give you a better answer but from what i understood, your assumption is correct: a bunch of info will be handled server side if possible (read: if it doesn't cause too much lag) and the client side information will be better verified server side before being "processed" (like BIATCH currently does).

Exemple: instead of sending "client: I've done 50 damage", it'll send: "I did damage with a rifle" and the server will tell how much damage a rifle does.

I don't know if this example is exactly what the TT-people do, but it's the principle.

Subject: Re: Question

Posted by [Ghostshaw](#) on Tue, 16 Dec 2008 14:15:30 GMT

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

I won't divulge everything, but yes it will completely replace RenGuard. And what gozy explained is indeed one part of the countermeasures.

Subject: Re: Question

Posted by [RTsa](#) on Tue, 16 Dec 2008 14:15:47 GMT

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

+ the patch will fix a lot of bugs and have an autodownloader for maps. (right?)

Subject: Re: Question

Posted by [Hitman](#) on Tue, 16 Dec 2008 14:21:21 GMT

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

im sure u got the anti damage hack and whatever figured out easily but how about the cheats that make your arty bullets 100% straight all the time and radar hack and no screenshake and shit like that

Subject: Re: Question
Posted by [DutchNeon](#) on Tue, 16 Dec 2008 14:21:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Would it detect RoF and Velocity cheats too now? Pretty much the most seen cheats nowadays next to *cheat name removed*

Subject: Re: Question
Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Tue, 16 Dec 2008 14:34:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hitman wrote on Tue, 16 December 2008 08:21im sure u got the anti damage hack and whatever figured out easily but how about the cheats that make your arty bullets 100% straight all the time and radar hack and no screenshake and shit like that
Probably, those are handled via objects.ddb as far as I know, just like damage.

Subject: Re: Question
Posted by [ChewML](#) on Tue, 16 Dec 2008 14:36:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I believe the preferred term is "**cheat name removed**", it is kinda like one of those names people are scared to say for a superstitious reason.

Subject: Re: Question
Posted by [ErroR](#) on Tue, 16 Dec 2008 14:53:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

so it will change the damage modifiers from client side to server side? if so it's awesome!

Subject: Re: Question
Posted by [Goztow](#) on Tue, 16 Dec 2008 15:04:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

DutchNeon wrote on Tue, 16 December 2008 15:21Would it detect RoF and Velocity cheats too now? Pretty much the most seen cheats nowadays next to *cheat name removed*
That's prolly because they're the "only" "undetectable" cheats that can do serious damage.

Subject: Re: Question
Posted by [Ghostshaw](#) on Tue, 16 Dec 2008 15:12:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yes they will be detected, and no I won't say how. Suffice to say that even if what we are putting in now is bypassed after a while I still have some backup ideas.

Subject: Re: Question
Posted by [Goztow](#) on Tue, 16 Dec 2008 15:26:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

TBH: if you say that whoever plays around with bypasses will get their Renegade serial banned off xwis, that would already be a good signal to some people.

Or better: create an unique TT hash, based on a combination of variables and ban that. Then people would need to change their hardware / OS / ... to get unbanned.

Subject: Re: Question
Posted by [Hitman](#) on Tue, 16 Dec 2008 17:06:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

nice

hopin it wont take to long tho

Subject: Re: Question
Posted by [Dover](#) on Tue, 16 Dec 2008 23:27:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Goztow wrote on Tue, 16 December 2008 07:26TBH: if you say that whoever plays around with bypasses will get their Renegade serial banned off xwis, that would already be a good signal to some people.

Or better: create an unique TT hash, based on a combination of variables and ban that. Then people would need to change their hardware / OS / ... to get unbanned.

...I was under the impression that RG currently uses a hardware ban.

Subject: Re: Question
Posted by [Lone0001](#) on Wed, 17 Dec 2008 00:27:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Goztow wrote on Tue, 16 December 2008 10:26TBH: if you say that whoever plays around with bypasses will get their Renegade serial banned off xwis, that would already be a good signal to some people.

Or better: create an unique TT hash, based on a combination of variables and ban that. Then people would need to change their hardware / OS / ... to get unbanned.

YaRR bans something that only changes when you change your isp, though this way does have one problem, if someone were to live on the same street with the same isp they would be banned(this is very unlikely to happen) here's a link:

<http://dcomproductions.com/forums/viewtopic.php?f=33&t=860&start=0>

To me this system works pretty well.

Changing hardware for some people would not be that big of a hassle, changing the isp on the other hand can be a big hassle.

Subject: Re: Question

Posted by [Goztow](#) on Wed, 17 Dec 2008 07:35:28 GMT

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

Changing ISP's ain't hard, it's just that you can usually only change once a year .

Thing is: who would be foolish enough to change hard- or software each time he wants to cheat on Renegade?

Subject: Re: Question

Posted by [TD](#) on Wed, 17 Dec 2008 09:16:17 GMT

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

Goztow wrote on Wed, 17 December 2008 08:35 Changing ISP's ain't hard, it's just that you can usually only change once a year .

Thing is: who would be foolish enough to change hard- or software each time he wants to cheat on Renegade?

Hey, you never know

Subject: Re: Question

Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Wed, 17 Dec 2008 15:50:20 GMT

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

Goztow wrote on Wed, 17 December 2008 00:35 Changing ISP's ain't hard, it's just that you can usually only change once a year .

Thing is: who would be foolish enough to change hard- or software each time he wants to cheat on Renegade?

I have 5 Renegade capable computers sitting around fully set up at my house, if I wanted to change hardware just to cheat on renegade its not that hard, they all connect to my wireless

network but I can easily access my neighbor's networks as well, so if it came to an easy IP change it only takes a few seconds to switch to someone else's router...

Subject: Re: Question
Posted by [Hitman](#) on Wed, 17 Dec 2008 18:07:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

pretty sure that not everyone has that tho

Subject: Re: Question
Posted by [Lone0001](#) on Thu, 18 Dec 2008 01:21:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I have 3 Renegade capable computers, I could have 4 if I felt like fixing one of my older ones.

Subject: Re: Question
Posted by [Genesis2001](#) on Thu, 18 Dec 2008 04:08:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I have two, soon to be 3. *hopefully*

Subject: Re: Question
Posted by [ErroR](#) on Thu, 18 Dec 2008 14:17:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I had, and have the same pc for 5 years, with no changes (piece of crap!)

Subject: Re: Question
Posted by [Veyrdite](#) on Fri, 19 Dec 2008 07:48:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dover wrote on Wed, 17 December 2008 10:27Goztow wrote on Tue, 16 December 2008 07:26TBH: if you say that whoever plays around with bypasses will get their Renegade serial banned off xwis, that would already be a good signal to some people.

Or better: create an unique TT hash, based on a combination of variables and ban that. Then people would need to change their hardware / OS / ... to get unbanned.

...I was under the impression that RG currently uses a hardware ban.
Yes it does, but only one component that doesn't need to be physically changed in any way to

bypass the ban.

Subject: Re: Question

Posted by [StealthEye](#) on Fri, 19 Dec 2008 20:43:03 GMT

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

forcing a hardware change can never be done anyway, one can always change the detection code to make it detect whatever hardware they want.

Subject: Re: Question

Posted by [Craziac](#) on Sat, 20 Dec 2008 07:01:53 GMT

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

But it's better than nothing. Especially if the general public is unaware of it.. Though it's still 'hackable', it makes it more difficult, especially to the average player.

Subject: Re: Question

Posted by [Goztow](#) on Sat, 20 Dec 2008 09:53:17 GMT

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

The whole point is that nothing is unbyassable. If you make it difficult enough, a lot of people will not bother trying.

Don't forget many of these cheaters play on their daddy's computer and can't afford to do a lot of the stuff that would be needed to bypass these measures.

Subject: Re: Question

Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Sat, 20 Dec 2008 15:42:39 GMT

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

not much of a question is it?

Subject: Re: Question

Posted by [Hitman](#) on Fri, 26 Dec 2008 03:19:42 GMT

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

is it confirmed that this patch is going through as official therefor made mandatory?

Subject: Re: Question
Posted by [cmatt42](#) on Fri, 26 Dec 2008 03:26:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hitman wrote on Thu, 25 December 2008 21:19: is it confirmed that this patch is going through as official therefor made mandatory?
If you were to go back and read the early TT threads, you'd know that they plan to seek EA's approval to push the patch. Of course, they won't do this until they're absolutely sure it's rock solid.

Subject: Re: Question
Posted by [Hitman](#) on Fri, 26 Dec 2008 03:33:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

i just hope that it doesnt bring alot of trouble once it enters beta testing...

Subject: Re: Question
Posted by [Goztow](#) on Fri, 26 Dec 2008 08:26:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It was said before that tests would be done through "events". Hopefully these tests will be sufficient.

Subject: Re: Question
Posted by [EvilWhiteDragon](#) on Fri, 26 Dec 2008 10:16:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hitman wrote on Fri, 26 December 2008 04:33: i just hope that it doesnt bring alot of trouble once it enters beta testing...
Well, we are of course not testing while we program, and we also do not have internal alpha tests, and we certainly will not have beta tests....

Ofcourse we're testing it.....

Subject: Re: Question
Posted by [Hitman](#) on Fri, 26 Dec 2008 16:03:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

im pretty sure shit like windows vista and such will give so many errors with this patch tho... but i dont run that shit anyways so nvm

Subject: Re: Question

Posted by [EvilWhiteDragon](#) on Fri, 26 Dec 2008 17:00:43 GMT

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

Hitman wrote on Fri, 26 December 2008 17:03im pretty sure shit like windows vista and such will give so many errors with this patch tho... but i dont run that shit anyways so nvm
Well, guess what, we're testing on both windows XP as vista, so unless you screwed over your windows install, it'll probably run on it....

Subject: Re: Question

Posted by [Hitman](#) on Fri, 26 Dec 2008 17:32:04 GMT

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

so how's the work in progress? 1/3th done? 2/3th done? can we expect this patch in the first half of 2009?

Subject: Re: Question

Posted by [KobraOps](#) on Fri, 26 Dec 2008 19:19:53 GMT

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

The reason hitman keeps asking is that if the patch doesn't come out relatively soon the clanwars.cc renegade league is gonna hit the fan.
I know alot of the renegade public isn't too fond of the ppl in the league, but it can be renegade at its finest when retards aren't around :/

Subject: Re: Question

Posted by [Hitman](#) on Fri, 26 Dec 2008 19:25:40 GMT

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

hmm well yeah... but not really particulary in the cw.cc league but renegade overall is pretty fucked up nowadays... only game i play cos other games get so boring so quick

Subject: Re: Question

Posted by [saberhawk](#) on Fri, 26 Dec 2008 19:30:48 GMT

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

Hitman wrote on Fri, 26 December 2008 10:03im pretty sure shit like windows vista and such will give so many errors with this patch tho... but i dont run that shit anyways so nvm

I've heard from *very* reliable sources that the person doing shaders.dll work runs Windows Vista Ultimate x64 with UAC enabled on his system and is also working on getting as many kinks out of Renegade for players running Vista or any other Windows OS without having full administrative privileges. Get this, Renegade with a limited user on XP has the same problems as Vista "has".

Subject: Re: Question
Posted by [CarrierII](#) on Sat, 27 Dec 2008 22:23:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yeah, MS finally implemented user privilege levels and loads of software broke... surprise! At least they added the "run as administrator" option.

I imagine the patch will get done pretty soon - some sort of test by march 09. I hope.

Subject: Re: Question
Posted by [saberhawk](#) on Sat, 27 Dec 2008 23:49:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

CarrierII wrote on Sat, 27 December 2008 22:23 Yeah, MS finally implemented user privilege levels and loads of software broke... surprise! At least they added the "run as administrator" option.

They've always had them implemented under NT, but everybody (consumer-wise, not businesses) was always running as Administrator because they didn't want to log out and back into an admin account to make administrative changes.

Subject: Re: Question
Posted by [EvilWhiteDragon](#) on Sun, 28 Dec 2008 12:46:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Saberhawk wrote on Sun, 28 December 2008 00:49 CarrierII wrote on Sat, 27 December 2008 22:23 Yeah, MS finally implemented user privilege levels and loads of software broke... surprise! At least they added the "run as administrator" option.

They've always had them implemented under NT, but everybody (consumer-wise, not businesses) was always running as Administrator because they didn't want to log out and back into an admin account to make administrative changes.

Don't forget that the default user when created is created as administrator. Or at least, that was the case on windows XP. And well, most PC users don't even know what administrator means, let

alone change it for some user account...

Subject: Re: Question

Posted by [saberhawk](#) on Sun, 28 Dec 2008 12:59:52 GMT

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

EvilWhiteDragon wrote on Sun, 28 December 2008 06:46Saberhawk wrote on Sun, 28 December 2008 00:49CarrierII wrote on Sat, 27 December 2008 22:23Yeah, MS finally implemented user privilege levels and loads of softwre broke... suprise! At least they added the "run as administrator" option.

They've always had them implemented under NT, but everybody (consumer-wise, not businesses) was always running as Administrator because they didn't want to log out and back into an admin account to make administrative changes.

Don't forget that the default user when created is created as administrator. Or at least, that was the case on windows XP. And well, most PC users don't even know what administrator means, let alone change it for some user account...

Nope, you definitely had a choice.

Subject: Re: Question

Posted by [EvilWhiteDragon](#) on Mon, 29 Dec 2008 12:12:46 GMT

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

I'm certain that with Win XP SP2 install disk the default user that you create is Administrator, At least that happens for the dutch version....

Subject: Re: Question

Posted by [saberhawk](#) on Mon, 29 Dec 2008 13:41:50 GMT

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

EvilWhiteDragon wrote on Mon, 29 December 2008 06:12I'm certain that with Win XP SP2 install disk the default user that you create is Administrator, At least that happens for the dutch version....

The first users (aka the ones you create via Setup) are Administrators, however the Users control panel item gives you the choice between Administrator and Limited User.

Subject: Re: Question

Posted by [EvilWhiteDragon](#) on Mon, 29 Dec 2008 13:44:44 GMT

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

Saberhawk wrote on Mon, 29 December 2008 14:41: EvilWhiteDragon wrote on Mon, 29 December 2008 06:12: I'm certain that with Win XP SP2 install disk the default user that you create is Administrator, At least that happens for the dutch version....

The first users (aka the ones you create via Setup) are Administrators, however the Users control panel item gives you the choice between Administrator and Limited User.

I suspect that about 70 to 80% (at least) of the users don't know the control panel "users" so... By default everyone is an admin.

Subject: Re: Question

Posted by [Lone0001](#) on Mon, 29 Dec 2008 19:52:41 GMT

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

Well if they don't know about creating new accounts "in" windows then I don't see how they could even get through a windows install

Subject: Re: Question

Posted by [EvilWhiteDragon](#) on Mon, 29 Dec 2008 21:33:42 GMT

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

The same way as you install any other program, just by pressing next next next all the time

Subject: Re: Question

Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Sat, 03 Jan 2009 04:52:23 GMT

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

StealthEye wrote on Fri, 19 December 2008 13:43: forcing a hardware change can never be done anyway, one can always change the detection code to make it detect whatever hardware they want.

I also assume you could just run it all inside of a virtual machine, therefore emulating whatever hardware you wanted...

Subject: Re: Question

Posted by [Caveman](#) on Sat, 03 Jan 2009 12:49:15 GMT

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

However true that may be... I dont really think playing Ren via VMware or any other emulating program is gonna be easy. I would suspect that it would lag real bad and make it really unplayable

for the user.

Subject: Re: Question
Posted by [mrÅ£Ä\\$Ä-z](#) on Sat, 03 Jan 2009 13:20:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Caveman wrote on Sat, 03 January 2009 06:49: However true that may be... I don't really think playing Ren via VMware or any other emulating program is gonna be easy. I would suspect that it would lag real bad and make it really unplayable for the user.

Subject: Re: Question
Posted by [Hitman](#) on Sun, 04 Jan 2009 05:27:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

on canyon near gdi tunnel entrance there is this grass near the tree that a tank can get stuck in when it touches it... fix that to its annoying

Subject: Re: Question
Posted by [Genesis2001](#) on Sun, 04 Jan 2009 07:12:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Caveman wrote on Sat, 03 January 2009 05:49: However true that may be... I don't really think playing Ren via VMware or any other emulating program is gonna be easy. I would suspect that it would lag real bad and make it really unplayable for the user.

Not if the VM is on the local machine and it's got vmware tools installed...the lag isn't that bad.

Subject: Re: Question
Posted by [jnz](#) on Sun, 04 Jan 2009 09:17:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Afaik VMware doesn't allow direct access to the graphics card, so renegade won't even run.

Subject: Re: Question
Posted by [CarrierII](#) on Sun, 04 Jan 2009 15:10:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

RoShamBo wrote on Sun, 04 January 2009 09:17: Afaik VMware doesn't allow direct access to the graphics card, so renegade won't even run.

Microsoft Virtual PC certainly doesn't, we tried an XP based VM to bypass the now (10 months later!) fixed Vista <--> XP network play in AOE III not working - AOE III wouldn't start, citing the graphics card as too poor. Maybe there's a better emulator that can do direct video card access, but I don't know.

Subject: Re: Question
Posted by [jnz](#) on Sun, 04 Jan 2009 17:52:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

There's one called bochs, you could always try that. I think though because of the very nature of an emulator it would be very difficult to allow direct access to certain hardware. Mainly because I don't think 2 things can use it at the same time. So you'd have to somehow switch over execution on it to the virtual machine. I'm sure windows would take that great.

I don't really know, I just assume this is the case. I'm sure Saberhawk could clear this up.

Subject: Re: Question
Posted by [EvilWhiteDragon](#) on Sun, 04 Jan 2009 18:46:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

WMware does have an option to use Dx9.0c. Not sure how it performs, but it could work.

http://www.vmware.com/support/ws5/doc/ws_vidsound_d3d_enabling_vm.html

Subject: Re: Question
Posted by [saberhawk](#) on Sun, 04 Jan 2009 20:10:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

RoShamBo wrote on Sun, 04 January 2009 11:52 There's one called bochs, you could always try that. I think though because of the very nature of an emulator it would be very difficult to allow direct access to certain hardware. Mainly because I don't think 2 things can use it at the same time. So you'd have to somehow switch over execution on it to the virtual machine. I'm sure windows would take that great.

I don't really know, I just assume this is the case. I'm sure Saberhawk could clear this up.

No idea. However, seeing as Renegade is CPU-heavy on "modern" machines, and most people are complaining about low FPS, a virtual machine would likely be too slow to be "playable".

Subject: Re: Question

Posted by [jnz](#) on Sun, 04 Jan 2009 21:39:28 GMT

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

EvilWhiteDragon wrote on Sun, 04 January 2009 18:46VMware does have an option to use Dx9.0c. Not sure how it performs, but it could work.

http://www.vmware.com/support/ws5/doc/ws_vidsound_d3d_enabling_vm.html

I haven't use VMWare for a long time, that must be a fairly new feature.

Saberhawk wrote on Sun, 04 January 2009 20:10

No idea. However, seeing as Renegade is CPU-heavy on "modern" machines, and most people are complaining about low FPS, a virtual machine would likely be too slow to be "playable".

I don't know really, I find the virtual machine to be quite fast. On an up-to-date computer it might be playable.

Subject: Re: Question

Posted by [Hitman](#) on Wed, 07 Jan 2009 18:50:35 GMT

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

any updates yet on the patch on how its progressing?

Subject: Re: Question

Posted by [danpaul88](#) on Thu, 08 Jan 2009 10:32:07 GMT

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

CarrierII wrote on Sun, 04 January 2009 15:10RoShamBo wrote on Sun, 04 January 2009 09:17Afaik VMware doesn't allow direct access to the graphics card, so renegade wont even run.

Microsoft Virtual PC certainly doesn't, we tried an XP based VM to bypass the now (10 months later!) fixed Vista <--> XP network play in AOE III not working - AOE III wouldn't start, citing the graphics card as too poor. Maybe there's a better emulator that can do direct video card access, but I don't know.

That's because the video card it emulates is a really basic VGA type card. And why would an emulator then turn around and grant direct access to the hardware? That kind of defeats the purpose of an emulator in the first place.

However, I digress from the topic at hand... not that I can remember what that topic was meant to be since 'Question' is not very descriptive in the topic title.

Subject: Re: Question
Posted by [KobraOps](#) on Thu, 08 Jan 2009 21:57:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ummm maybe if u read the "question" that happened to be the very first post seeing how he made a topic for a question he had.
