

---

Subject: Request of my TT colleagues

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Mon, 16 Nov 2009 17:24:34 GMT

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

---

I'd like to ask again for the "deadzone fix", i.e. a fix for the bug where tankshells from higher up (like the mesa bridge) lose some of their efficacy against targets lower down.

As many people know I have just revitalised the clanwars league - so far it's going very well - and have instituted the proper Renegade points system (i.e. the pointsfix, as well as the vehicle-alignment modification), as well as disallowed harvblocking. In all Westwood maps except one, this has had a positive effect on balance. Field, Cityfly, Under, Wallsfly etc - all much, much fairer. In Mesa it's had the reverse effect; Nod has the clear advantage. I can explain exactly why this is but it's probably redundant, just take my word for it unless you feel like challenging it.

But I believe this can be rectified with the deadzone fix (the altitude thing). Can I please get a fix JUST for this on its own, so it can be tested in clanwar settings? Right now I'm strongly considering removing Mesa from the clanwar servers altogether. (This isn't SO bad since other maps are now much fairer...)

---

---

Subject: Re: Request of my TT colleagues

Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Mon, 16 Nov 2009 18:17:54 GMT

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

---

Wasn't there already a topic about this? If not, well, yeah, this should be fixed. I always felt Mesa was a tad unbalanced anyways, I suggest removing it until that bug is fixed.

---

---

Subject: Re: Request of my TT colleagues

Posted by [EvilWhiteDragon](#) on Mon, 16 Nov 2009 19:45:10 GMT

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

---

Spoony wrote on Mon, 16 November 2009 18:24 I'd like to ask again for the "deadzone fix", i.e. a fix for the bug where tankshells from higher up (like the mesa bridge) lose some of their efficacy against targets lower down.

As many people know I have just revitalised the clanwars league - so far it's going very well - and have instituted the proper Renegade points system (i.e. the pointsfix, as well as the vehicle-alignment modification), as well as disallowed harvblocking. In all Westwood maps except one, this has had a positive effect on balance. Field, Cityfly, Under, Wallsfly etc - all much, much fairer. In Mesa it's had the reverse effect; Nod has the clear advantage. I can explain exactly why this is but it's probably redundant, just take my word for it unless you feel like challenging it.

But I believe this can be rectified with the deadzone fix (the altitude thing). Can I please get a fix JUST for this on its own, so it can be tested in clanwar settings? Right now I'm strongly considering removing Mesa from the clanwar servers altogether. (This isn't SO bad since other maps are now much fairer...)

No, everything is integrated with each other. Unless you want to be the reason that TT will be more delayed, it won't and cannot happen. On a side note, the programmers are coding happily towards a beta release, then you can test this without delaying the beta.

Oh and yes it should be fixed (AFAIK it already is).

---

---

Subject: Re: Request of my TT colleagues  
Posted by [jonwil](#) on Mon, 16 Nov 2009 21:26:16 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I can tell you right now that separating any of the 4.0 changes from the rest of 4.0 is NOT going to happen.

---

---

Subject: Re: Request of my TT colleagues  
Posted by [Omar007](#) on Mon, 16 Nov 2009 21:36:46 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

jonwil wrote on Mon, 16 November 2009 22:26 I can tell you right now that separating any of the 4.0 changes from the rest of 4.0 is NOT going to happen.

---

---

Subject: Re: Request of my TT colleagues  
Posted by [liquidv2](#) on Mon, 16 Nov 2009 23:42:16 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

goodbye mesa

---

---

Subject: Re: Request of my TT colleagues  
Posted by [TruYuri](#) on Mon, 16 Nov 2009 23:43:53 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

If you're desperate for a fix, our (APB/AR/BHP) rigger Eggman891 found a simple fix before TT fixed it. Encompass the entire map in a box mesh, with the mesh facing inwards. Then have the mesh have "Hide", "Physical", and "Projectile" settings on it.

Couldn't tell you why it works, all I can tell you is that it does. Box can be as big as you like so long as it has the collision settings and the mesh faces inwards toward the map itself. It can be done as a separate .w3d include in LE.

---

---

Subject: Re: Request of my TT colleagues  
Posted by [Dover](#) on Tue, 17 Nov 2009 00:45:51 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Mesa sucks anyway.

---

Subject: Re: Request of my TT colleagues  
Posted by [Goztow](#) on Tue, 17 Nov 2009 08:07:48 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

TruYuri wrote on Tue, 17 November 2009 00:43If you're desperate for a fix, our (APB/AR/BHP) rigger Eggman891 found a simple fix before TT fixed it. Encompass the entire map in a box mesh, with the mesh facing inwards. Then have the mesh have "Hide", "Physical", and "Projectile" settings on it.

Couldn't tell you why it works, all I can tell you is that it does. Box can be as big as you like so long as it has the collision settings and the mesh faces inwards toward the map itself. It can be done as a separate .w3d include in LE.

Ermmm this sounds like a client side fix, no? Or is it server side?

---

Subject: Re: Request of my TT colleagues  
Posted by [StealthEye](#) on Tue, 17 Nov 2009 13:01:48 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

This requires for client and serverside modifications. It's not going to be separated from TT.

The quick&dirty fix is indeed to make some big object (or an object far down in the ground), because then the coordinates being sent will allow lower (negative) values. If you make the map "high enough" it will fix the problem. Note that you will have to do the map changes on both server and client.

---

Subject: Re: Request of my TT colleagues  
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Tue, 17 Nov 2009 13:05:28 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

if anyone can help, i guess this thread is the place for it.

[http://www.renegadeforums.com/index.php?t=msg&th=35205&start=0&rid=2\\_0608](http://www.renegadeforums.com/index.php?t=msg&th=35205&start=0&rid=2_0608)

---

Subject: Re: Request of my TT colleagues  
Posted by [reborn](#) on Tue, 17 Nov 2009 14:05:22 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

StealthEye wrote on Tue, 17 November 2009 08:01 This requires for client and serverside modifications. It's not going to be separated from TT.

The quick&dirty fix is indeed to make some big object (or an object far down in the ground), because then the coordinates being sent will allow lower (negative) values. If you make the map "high enough" it will fix the problem. Note that you will have to do the map changes on both server and client.

I realise that the first thing you stated was that a client and server fix was needed for this. However, if all that is needed for a dirty fix is to have an object low down on the z-axis, then would an object created on the level loaded event on the server be sufficient?

I don't really understand what causes the problem, let alone the possible solution, just asking...

---

---

Subject: Re: Request of my TT colleagues  
Posted by [Sladewill](#) on Tue, 17 Nov 2009 15:22:29 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Mesa still is annoying, the tib harv gets hit by the agt, and u always crash and get stuck in walls on the map as it is...

---

---

Subject: Re: Request of my TT colleagues  
Posted by [StealthEye](#) on Tue, 17 Nov 2009 20:10:44 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

reborn wrote on Tue, 17 November 2009 15:05 StealthEye wrote on Tue, 17 November 2009 08:01 This requires for client and serverside modifications. It's not going to be separated from TT.

The quick&dirty fix is indeed to make some big object (or an object far down in the ground), because then the coordinates being sent will allow lower (negative) values. If you make the map "high enough" it will fix the problem. Note that you will have to do the map changes on both server and client.

I realise that the first thing you stated was that a client and server fix was needed for this. However, if all that is needed for a dirty fix is to have an object low down on the z-axis, then would an object created on the level loaded event on the server be sufficient?

I don't really understand what causes the problem, let alone the possible solution, just asking... Nope, it needs to be part of the map. Basically, what the game does when loading a map is determine its bounds. It sets the network encoders to these bounds. That allows a few bits or bytes to be saved for position updates.

Consider a level with bounds (-300, 300) (-300, 300) and (-10, 30) in the X Y and Z direction respectively. A position like (150, -300, 10) would be sent though the netcode like (.5, 0, .33), basically giving the positions on the axes relative to their bounds. This works perfectly for

positions. However, for targeting, the game computes the target vector relative to the player's position. So if you shoot straight down this could be something like (0, 0, -20) (assuming you're 20m from the ground), not depending on the player's position. This target vector however, is sent through the same encoder, which means it is rounded to the level's bounds: (0, 0, -10). That's not necessarily the direction you wanted to shoot in.

If you understood what I tried to say, then it's clear that it can be solved by either changing the way things are sent (like TT does) or enlarging the map's bounds by placing an object low in the Z axis. The bounds are only computed for map meshes (I think) or at least only for things that are available at map load time when the bounds are determined, so there's no way to make that happen without clientside changes.

---

Subject: Re: Request of my TT colleagues  
Posted by [Jamie or NuneGa](#) on Wed, 18 Nov 2009 03:09:32 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

even with this fix the map will still favour nod with pointfix, a lot of people can hit buildings from the bridge anyway... apart from maybe a mrl on the bridge I don't think much difference would be made from this fix.

---

Subject: Re: Request of my TT colleagues  
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Wed, 18 Nov 2009 03:35:30 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

you don't think a med doing full damage and splashing techs, and being well protected against return fire from arties, is gonna be helpful to gdi?

---

Subject: Re: Request of my TT colleagues  
Posted by [liquidv2](#) on Wed, 18 Nov 2009 03:44:24 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

it will help but nunega feels it will still be a nod-dominated map despite the deadzones being removed

which he's probably right in saying, but who knows at this point

---

Subject: Re: Request of my TT colleagues  
Posted by [Goztow](#) on Wed, 18 Nov 2009 08:19:09 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It's hard to say but it would surely make a (big) difference. Nod currently owns the map with or without pointfix because the techs behind the arts can hardly be hit from anywhere and the arts

can shoot the mediums even before the driver gets in.

---

---

Subject: Re: Request of my TT colleagues  
Posted by [Sladewill](#) on Wed, 18 Nov 2009 13:12:51 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

The map needs to be redesigned with this in mind

---

---

Subject: Re: Request of my TT colleagues  
Posted by [Goztow](#) on Wed, 18 Nov 2009 14:57:26 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

That won't happen as it would change gameplay. Technically, a server owner could do it though, thanks to the auto downloader: recreate the map and try to make it more balanced. But technically that would make it a fanmap .

---

---

Subject: Re: Request of my TT colleagues  
Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Wed, 18 Nov 2009 16:20:15 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Spoony wrote on Tue, 17 November 2009 20:35 you don't think a med doing full damage and splashing techs, and being well protected against return fire from arties, is gonna be helpful to gdi?

Arty has more splash then the meds, park it up there and it will be equally (if not more) annoying to GDI as any med would be to Nod.

Maybe instead of playing for points you should play for who can destroy the enemy base; after all, anyone one who plays GDI can stand somewhere and lob grenades into the airstip, but destroying the airstrip actually takes a bit of skill, as it requires either the enemy team to be completely retarded, or your team to have some team work. And yes I do have a point with this: when it comes to destroying the enemy base, I have only seen GDI win that map.

---

---

Subject: Re: Request of my TT colleagues  
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Wed, 18 Nov 2009 17:55:38 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Jerad Gray wrote on Wed, 18 November 2009 10:20 Arty has more splash then the meds, park it up there and it will be equally (if not more) annoying to GDI as any med would be to Nod.

Maybe instead of playing for points you should play for who can destroy the enemy base; after all, anyone one who plays GDI can stand somewhere and lob grenades into the airstip, but destroying the airstrip actually takes a bit of skill, as it requires either the enemy team to be completely retarded, or your team to have some team work. And yes I do have a point with this: when it comes to destroying the enemy base, I have only seen GDI win that map.

---

make a clan with the best players you know and play 10 games on mesa against either CAG, H2O or TC on the league, then come back and tell me how many you've won.

---

---

Subject: Re: Request of my TT colleagues  
Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Thu, 19 Nov 2009 00:39:46 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Spoony wrote on Wed, 18 November 2009 10:55Jerad Gray wrote on Wed, 18 November 2009 10:20Arty has more splash then the meds, park it up there and it will be equally (if not more) annoying to GDI as any med would be to Nod.

Maybe instead of playing for points you should play for who can destroy the enemy base; after all, anyone one who plays GDI can stand somewhere and lob grenades into the airstip, but destroying the airstrip actually takes a bit of skill, as it requires either the enemy team to be completely retarded, or your team to have some team work. And yes I do have a point with this: when it comes to destroying the enemy base, I have only seen GDI win that map.

make a clan with the best players you know and play 10 games on mesa against either CAG, H2O or TC on the league, then come back and tell me how many you've won.

No one has the exact same skill level, and there are hundreds of strategies to win on mesa, you just have to know ones to counter, or use it to your advantage. Now beings the dead zone affects both teams, I'd just recommend staying clear of it, sounds like a good strategy to me.

---

---

Subject: Re: Request of my TT colleagues  
Posted by [liquidv2](#) on Thu, 19 Nov 2009 01:58:50 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Jerad Gray wrote on Wed, 18 November 2009 10:20And yes I do have a point with this: when it comes to destroying the enemy base, I have only seen GDI win that map.  
have you only played mesa like 5 times?

---

---

Subject: Re: Request of my TT colleagues  
Posted by [Goztow](#) on Thu, 19 Nov 2009 07:28:59 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I hardly ever see GDI win that map, beit on base destruction or points.

Maybe you're referring to bigger games, like 20v20 games where I'm referring to smaller games (3v3 up to 9v9). In the games I play, the simple fact of having a single or two light tanks / arts on the side and 2-3 arts with techs in the tib field makes it impossible for GDI to rush in. The medium tanks need to try to push through thanks to their armour but are hampered by:

- \* lack of credits
- \* their armour being shot down before they come out of the warf
- \* the fact it's almost impossible to splash the techs

It's true the bridge could also be taken by Nod but they'd need 2 players for that and the art on

---



there would be much more vulnerable because its tech can be killed quite easy (no range advantage when you're on the bridge).

No, there's really something to say for the deadzone fix for helping to balance this map for competitive games.

---

---

Subject: Re: Request of my TT colleagues  
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Thu, 19 Nov 2009 08:00:52 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Jerad Gray wrote on Wed, 18 November 2009 18:39No one has the exact same skill level, and there are hundreds of strategies to win on mesa, you just have to know ones to counter, or use it to your advantage. Now beings the dead zone affects both teams, I'd just recommend staying clear of it, sounds like a good strategy to me.  
have you ever played a clanwar on mesa?

remember, we are specifically talking about the clanwars league in this thread.

---

---

Subject: Re: Request of my TT colleagues  
Posted by [BLÃ»Íµl4Î²ÃªL](#) on Thu, 19 Nov 2009 14:30:50 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Goztow wrote on Thu, 19 November 2009 01:28It's true the bridge could also be taken by Nod but they'd need 2 players for that and the art on there would be much more vulnerable because its tech can be killed quite easy (no range advantage when you're on the bridge).

I disagree. Whenever i'm alone on the bridge and I have a tech in my art, I kill the med that is coming for me 8 out of 10 times.

---