WHAT'S NEXT GDC:06

Physical Gameplay in Half-Life 2

presented by
Jay Stelly

GameDevelopers Conference

Physical Gameplay in Half-Life 2

- New technology that hadn’t been successfully integrated into our genre
- Technical solutions not very well understood
- Obvious visual payoff
- Opportunity was to integrate with gameplay
- Both a game design problem and a technical problem

High-level strategy

- Don’t build the simulator
- Don’t add features to the simulator (until it becomes necessary)
- Differentiate the product by depth of gameplay integration, not incremental simulator features or quality
- Engineer tools and solutions in the game design space

Half-Life 2 Timeline for Physics

- Inspired by physics demos
- Generated a bunch of ideas
- Licensed physics simulator
- Took some time for game designers to really internalize physics technology
  - Built a bunch of prototypes
  - Built a bunch of design tools & logic

Half-Life 2 Timeline for Physics (continued)

- Gameplay mechanics experiments
- Solved some technical problems
- Cut & focus pass
- Solved more technical problems
- Incrementally delivered a stable system
  - Valuable features at each deliverable
- Polished and shipped the game

Physics prototypes (pre-production)

- Zombie basketball
- Watermelon skeet shooting
- Glue gun
- Danger Ted playset
- Toilet crossing

Cut & Focus pass

- How can we tell which gameplay idea is better?
- How many gameplay ideas do we need?
- How can we measure or change the difficulty of this gameplay?
- How are we going to turn these prototypes into shippable gameplay?
  - Are there metrics or analyses that will lead to better gameplay?
  - Is there a systematic way to move these ideas forward?
  - What are the technical problems we'll need to solve?

Game design

- Game design can be reduced to training and testing:
- A game design is a set of player experiences that:
  - trains a player with specific skills and knowledge
  - allows or requires the player to demonstrate that skill or knowledge
  - is presented with style.

Game design is engineering (at least a bunch of it is)

- Define success
- Identify constraints
- Generate ideas
- Analyze solutions
- Build prototypes
- Test results
- Measure success
- Re-examine constraints

Engineering training and testing

- Measurable criteria
- Models & Analysis
  - Cost / benefit
- Tradeoffs
- How to cut
- How to compare
- How to solve backwards for requirements
- How to measure value

Tools for training

- By example
- Clues then deduction
- Cliché
- Explicit test (assertion)
- Sandbox / toy / experiment
- Practice
- Forced choices

Obstacles to training

- Combat
- Peril
- Basically anything that forces the player to make decisions
- Reactions – rely on past skills & knowledge

Improving training

- Make it clear that it's ok to experiment or fail
- Sell forced choices with style
- Suggest experiments
- Story is not an obstacle to training

Player value as a metric for skills and knowledge

- Each piece of skill or knowledge must have value or get cut from your game
- There is a limit to the total number of things you can train in a game
- Having a skill or piece of knowledge interact with another increases the value of both
- Requiring a piece of skill or knowledge to pass a test increases its value to the player
- These relationships form an economy that can be analyzed and optimized
- At Valve we call this “design economy.”

Constraints from Half-Life

- Breakable objects – crowbar
- Physics needs to interact with core combat gameplay
  - Collisions that cause damage
  - Players and NPCs use physics as cover
- Physics needs to extend core puzzle gameplay

Integrating physics with Half-Life is difficult

- Physics is reasonably intuitive, but doesn't "just work" for a bunch of reasons.
- Most game designers don't completely understand the physics simulation technology, implementing their designs makes understanding the simulator really important.
- Game logic may place impossible requirements on a physics simulation – requiring code to be written that straddles the boundary between game design and physics technology.

Design interface

- Educating designers in physics
- Decomposing machines into physics blocks
- Unfamiliar units (e.g. torque, impulses)
- Tuning parameters
- Complex sets of variables imply calculations
  - I want this part of this machine to spin at this speed
  - I want this plank to be stable enough to support the player, but only until he reaches this point
- Deliver technology incrementally
  - Only a few features to learn at a time
- Need a physics expert to support designers

Latency & Continuity

- Most physics engines interact with the game in discrete steps of time
- Changes to the state of the system are often queued until the next update/step
- Game rules are often discontinuities in state
  - I want to break this object on collision
  - You can only break objects at time steps
  - Collisions occur between time steps
  - Built support for this by resetting in the future
- Run until the next collision is ideal, but not practical

Speculation

- Reserving space (Inventory, creating objects)
- Motion planning
- Collision detection without physics (tools, queries)
  - Built tools and query layer
  - Critical problem for our AI system
  - Built in-house speculative collision solver

Overdetermined systems

- simulation variables
- design variables
- design criteria
  - gravity gun movement vs. damage
  - zombie car trap
- Superman problem

Simulation failure

- Objects stuck in each other
- Not settling
- Valid for physics invalid for game design
- Simulator explodes
- Game design constraints that can't be satisfied
- Create objects in solid space

Conclusions

- Engineer your gameplay mechanics
- Use analysis and design economy to intentionally improve your game design
- Many technical problems remain with integrating physics. You can solve some of these with design constraints, but plan to invest in technology.
- Plan for failure cases and be sure to ask, “is this failing as a result of desirable gameplay?”