Yes, but why take any damage on T1 for only a possibility of success when you can kill the same targets on T2 with minimum force? If you marshall your forces with the Lyrans on T2 by bringing them into the neutral zone and ending your move there, you can still kill every BATS from 0703 to 1405, plus the minor planet at 1105 plus both SB's. You will suffer minimum casualties at the BATS/planet. At the SB's you are guaranteed success at at least one. If he over defends one of the SB's with the homefleet then he risks a T2 raid on his HW.

The reason I’d target at least 703 or 803 is because it's more complicated to kill both in 1 turn than over 2 turns.

Otherwise, I'd generate a bunch of battles and retreat after 1 round at most of them. I want to try to force a mistake from the Kzinti.

Yes Tony, but on Turn 2 what sane Zin is going to be sending a reserve to save a BATS when it may be able to save a SB instead? I think that's Jimi's point, the BATS really won't be defended Turn 2.

I would so love the Kzinti to defend his outer bats against a combined Klingon/Lyran assault and not defend his Starbases.

RPadilla understands what I was trying to say. Thank god someone did because I have the worst time explaining myself sometime =)
game and many things can change.

The key to fast advances in this game (IMHO) is to threaten the Alliances most valuable targets as quickly as possible.

For that reason I like to try getting as many Lyrans into range 6 of the Kzinti capitol on T1 as is possible.

Since the Kzin have CEDS and fighters they can usually win battles, so you have to find a way to get into position without fighting long battles. My preferred method is to drop the majority of the Home fleet onto 0803. Take the 6 ships contingent and pick up the RC fleet and overrun to 1004 (or 0904 if he reacts to stop you). If he reacts/reserves against your RC fleet fight one round and retreat it into the Klingon/Kzin NZ and accept internment from the peace-loving Klingons. If you are lucky on the Kzinti turn you can react your RC fleet deeper into his space fight one round and retreat back to 6 hexes from Kzintai.

Against a good player I don't expect to get the RC fleet into range as well, but the only way to stop the Lyrans from getting 35 or so ships within strike range of the Kzin capitol is to react all of the Duke's and Count's fleets to 0803 when the Lyran HW fleet moves. Then only 20 or so Lyrans will be able to overrun. But at that point you can content yourself with getting a free Counts fleet SB kill.

If the Coalition can have 85-90 ships in range of a capitol attack on T2, the Kzin will have to make some serious choices. They only have 70-75(ish?) ships free on Turn one. You can go into the Kzin capitol early to soften up the main capitol system before he gets 4 majors on it, and/or devastate him economically. Or, if he defends the capitol heavily, you can ignore it and clean up Kzin space.

Check your numbers again on the number of ships the Kzin have to play with. They have about 85 SEs turn 1 and build 5.

The Lyrans have 71 in the Home and Red CLaw, plus they build 12, for 83.

The Kzin outnumber you by about 7 or so. If you leave your fleet to be pinned in Kzin space they can take those 7 ships and take out a few of your BATS or perhaps even the Red CLaw Starbase if they get lucky and you take enough cripples.

I did this to the last Lyran that left his forces in range of the Kzin capital. It was not a pretty sight.

The Kzinti are not to be laughed at anymore, they can really hurt you on turn 1 if you are not cautious.
Screw the RC SB, I'd trade it in a second for a nice shot on a thinly defended Kzintai on T2.

I agree with Mark and Stew, the Lyrans **must** attack the Kzinti T1 in order to get ships in range of Kzintai. You can really screw up Kzinti defense for T2 if you can get the RC within range of the capital.

Chris, I did undercount the Kzin a bit but it is irrelevant. I couldn't care less if I lose all three border BATS. You can't bring your BATS' into a capitol assault - and if I can get the Home Fleet in range of the capitol I dont care if I lose the RC SB. I usually operate out of Klingon space anyway by setting up a MB on 1307 or 1408.

Assuming you only get your RC+6 safely interned, you can retreat the home fleet if you are worried about defense to 0704. After removing 6 ships from the home you should still have about 32 there. They can react north to cut the Kzin off from a good path to the Red Claw SB, and your new production can be on reserve as well. If your 44 active ships stay back you will not be in range of the Kzin home fleet and can pretty much match the Counts/Dukes. If the Kzin do drive those ships into your space they won't be able to retrograde into the capitol.

If I saw an opportunity to keep both Lyran fleets within 6 of the Kzin capitol, I would love it if they attacked the RC SB. Put my 12 reserves there, and they will need over 20 ships to take it out. That leaves them at best 65 ships to defend the capitol against 110-115 coalition ships.

I also just realized I said RC twice when I meant HW in my first post. Hope it didn't make the point of it too confusing. Basically though, my advice for the Lyrans is to drive the 6+RC 2 hexes into Kzin space and retreat into the Neutral zone. Bypass the Kzin defenses as much and as fast as possible to get maximum pressure on his capitol. Once he pulls in to defend the family jewels you can pop his BATS' and probably SB's with ease.

Do not underestimate the Lyrans T1, too many people do and time is precious for the Coalition - make the most of it!

A problem with the plan to have the Lyran's interned in the Klingon NZ, is that you have to CONTINUE moving into the Klingon Territory Proper after your retreat. According to rule 503.65, you cannot remain in the NZ. Because of this
any force that is forced to retreat from 904, 1004, or even 1105 will be 7 hexes away from 1401!

So only if the Kzinti lets you stay in Kzinti space will you be able to reach the Capital from those two hexes. Knowing that, many Kzinti put the non-reserve part of the fleet in 1003. This allows them to react to any intrusion along the border, putting that many more Kzinti ships (and fighters) into action on Coalition Turn 1.

Additionally, the Kzinti can strike any of the Lyran Bases on Kzinti Turn 1 and then Retreat & Retrograde to both 0902 and 1304. The Duke and Count's fleet have equal ship counts to the Home + New Builds, which means something will be undefended. Also, any ship crippled by the Kzinti during their turn will be unavailable during the Lyran turn, since the repair capacity at any BATS is limited.

In my opinion, the risks outweigh the benefits of performing this maneuver. Better to trade blows over the BATS and wait for the Turn 2 attacks.

By Mark Sayther (Msayther) on Friday, October 24, 2003 - 02:39 am: Edit

503.61 says
"Ships can enter Neutral Zone hexes if they continue to move into the neutral power and accept internment ... If a unit spends its last movement point (or its only hex of retreat movement) entering the Neutral Zone it is allowed to move on into the first hex of the neutral country immediately and be interned immediately. (Actually, what happens, is the pursuing enemy force stops pursuit at the end of the Neutral Zone and the fleeing units enter the neutral country on the next turn, but it is more convenient to handle this immediately)."

Check out the second sentence of the rule you refererred to. The use of the word 'allowed' we always read to mean that it was voluntarily in the case of a unit with no movement points left. Especially considering the paranthetical clause which seems to back that up by describing a continuation of movement on a subsequent turn.

I think a strict reading of that rule would be that --- If you were using normal movement and still had a pulse left you would have to continue moving into enemy space and be interned as per the first sentence. However, if you used your last pulse of movement to enter the Neutral Zone and don't have another movement point to spend you are 'allowed' as a 'convenience' to take a free movement point and move into the neutral powers space.

I could well be wrong and they chose the word 'allowed' poorly, but I don't feel that as this rule is currently written that the tactic I described is breaking either the letter or the spirit of the rule. I'll post it on the Q&A section though to be sure.
Heck, if units that spend time fighting can move 6500 parsecs in 6 months while units that do not can only move 3000, I suppose anything is possible. I guess if you are shooting all your rear facing weapons you can double your warp speed ;)

Going back to Paul Bonfatti's question of Tuesday 21st 2:02PM

I find though that if you want a good general rule as to what you (the attacker) needs to bring in to destroy a hard point is this.

Vs the Hydrans you need twice the ship type as the defender. I.e. if the Hydran has 2 command, 20 cruisers, 20 destroyers and 30 frigates defending a hard point then you need 4 command, 40 cruisers, 40 destroyers and 60 frigates to when with good odds. Anything less and you start having risky odds. Against most other races you need 1.5x his ship types so 3 command, 30 cruisers, 30 destroyers and 45 frigates for a fairly easy kill.

Hydrans require you to take more due to their high fighter count.

I don't think one formula will work for a defended target. Like someone else said, there are so many variables, it's impossible to make any calculation, with the possible exception of looking at the battle force one intends to attack the target with and calculating what BIR, and how long you'd have to hang in the fight to destroy the target.

The type of target also influences things, as well as whether destruction is the goal, or is the objective to hold the terrain after destruction? And then there is the makeup of the forces fighting over the target. One of those all-DN/BC battle forces the Lyrans can field needs a lot fewer ships than a standard Fed force, for example.

I think Jimi was on to something with regards rough ship ratio, though I'd go on to say that the ratio of att:def differs depending on the target. For BATS, 1.5:1, SB 3:1, planets, 1.5:1 or 2:1. Start out with something like that, pay attention to your opponent's style, and, of course, the strategic situation, and you'll come up with something better tailored to your play, Paul.

the ratio also starts to vary depending on the size of the defending fleet.

if the defenders have 900 ships at a base and you want to kill it you don't need 1800 ships to be sure that you succeed, 950-1000 would probably do (you can direct on the base for 9 rounds taking your lumps in extra losses and then you have a simple open-space fight)
even if for some reason you don't want to direct on the base (say you want to do as much damage to the enemy fleet as possible and don't care what your losses are) you still don't need 2:1 or 3:1 at these numbers, the base adds <50% to the firepower of the defending fleet (call it 50% when you take the EW into account) plus it can absorb the same damage as 8-10 ships so 1.5:1 plus 30 ships would win (with heavy losses)

By Jay Paulson (EtiJake) on Sunday, January 18, 2004 - 06:11 am: Edit

Mark:
Ships would be unable to enter the neutral zone on their last movement point if they didn't use the allowed movement. Look at the first sentence of 503.61

By Gene Van Hook (Gvanhook) on Saturday, January 24, 2004 - 06:59 pm: Edit

Newbie here

I have looked around the boards a bit, and see allot of reference to the MUDSLIDE tactic, however I think the actual tactic is no longer on the boards in the form of an archive, can anyone give me a brief clue on what this tactic is? I assume it is someway to bottle up the Kzin's and Hydrans without attacking the capitals, and then driving hard for the Fed homeworld's, is my assumption correct?

By Douglas E. Lampert (Dlampert) on Saturday, January 24, 2004 - 07:14 pm: Edit

The basis of the mudslide is a belief that if the coalition takes away alliance income without losing lots of ships they can outbuild the alliance even after exustion. This allows the coalition to maintain ship count superiority (and hence the initiative) forever.

Thus the key to the mudslide is to hit targets of opportunity (the alliance cannot defend everywhere), costing the alliance their builds by starving them of cash, while taking enough territory to keep your own builds going even after turn 15.

The theory was originated by Pete Dimitri, who seems to no longer be on the board, and who never posted a simple explanation. So other people may have different ideas of what it means.

By Robert Padilla (Zargan) on Sunday, January 25, 2004 - 08:25 am: Edit

And part of it, I believe, is to keep as many of the Coalition forces forward deployed as possible, thereby also protecting the province raiders and seriously limiting Alliance offensive operations lest they get cut off from supply.

By Gene Van Hook (Gvanhook) on Sunday, January 25, 2004 - 04:05 pm: Edit

So I can see one stripping and devastating the other capital systems, but what about the capital planet and shipyard? This would cost a ton of ships and if the Coalition is going for ship superiority might be counter productive, but then again, it would be an income hit to the Alliance, the capital hex, and rebuilding the shipyard? Or is it not as easy as black & white maybe and really depends on
Think targets of opportunity: if a capital hex is left underdefended you raid it, if you can take the capital planet on the cheap you do it; if not, then not.

Typically the Alliance will defend the capitals well enough that the mudslide may raid the outer systems, but does not go for the kill. But the moment someone starts counting on this and leaves themselves open....

So not as easy as black and white, but the expectation is that you will not take any capital hex until turn 11 or later.

IMO the ultimate goal of the mudslide would be a conquest of Earth possibly as early as turn 12. The only reason to allow the Hydrans and Kzinti to keep their capitals and much of their economy intact is if you can eventually take out the Feds.

Instead of wasting resources on Kz-Hy capital assaults you instead save them for the Feds. The Feds simply can’t stand up to 350+ Klingon and Romulan ships primed with years worth of accumulated maulers, stasis, carriers, high compot ships, SAFs, etc.

I don’t think that taking earth is a requirement, or even a goal of the mudslide

I see it as taking enough of the alliance economy that the coalition will always outbuild the alliance and therefore never lose the initiative.

capturing a capitol is a big deal, it deprives your opponent of 90 EP (to build a shipyard) and 6 turns worth of construction (actually a little less as a significant amount of that construction isn't lost, it's just postponed, the money saved during the time it couldn't be spent gets used to extend full production for a few turns into exhaustion or to overbuild ships) and some additional income from the planets in the capitol hex (although the capitol hex is frequently going to be re-captured, potentially fairly quickly)

capturing earth on turn 12 means the feds get their new capitol on turn 18, halfway through the war. If the coalition loses more ships during the capitol assault the the feds do then it was a mistake for the coalition to take earth.

Now if the alliance leaves a capitol underdefended so that it can be captured at a low enough cost to the coalitioin then it should be dead meat. This means that the alliance needs to either station large fleets at the capitol (limiting the use of the
ships) or build fixed defenses scary enough to allow a smaller fleet to do the job.

Well, ships not built are lost forever, not just delayed. Loss of a Kzin or Hydran shipyard means the loss of about 72 actual ships and 12 more SEs or fighters.

Especially as the Kzin have little money left over after building their shipyard (about 20-25 offmap), they really are in a hurt.

The rest of what David said I agree with.

If you are predictably going to be unable to afford all your builds prior to the end of the game then it is quite possible for a 'lost' build to only be delayed if you save the cash.

Build something that would normally be lost anyway. Who builds the full Kzinti or Hydran late war schedule?

Christopher, some of them are delayed because the money that would have built the ships while the shipyard was out of commission is available to build ships at a time that the slipways would be idle.

as an example of this think about what normally happens for a few turns after the hydran shipyard is replaced, the hydrans are building a full schedule, even though the hydran income would normally only build a small fraction of that.

David, they are still not delayed.

To delay means that the ships eventually get built.

Ships not built on turn 10 are lost forever. Just because you have some extra money to build ships you would not normally be able to on turn 17 does not mean those turn 10 ships are suddenly getting built.

It means that a few extra ships get purchased later on over the course of the war.

Also, where is this magic later money coming from? The IC sucks up most of the Guild gift for the Hydrans, and the Kzin barely have enough in the off map to build a shipyard and do a turn's worth of repairs.
delaying those 10 ships by 7 turns

the money is from the fact that while the shipyard is under construction it's hard to spend very much cash.

remember that the loss of the shipyard does not mean the race looses all it's on-map income.

David, I think we are going too have to just disagree on this and let it be. There is no way you can convince me with your way of thinking.

Also, the Hydrans MIGHT keep a province or two if they are willing to trade ships for them.

The Kzinti can be cutoff from anything on map for a long time, again, unless they are willing to trade ships for any ground they keep.

9 times of 10, if the Hydran or Kzin lose their capital, they will most (if not all) of their onmap income.

Also, 10 fewer ships built on turn 10 is only actualy delayed if you build 20 ships on turn 17, or whenhaveyou.

exactly, so while you skip building say 72 ships while the shipyard is down your total ship losses are something less, I would say in the 50-60 ship range

one of the things that started this discussion was talk of leaving the hydrans and kzinti on-map, but taking out the fed capitol, it's unlikly that the feds would be driven entirely offmap in this process.

yes it would be painful, but it's not quite as bad as it would seem from totaling up 6 turns worth of production

In "The Family Feud" thread in Reports from the Front, someone suggested doing
a statistical analysis of stasis ships. Here's my attempt.

I made two assumptions—a neutral EW environment was one. The other had to do with targeting. I classified targets as "desirable" or "undesirable." An undesirable result occurs when the defender selected the target or random selection resulted in one of the three ships the defender chose. A desirable result occurs when the targeted ship was frozen, or random selection got one of the ships the attacker chose. Here's the data:

D7:

1 SHIP TARGETED:

Freezing one target: 83%
Freezing two or three targets: 0%
Freezing no target: 16%

Freezing a desirable target: 50%

2 SHIPS TARGETED:
Freezing one target: 28%
Freezing two targets: 69%
Freezing three targets: 0%
Freezing no target: 4%

Freezing a desirable target: 50%
Freezing two desirable targets: 14%

3 SHIPS TARGETED:
Freezing one target: 6%
Freezing two targets: 29%
Freezing three targets: 47%
Freezing no target: 17%

Freezing a desirable target: 22%
Freezing two desirable targets: 27%
Freezing three desirable targets: 5%

I'll post D5 and C9 following this post

Stasis possibilities continued:

D5:

1 SHIP TARGETED:
Freezing one target: 83%
Freezing two or three targets: 0%
Freezing no target: 16%

Freezing a desirable target: 33%

2 SHIPS TARGETED:
Freezing one target: 25%
Freezing two targets: 56%
Freezing three targets: 0%
Freezing no target: 19%

Freezing a desirable target: 36%
Freezing two desirable targets: 7%

3 SHIPS TARGETED:
Freezing one target: 6%
Freezing two targets: 23%
Freezing three targets: 29%
Freezing no target: 34%

Freezing a desirable target: 14%
Freezing two desirable targets: 10%
Freezing three desirable targets: 1%

C9, C5:

1 SHIP TARGETED:
Freezing one target: 83%
Freezing two or three targets: 0%
Freezing no target: 16%

Freezing a desirable target: 58%

2 SHIPS TARGETED:
Freezing one target: 28%
Freezing two targets: 69%
Freezing three targets: 0%
Freezing no target: 4%

Freezing a desirable target: 50%
Freezing two desirable targets: 27%
3 SHIPS TARGETED:
Freezing one target: 11%
Freezing two targets: 37%
Freezing three targets: 47%
Freezing no target: 1%

Freezing a desirable target: 36%
Freezing two desirable targets: 36%
Freezing three desirable targets: 9%

I haven't done C7, B10, or SBA yet, but I can if people are interested.

Analysis to follow

By David Lang (Dlang) on Tuesday, January 27, 2004 - 12:27 pm: Edit
Paul, are you taking into account the breakdown roll which will negate prior successes?

By Paul Bonfanti (Bonfanti) on Tuesday, January 27, 2004 - 01:56 pm: Edit
Yes. That's why the percentages of getting 0 targets are higher when attempting to freeze 3 targets than 2.

Basically, what the numbers tell me is that it's not worth it to try to freeze more than 1 target with a D5, and it's just crazy to try to target 3. With a D7, it's definitely worth it to go for 2--the only downside is that you lose 6 attack strength. Going for 3 is probably not worth it-- you do have a better chance of getting two frozen ships, but you're reducing the chance of getting good ships, and running the risk of getting nothing.

The C8 is a difficult call--going for two has no downside except the 10 lost COMPO. Going for three is also has a good chance of success, but it has to be weighed against the fact that you're giving up 6 extra damage to try for it.

By Alan De Salvio (Alandwork) on Tuesday, January 27, 2004 - 04:42 pm: Edit
Paul, you simply must evaluate the B10 and SB (and any other available stasis variants, if they have different tables).

By Paul Bonfanti (Bonfanti) on Tuesday, January 27, 2004 - 05:09 pm: Edit
OK. I need to adjust my spreadsheet to account for a B10 or SB with two SFGs, but here's what I can do without too much trouble. I should note that when I said "freezing a desirable target" I should have said "freezing one (and only one) desirable target":

C7A:

1 SHIP TARGETED:
Freezing one target: 83%
Freezing two or three targets: 0%
Freezing no target: 16%

Freezing a desirable target: 50%

2 SHIPS TARGETED:
Freezing one target: 28%
Freezing two targets: 69%
Freezing three targets: 0%
Freezing no target: 4%

Freezing one desirable target: 50%
Freezing two desirable targets: 19%

3 SHIPS TARGETED:
Freezing one target: 6%
Freezing two targets: 28%
Freezing three targets: 48%
Freezing no target: 17%

Freezing one desirable target: 23%
Freezing two desirable targets: 30%
Freezing three desirable targets: 7%

The C7 is just as bad as the D7 for freezing three targets, but much better if attempting to freeze two.

By Paul Bonfanti (Bonfanti) on Tuesday, January 27, 2004 - 05:13 pm: Edit

B10A:

1 SHIP TARGETED:

Freezing one target: 100%
Freezing two or three targets: 0%
Freezing no target: 0%

Freezing a desirable target: 67%

2 SHIPS TARGETED:
Freezing one target: 16%
Freezing two targets: 83%
Freezing three targets: 0%
Freezing no target: 0%

Freezing one desirable target: 47%
Freezing two desirable targets: 38%

3 SHIPS TARGETED:
Freezing one target: 3%
Freezing two targets: 25%
Freezing three targets: 72%
Freezing no target: 0%
Freezing one desirable target: 21%
Freezing two desirable targets: 50%
Freezing three desirable targets: 21%

Wow. But do you really want to jeapordize that B10?

SBA:

1 SHIP TARGETED:
Freezing one target: 83%
Freezing two or three targets: 0%
Freezing no target: 16%
Freezing a desirable target: 33%

2 SHIPS TARGETED:
Freezing one target: 39%
Freezing two targets: 56%
Freezing three targets: 0%
Freezing no target: 6%
Freezing one desirable target: 41%
Freezing two desirable targets: 7%

3 SHIPS TARGETED:
Freezing one target: 22%
Freezing two targets: 50%
Freezing three targets: 29%
Freezing no target: 3%
Freezing one desirable target: 39%
Freezing two desirable targets: 21%
Freezing three desirable targets: 2%

I'll work on 4-6 attempts and working EW into the equation
it is probably also worth generating a run of numbers with an EW shift so see how badly that hurts.

if you want to send me the data I will go through and consolidate it into a single table

Hmmmm, although the math on having built 10 fewer ships on turn 10 is covered by building 10 extra ships on turn 17, there is also the effects on having 10 fewer on turns 11-16 to be considered as well (especially when on the defensive)...not to mention the cost of overbuilding those 10 and the fact that they may not be the equivalent (COMPOT or CR) to the 10 not-built...

Well, the theory is that the Kzinti would have normally been forced to drop ships from the production schedule after exhaustion kicks in - and so eventually the 10 ships would not be built. Therefore, if you didn't build the 10 ships on turn 10, and save the money, you can then build the ships late in the game that you would otherwise have had to skip.

Thus, the 10 ships are eventually built, same cost, possibly better compot due to more modern designs.

However, your first point is quite valid - if you don't have those 10 ships from turn 11 until you finally have the chance to spend the saved money, then you will probably be less able to control territory, thus you will have less income, thus you never really will build those 10 ships. The money not spent on ships on turn 10 will simply cover the shortfalls of lost territory.

Thus, 10 ships not built on turn 10 may very well translate to 10 ships never ever being built.

even if the money not spent on the ships on turn 10 is used to cover the shortfalls of lost territory, covering that shortfall avoids having to cancel production so again ships are built that would not have been.

I'm not trying to say that the delay is insignificant, I'm just saying that it's not as bad as loosing the ships permanently.

say the feds have a build schedule of 20 ships/turn (I know they ahve more, but just as an example), loosing their shipyard means that there are 120 ships that doen't get built, but that could be 70 ships lost permanently and 50 ships delayed for 10 turns.
if you are the coalition deciding if you want to launch an assault on earth and you calculate that you will loose 100 ships in the process it's probably not worth it as the feds really only loose 70 (with the others delayed) but if you considered them pure losses then you would definantly want to attack as you would be permanently killing 20 ships more then you loose.

and yes for the purpose of the example I am ignoring the details of the economic costs and lumping them into the shipcounts (the reason you don't eventually build all 120 ships is that you spent 90 EP on the new shipyard and lost the capitol income for a few turns, etc)

By Stewart W Frazier (Frazikar) on Wednesday, January 28, 2004 - 11:15 pm: Edit

David, why would it not be worth 100 of Coalition ships to keep 120 (less SB FF builds) Fed ships out of circulation when I'm also building 120 over that time frame (100 of which could be in the FTO)...even if the Fed does overbuild 50 ships (plus his regular 20) he still has to evict me from his territory (not to mention any bases I build to keep his territory)...

By Douglas E. Lampert (Dlampert) on Wednesday, January 28, 2004 - 11:28 pm: Edit

Stewart, you have been told at least three times that no-one is overbuilding in this scenario, yet you keep saying the feds are overbuilding, are you actually reading the posts in this thread?

To repeat, as a rule, by the late war, you do NOT build your entire schedual, this happens because even the Lyrans are too broke to do so. There is not enough cash available. You are canceling builds due to lack of money prior to the end of the game. This is doubly true for someone who has lost most of their on map territory.

Thus in the late war you can use money you saved earlier when you could not build to build ships that would normally be canceled. Not to overbuild, to build.

By David Lang (Dlang) on Wednesday, January 28, 2004 - 11:55 pm: Edit

stewart, it would not be worth it becouse it will take you at least 5 turns to catch up and get back into parity with the fed fleet so the feds will be driving you back during this time (or at least you loose the initative for a while)

if you want to quibble over the exact numbers then we can change the senerio until get get numbers that would cause second thoughts, but can you understand the core idea without us having to do that.

By Mark Sayther (Msayther) on Sunday, February 01, 2004 - 01:13 pm: Edit

Paul,

What about when the B10A targets 5 or 6 ships? Remember it has two stasis generators.
Also, you mentioned not wanting to risk the B10A's but if you have two of them with 2 stasis generators each choosing to stasis 5 targets each the risk is almost nil. The Klingons will have 8 or 9 ships stasised by odds. Even if they are facing a stacked force of Hydrans, 6DG, 5RN, PAL (133) they are likely to knock that compot down to 50 with a little bad luck and 61 with a lot of bad luck. They are only rolling 8 times to not nab a target when stasising 5 ships each so they will likely only fail to stasis 1 thing - leaving a 39 compot.

In return the Klingons can have a compot of 140 easily (C8, 3Drone Bombardments, 2B10, 3 ftr squads, D6M, 3D5, 3F5.) They pick a 3 battle intensity and the alliance will be hard pressed to even cripple a B10 and have no chance of killing one pretty much ever (61*.45=27) - Especially after the first round of combat when the coalition can maintain minus points by overcrippling.

So the Hydran for all his troubles will likely kill a bunch of fighters and in exchange will lose 3 or 4 cruisers a round - every round - forever. The flower of the entire Hydran navy can be destroyed in a couple turns if they are foolish enough to actually come out and fight.

Why even look at using your stasis on anything else, when there is such a lopsided rule in the game to take advantage of 😊

Our group has not usually played with Stasis as we already feel that the coalition has (or had, pre AO) a tremendous advantage and just didn't need something like this. So I apologize if I have missed something, but this is my reading of the ultimate use of the stasis rules.

Mark - The solution to your situation is Carriers - The Hydran IC, ID and CV can all have 4 escorts. Fill out the reat of the line with a couple of throw away hulls and something good in the form bonus and the Klingons can't risk a B10A at 1:1 directed damage.

OK I may see what you are driving at. I was thinking that each stasis unit chooses its 2 or 3 targets, then the next stasis unit does so, etc allowing them to 'climb' up the escort ladder of a carrier group.

Tell me if I have this straight...

Fed Force -
SC (scout), 3NCD(Drones), DNG, [CVA NAC NAC DE FFE], [CVA NAC NAC DE FFE], 1FF (110 compot - since one CVA has to leave behind a squadron)

The Klink selects 10 ships to target - Hmm, OK I see one other thing I missed - The Klingon can only target each straggling FF once from each B10? So he only
gets 3 rolls per B10? I guess that does make a big difference. I better go read up in the Q&A on stasis rules some more 😊

Thanks for the suggestion.

I was thinking more the Hydrans but yeah, it goes for the Feds as well.

Carriers are very hard to stasis - firstly you cannot target inner escorts at all. All attempts have to be declared before any are resolved and the only way to get further into the escorts is with a 'random' result. The B10's are allowed to attempt to stasis each target with separate stasis units, so 12 attempts are still available, but it would be a high risk strategy. A lot of the Fed force could be left intact and the coalition could end up losing an irreplaceable B10.

I find that unlikely. You are bound to catch half the escorts at least with random rolls. I had a CV group blown out from under me when the outside escort was frozen and the damage done was high.

James,

I think I disagree about the 12 attempts. Here's what nick wrote back in April (I think April 7 2003)

************************************************************************************
And yes, each stasis unit (even one with multiple stasis generators) can only make one declared attempt against a given target. Note that (312.224), last sentence, allows two different stasis units to target the same unit in a given round.
************************************************************************************

So to extend your strategy to its fullest - have only 2 carrier groups on the line when you face the 2xB10A scenario and he will get only 2 attempts per B10, and a good chance that he will hit the same one twice. That will give you an excellent chance at taking one out with most of a 110 pt force left intact.

If you are the Feds, combine the two Fed CVA groups into a single carrier battlegroup (saving one command point, and exposing only one ship).

Then add a 6 ship battlegroup consisting only of DW and FF units, if he wants to make it easier to kill a B10A or two by freezing those he is free to do so.
Mark, you're absolutely right - had forgotten about that (and would you believe Nick was answering my question)

I am wondering what other people typically do to defend the Federation (and yes I am following the Family Feud with great interest). This is the first time my friend and I have gotten to a Klingon invasion (we've done an East Map T10 game once, and a Fed Limited War before). I'm doing the 4xPDU, MB at Earth, of course, and one MB at the 6th Fleet SB. Besides building their full schedule and putting down as many PDUs on Earth as possible, I am curious if people do the following:

1) Put down PDUs on other Fed Majors with SBs in 2908.

2) Upgrade MB(s) in the capitol hex to SB(0)s (and then maybe to SB(6) and SB later if it survives?).

3) Build more MBs beyond the first free three.

4) Deploy any MBs in Kzinti space for operations there.

5) Upgrade 2609 on T7A so that the Coalition will have to decide whether to activate the 6th Fleet.

6) Avoid spending money on fixed defenses and concentrate on fleet upgrades (DNL on T7A, VAP+, NCD, besides maxing CA->CVS and FF->FCR).

I know that there is no one answer as everything depends on the situation, I am just curious as to what other people have done in the past and seeing if those strategies would be effective in my game. I also know that I am very underexperienced in running as big an empire as the Feds.

I always go for the VAP+. Max out on CVS. Build a DNL in place of the standard DN. Always build your CVAs of course. FCRs are good, but you should have plenty of extra with the Aux's TGVs and FVs etc. Build one unless you have to give up something better.

The beginning of the Fed invasion needs to be handled like the German withdraw from Sicily. Trade space for time.

Create hardpoints, but build the fleet up first. Setup all your MBs at the capital, at least 2 on Earth itself, and also the one at the 6th Fleet.

I only ever build PDUs if I have extra money after all that.
What Chris said.

I only upgrade the defences of the Fed capital if the coalition is coming at me with stupid numbers of ships - obviously attempting to take it.

Worth deploying the MB's there and (one on the 6th SB) as they can be dismantled. PDU's and base upgrades there, risk being a complete waste of money that you WILL find you or your allies could better spend on ships and repairs.

Rest looks pretty good - upgrading 2609 is an interesting idea.

2609 is an interesting proposition!

Get the Term Paper rights for that one, quick!

putting 4xPDU on earth is a waste of money in most games.

in family feud the klingon attack is unusually strong so the fed capitol is in significantly more danger then normal.

you want to build strongpoints where you can, but remember how long it takes to set them up and make sure they will be in place before they are attacked. useually this will mean that you don't spend much money on upgrading defenses as you can't make sure of this (spending money on fixed defenses that the coalition can destroy before they are active is a great way to convince the coalition to attack there)

Dale

PDUs on Fed planets - no

PGBs - possibly.
Drop the MB's on the capital, upgrade 2609, PDU's (self generation) on 2509/2610 is what I normally do. On the Eastern Front upgrade 3209 and PDU's on 3509/3210 by self generation. This gives you a second line of defense after the main SB's are down.

By Tim Losberg (Krager) on Monday, February 02, 2004 - 12:46 pm: Edit

2609 was already used in a Term paper

---

Quote:

By Lawrence Bergen (Lar) on Wednesday, March 20, 2002 - 09:29 pm:
BUYING YOUR FRIENDS
Lawrence Bergen -USS Michigan

On the first Alliance turn after Coalition forces attack, a Federation Tug should be moved to hex 2609. The next economic phase Feds should then pay to have that BATS upgraded to a SB. The Coalition, on their turn (not wanting the base to be upgraded), should attempt to knock it out. That is when your friends come to help. Rule 602.2 states that the 6th Fleet is immediately released when any coalition forces come within 3 hexes of the Fed capital. Hex 2609 is within 3 hexes! Since the 6th Fleet has a RESV marker you should have placed a reserve fleet at BATS 3212 so you can move them once the 6th goes active. The result is either your SB goes up unopposed or the 6th Fleet is activated. NOTE: Just remember to get the ships back in time to welcome the Romulans.

---

By Craig Tenhoff (Cktenhoff) on Monday, February 02, 2004 - 03:04 pm: Edit

I'd say add PDBs under the SBs in 2908. Quick way to win any EW war over the capital, and cost effective.

Build more MBs and deploy them over PDUs, the 6th SB, and the Capital (if threatened). Remember if they're over a planet they can be upgraded to BS for 4 EP without a tug. Not much, but every little bit helps.

FCRs aren't available until turn 10, IIRC 😄
Monitors help for those fixed position battles. These are probably the lowest priority to spend money on though, since they're not 'mobile' once at a planet. Better to get mobile ships for pinning, but not if having to overbuild.

VAP pods are nice. Especially if you CEDS retro the CV Tug back to someplace you want upgraded next turn ;). Remember the ECL is a nice escort unit to go with these ships.

Don't sacrifice ship builds for upgrades or fixed defenses. Either save the money or spend it on fixed defenses that are directly in the opponents path (since they'll have to go past them). Strong fixed defenses, that can't be bypassed and are properly supported can bleed the opponent.

2609 is great if you can upgrade it. Combined with upgrades of the two adjacent planets (2509/2610), they provide mutual supporting positions (at least until the Coalition reduces 2609). Don't count on the 6th Fleet Reserve reaching 2609 though. If Orion goes neutral, the 6th is more than 6 hexes away from the BATS in 3212.

Always build the Fed FCR each turn, its available T8 not T10.

I never build PDUs anywhere as the Feds. I'd build another SB over Earth if you're really in deep doo-doo.

Build all the carrier stuff you can, CLVs, an extra CVS, VAP pods etc.

2609: Craig is hinting at a neat little trick; CEDS-retro the 3rd Fleet CVT on T7 to 2609 allowing for an immediate upgrade. You probably have the best chance to upgrade this turn as the Klingons hopefully took a ton of cripples during their attack. You can always station the CVT at 2612 (as a reserve with a few ships also covering 2915) to guarantee it doesn't get cut-off from retro to 2609.

Make sure you set simultaneously setup an MB over 3611 giving you a shot at a double SB if the 6th fleet gets released by an attack on 2609.

Thanks to everyone for all of the methods of defending the Federation. It seems like this would make a good term paper or so, which I would like to preemptively dismiss myself from writing since I have yet to perform it. I have tried not to detail my exact circumstance, as my opponent does not follow the board (despite my urging to) and I don't want to gain an unfair advantage. Perhaps I should also ask for advice on how to invade the Federation...

Invading the Federation is probably the most detailed part of the war for the Coalition. Alot of it starts with the Coalitions main battle plans. Some of it is
forced by how successful (or unsuccessful) they have been against the Hydrans/Kzinti's. Some of it is just prepositioning of troops. Ideally the Coalition would like to kill of the 3rd, 4th, and 7th fleet Starbases with minimal losses and the ability to keep the invasion moving forward while keeping the Hydrans/Kzinti's from accomplishing anything of relevance on their fronts.

In other words, instructions on invading the Feds has so many different replies that they are all meaningless... =)

By Dale Lloyd Fields (Dylkha) On Friday, February 06, 2004 - 05:49 pm: Edit

What I will ask for opinions/muse about is, if the Klingons take out the BATS-SB(6) in 2609, what would be the best BATS->SB conversion in the 6th Fleet Deployment area? Unfortunately, I note that one cannot have the MB->BATS->SB conversion done at 3611 before the Romulan attack (a conversion which I think would otherwise be optimal) as the MB goes in T7A,T8C the BATS conversion takes T8A,T9C then the SB conversion is T9A,T10C. The Roms would be fools not to cloak in and blow it the hell away with their entire West Fleet. Though the thought of smacking them around for several turns in 3611 is tempting, nonetheless. A safer bet is to do a BATS->SB conversion starting on T8A so that they couldn't possible react to it. For this conversion I am drawn to three possible targets: 3212, 3414 or 3812. 3212 seems nice because it provides an even defense across Federation space. The Roms couldn't just envelope the 6th SB and proceed towards Earth. 3414 is for much the same reason, just more forward deployed. If the 7th Fleet SB gets whacked, either of these would be good fall-back positions for that fleet. 3812 looks to be very nice since it would be the SB most deeply deployed into Romulan space possible. With 3611, 3612 and 3711, it forms a very defensible pocket that has to be dealt with unless the Roms want to be defending their own space early on. If the Federation cloned the 6th Fleet and dropped it on 3812, the Roms would be in for defensive operations almost immediately. It would seem like a waste to me, though, to convert 3812 and not devote another 30ish hulls to it, as I would want to insure the survival of at least one of them. Comments?

By Trent Telenko (Ttelenko) On Friday, February 06, 2004 - 05:59 pm: Edit

A key point to remember about those Federation capitol MB is with AO, you can upgrade MB with fighter modules. Since the modules are in the capitol hex, they emplaced and active immediately without the need of a tug.

By Jim LaForm (Laform) On Friday, February 06, 2004 - 06:25 pm: Edit

If the Klingons are knocking on the doorsteps of the Earth system, upgrading other points is sometimes not the proper response. Remember that any static fortifications are never ever worth the cost of not building a ship. Always build your full schedule and activations. Then the left over money goes to repairs of important ships, then do static point upgrades.

Now on to more of the meat of your questions. I would never (and have never) upgraded a border Alliance Bats, they are impossible to defend. If I do any
Federation static point upgrades they are limited to 2609 or 3209. I have seen an Alliance player upgrade 3016 to a Starbase before the Romulans entered the war, but that was only once. I have seen some Fed players put new PDU's down on some of their large planets, but those are rare.

The best thing the Feds can ever do is their full production/activation/repairs and send the left over money to the Gorns/Kzinti's... in my eyes of course.

This is the right topics for me now!
I'm defending the federation against the klingon and romulan horde. Turn is S174 and we are ready to enter the gorns.
The problem is: the coalition has not pushed out neither the hydrans or kzinti, so they have lot of ship around me. The klingon had raided the capital last turn (only 3 minor devastated- an abortive attack) and they are based in force in the planet 2708 (with 3 PDU) and they are ravaging the interior from here. The romulan took 3611 the last turn. The Lyran is setting up a MB near the Kling/Fed neutral zone.
The Fed production is around 120 and i concentrate on ships but i put 4 BDE and 2 BATS on the capital.
But the cossacks are not slowing down!
Advice needed.

HHHHHHHHHHhhmmm we are good cossacks(being a Lyran Player myself)......would like to see that game myself ....but you will get some tips here on this site...good luck guy it sould like you will need it

Fabio,

Get the Hydran player to start attacking the Klings. A passive Hydran is the Coalitions best friend. Continue emphasizing ship builds. Now that the Gorns are in stomp on the Roms, they have too many things to do and destroying as many of their ships as possible makes their task much harder. Even killing frigates helps. Also remember that turn 16 the Coalition economy drops 25% making maintaining an offesive that much harder. Good Luck. And GET THE HYDRAN MOVING!!!!!

Eric

Thank you Eric.
The Hydran is already on attack having destroyed BATS 0212, 0413, 1214 and Starbase 0411 (replaced by a MB) but the coalition maintain a strong garrison (not pinnable) in hex 0616 and 0517 aside any other garrison and a barrier of ships near the Old Colonies. The Hydran production is 40 when the tugs make through the barrier from off map.
The kzinti too have destroyed BATS 0705 and 0906. The things looks grim anyway.

By David Lang (Dlang) on Sunday, February 15, 2004 - 08:37 am: Edit

if you give more info there will be a better response. with what you have given all that you will get is suggestions to have all the other alliance races step up the pressure

By Eric Doppelmayr (Slammer) on Sunday, February 15, 2004 - 03:34 pm: Edit

Fabio,

Have the Hydrans go after Kling ships, for the most part ignore Lyrs, have the Kzinti do the same. Both use fighters to soak damage, but you have to destroy Kling ships. The Lyrs cannot seriously harm the Federation and the only way to take the pressure off them is having your allies trash the Klings.

Eric

By Fabio Poli (Gambler) on Sunday, February 15, 2004 - 03:42 pm: Edit

Thanks to all. I tell you how it comes...

By Stewart W Frazier (Frazikar) on Sunday, February 15, 2004 - 10:55 pm: Edit

Be careful as the only way to 'destroy' Klingon ships is to direct on them (or Klingon only battles) otherwise, the Lyran gets a bunch of crips or destroyed ships...

By Robert Padilla (Zargan) on Tuesday, February 17, 2004 - 08:17 am: Edit

Does it really matter if you go after Klingon or Lyran ships in Hydran space? Destroying or crippling either causes a drain on Coalition resources, and forces either more Lyran ships (in the case of Klingon losses), or more Klingon ships (in the case of Lyran losses) to the Hydran front. And frankly, given the small size of the Lyran navy compared to the other Coalition powers, it's easier to bring the hammer to them than to the Klingons, espically if the Lyrans like to stay and fight.

By Jimi LaForm (Laform) on Tuesday, February 17, 2004 - 10:17 am: Edit

If you have a choice crippling the Klingon navy is more important. Their economy teeters more on the edge and they are fighting a 3 front war (Kzinti/Hydran's/Federation). If all 3 races concentrate on the Klingon repair facilities, ships, and internal structure then the Klingons can be overcome.

By Tony Barnes (Tonyb) on Tuesday, February 17, 2004 - 10:52 am: Edit

Well, IMHO, if you target the Klingons, you're going to have to fight through their fighters every battle, and then the Lyran bankers will pay to have their stuff
Targetting the Lyrans, it's much quicker to get through to the meat.

As an Alliance player I will rarely if never ever direct. If I have a choice of hitting Klingon or Lyran units/points I will always choose the Klingons for the reasons given above regardless of the fighters. If the Klingons are putting their carrier groups on the line then their compot has fallen even more then normal.

If you look at typical battle lines written up between the two races the Lyrans will always be able to put up better lines as 1: they have many more command ships and 2: the Lyrans have much higher compot ships to put upon the line.

The bottom line is, the Klingons cannot afford to build/convert and repair their navy. If you hit the the Klingons turn after turn they will implode economically. Sure the Lyrans can help support the Klingons but the Lyrans repair yard can only be in so many places. The Lyrans cannot support all 3 fronts for the Klingons. As the Alliance, if you hit the Klingons everywhere you can, at all times, turn after turn, you can win the war.

Defending the Feds: (apologies for the late comments)

There's a problem with upgrading 2609. The Orion Cluster. If the Klingons are smart, they'll zip a frigate into Orion, it goes neutral, and then 6th Fleet can't reserve from 3212, as it's a 7-hex path.

Defending the Feds requires the Federation to be looked at as if it was 3 seperate entities; the Romulan Border Zone (RBZ), the North, and the Center. Victory will come in the Center, but if the North or the RBZ can be sufficiently threatened, the defences in the Center will be thinned or, if the Fed player abandons the other areas, the Center will be cut off from the rest of the Federation and that's close enough for government work.

So, to defend the Feds, build as many ships as you can. Forget upgrading bases or placing PDUs, concentrate on pumping out ships. Remember, the Feds are Soviet Russia and there're so many Klingons coming over the border it's like the country has sprung a leak. The Feds can build like bandits; do so. Also, like Soviet Russia, trade space for time in the Center and, slightly less so, in the North.

3rd Fleet and Home Fleet, properly reinforced, can become quite nice battle fleets. 7th Fleet's raison d'etre is to cause as many losses as possible before giving up its SB and fall back towards 6th Fleet so that 6th Fleet's backside doesn't get warmed too terribly much by the Klingons. 4th Fleet exists to make the Klingons honest in the North and to keep things hot enough so that the
Klingons can't release their frigates. If the Klingons can cow 4th into lurking under the guins of their SB (brave lads), then the Northern Federation rather rapidly ends up looking like two amoebas doing unspeakable things to each other. 4th Fleet gets mostly frigates and the odd NCL as reinforcements, as the lions share must go to the real fleets, 3rd and Home. With any luck, good or bad, 4th may get a reserve fleet or two if the Klingons get their wind up up North. If they do, yay, early Christmas for 4th Fleet. Like almost every fleet in the game, once ships show up at a fleet, that big sucking noise is heard as the admiral turns on the reinforcement vacuum.

Make the Klingons pay for every parsec of Federation Space. Try to avoid directing if you can, unless a nice juicy, and important (or annoying) target presents itself. General the Klingons back to the stone age. Well, the pre-warp age, anyway. Counterattack at every opportunity, especially right after giving the Klingons a bloody nose. Don't be stupid about it, though. Go hunting Klingons in Klingon space this early and, well, ask the Red Army how much of a cake walk it was to break into Berlin, even in 1945. The goal is to make the Klingon offensive succeed so well that they almost get to Earth and are able to muster up an F5 and maybe an E4 or two, then turn on the Roms and do unto the Romulans as Scipio Africanus did unto the Carthaginians.

Last, the RBZ. In the RBZ, at least until the Wehrmacht, er, the Klingon Deep Space Fleet has been handed their heads, everything is reversed. Build defences and plan on fighting to the last Romulan over each and every one of them. General, general, general, the Romulans have even less legs than the Hydrans, at least in terms of ships. Next, don't succumb to temptation and send everything but the kitchen sink away from 5th Fleet when the Klingons attack. Keep 5th Fleet intact and in the RBZ. A half turn of reinforcements and 5th Fleet can make fixed defences downright porcupiny, or at least provide 6th Fleet with a (semi)decent reserve hanging about.

Last, the CVLs. Don't send them off-map. Mate them up with frigates and FVs and send them off to hunt down perfidious Klingon frigate groups up North. Now that they can be rebuilt, they're expendable and, besides, the COV can wander off-map to help clean up Kirk's mistakes (a battalion of Marines ought to be just the ticket).

And, really finally (and this time I really mean it), remember, the Klingons/Lyrans know the Feds can't hold off a combined assault, the Romulans know the Feds can't hold off a combined assault, but has anyone bothered to tell the Feds that?

Yes the Romulan ship count is impressive compared to the Feds in that theater, but for the most part they suck. A whole lot of 5s that repair poorly, when normally a Fed force rarely puts FFs in the line anymore. In this theatre a FF on key BATS can be very helpful. The Romulans really aren't very good at taking out
defences with their scrubs.

Aganist the Klingons don't fight over every base, just fight where you have ships. Your goal is to use the bases compot advantage and your fighters to do as much damage as possible with as little cost. Especially as the Klingons get deeper into your space cripples can take 2 or 3 turns to get back to repair sites. Raiding to hamper Klingon supply and destroy FRDs is well worth it, as long as it doesn't bring Reserve fleets forward, or cripple your forces.

DO NOT put a ship on BATS to try and control BIR. The Klingons have many excess D6s, 3F5s, FVs and E4s that are pretty much worthless in their battle lines except for taking damage. If you cripple or kill an extra E4, the Klingon won't care, anmd he may direct to kill your FF, and just take a few more cripples to eliminate your ships.

If you are going to play BIR games on the Klingon front at BATS or minor planets, use the few Pols you have as pickets.

Given the set deployments, it may be better to just send Turn 8 and 9's Pol production to the Romulan frontier BATS to picket them. Then concentrate the Fed FFs ain battle groups at the 6th Fleet SB and in a reserve at the 3212.

Quick Q:
As the colation.
Do people think it is better to raid the Zin HW on the 2nd turn.
or aim at destroying the Dukes & Counts SBs.

Playing a game right now.
Raided the Zin HW, and devistated all non-HW planets.
To do this I had to leave both SBs unassulted on turn 2.
Pinning actions only.

Now I'm walking into turn 3 and I want to re-deply ships to meet the Hydro Invasion, and I'm running into a clash of priorities.

Those SBs have to fall, and I need to redeploy south.

Hmm... Priorities Priorities...

You have hit upon probably one of the biggest contentions there is.
On the plus side I have seen the HW fall on Turn 2 to an assault.

On the minus side I have seen the entire Kiling fleetn of the North cut off from supply and the Kzinti able to raise absolute mayhem.

Personally I tend not to do it.

By Mark Sayther (Msayther) on Saturday, March 06, 2004 - 01:46 pm: Edit

Bret,

This is the ultimate game of "hit 'em where they ain't".

Threaten the Kzin HW as best you can on T2 (and every turn) and see where he deploys. If he pulls back to preserve the capitol economy, smack the Starbases. If your opponent leaves too many ships at his starbases then devastate his capitol (or take it if it is an option.)

If your opponent holds onto those starbases T2, on T3 do the same thing again. Hit the capitol, but this time devastate the PDU's on his homeworld. The capitols are vastly more valuable than any starbase. Eventually, the Kzin will turtle up and pull his ships back to the homeworlds. Then you take out his starbases.

By John Doucette (Jkd) on Saturday, March 06, 2004 - 02:47 pm: Edit

Yeah, the Kzin and Hydran SBs are really just red herrings. The game will be one or lost at the capitals, though it can be devilishly hard to ignore those SBs; you will pay a price for it, just plan to pay that price from the start and keep focused on the main chance. And if you get the opportunity to take out a SB on the cheap, go for it.

Also, I wouldn't worry about redeploying to meet thje Hydrans. The forces you have in the north are needed there, either right now or in the not-too-distant future. Fight the Hydrans with what you have on the borders, even send them a turn of production as reinforcements, or station a reserve or two within range. I find that once ships go into a theatre, unless they're really spiffy ships, they tend to stay there, so reserving will have the bonus of building up your forces.

Besides, you always have Home fleet ;)

By David Slatter (Davidas) on Monday, March 08, 2004 - 06:11 am: Edit

I don't regard any SB as a red herring. You have to take down all the non-capital Zin+Hydran SBs or you are in big trouble. Because it is so much more expensive to take out the capital, I tend to prioritise the outer SBs a little. There have been horror stories of what happens when the Zin/Hydran fleets redeploy on the counts/1st fleet SBs AFTER the capital has fallen because the coalition has been
lax in tidying up.

Having said that Bret, it looks like your turn 2 raid was very successful, and the Zin capital was poorly defended. Devastation of all the planets is a bad loss for the Zin unless you were losing a number of ships.

By James Southcott (Yakface) on Tuesday, March 09, 2004 - 10:15 am: Edit

Yeah....this question's a tough one. Raiding the home world is a high risk strategy....a real poker approach. To be worth the risk of a T2 raid you must either intend to capture the Zin capital, or at least bluffing your opponent into pulling forces away from the SB.

David's right about the nightmare of beating the entire Zin fleet from the capital only to have it relocate to the Duke's SB. That's what I'd do with the Zin. If the real thrust is the Hydrans then keep things simple up north eh!

By Richard Abbott (Catwhoorg) on Tuesday, March 09, 2004 - 10:53 am: Edit

i always thought the REAL thrust was the Feds.

By Jimi LaForm (Laform) on Tuesday, March 09, 2004 - 11:35 am: Edit

No no, the REAL thrust are the Tholians =)

By Paul Bonfanti (Bonfanti) on Tuesday, April 27, 2004 - 01:02 pm: Edit

The Klingons have captured a Kzinti DF. I am trying to decide what to do with it. I generally am not a big fan of DFs since they are so easy to destroy even at 3-1.

It is T12. My opponent has not been targeting D6Ds often, so I have many of them. I am facing a short term EP crunch, but I expect it should be much better after this turn. I definitely do not have the EPs to convert the DF on this turn, but I may be able to next turn. I have also captured an SDF, which I will be converting to Klingon use first, but not until T13.

Do people think it is worth the 4 EPs it will take to repair and convert the DF, or should I just scrap it and take the 1 EP?

By Russell J. Manning (Rimanning) on Tuesday, April 27, 2004 - 01:06 pm: Edit

Scrap it and take the 1 ep, of course I am saying that because it is my ship and I don't want to see it in your line. 😊

Seriously though, I don't see the point in converting it. You have plenty of D6D's which I believe have a greater density. Even as a Kzinti player, I dislike the DF's because they are so weak.
Scrap it. I'd scrap the SDF as well. Russell is right on with his analysis (Russell - Make the check payable to me 😊)

The SDF is worth a thought of keeping, is a very good ship for holding a province and more difficult to kill with a raid. The DF should be scrapped as soon as possible.

On the other hand if you put the DF in the support role it was designed for it allows for 3 things:

1) The possibility for you to put the D6D in the line (in certain situations) for the extra EW bonus.

2) A target for your Kzinti enemy. I'd love to have the Kzinti do 3-1 damage on me as they are in fact usually not in a good position to do damage in this manner.

3) Its fun to assemble small fleets of your opponents ships for use against him.

The gain of 1 EP is nice but if you look at it as I can build an extra support ship for 4 EPs you get another pin unit to throw at the capital/his fleet as well as another damage sponge in an emergency situation. If you destroy the ship in combat it absorbs a good portion of your EP spent worth of damage (ie you get most of it back).

The 5 EP delta is enough to overbuild an E4, which has much the same effect (adding a 4 compot ship to your fleet). No one overbuilds E4's, so unless you want the drone bombardment ability you're better off scrapping it.

The 5 EP delta is enough to overbuild an E4, which has much the same effect (adding a 4 compot ship to your fleet).

This is true you could overbuild an E4 and by doing so you'd get salvage back (possibly) in addition to absorbing the damage when it dies so its basically the same econ cost (except the drone bomb ability).

No one overbuilds E4's.

True again, its a rare thing and done only in a desparate case.
so unless you want the drone bombardment ability you're better off scrapping it.

I guess 'better' is relative. If you want/need the 1 EP to fix an F5 yeah go ahead. If you are trying for that conversion you just need 'one more point' to make then yeah go ahead. I'd rather have the morale shot against my opponent of their own ship flying back to their capital with a big Klingon symbol painted on it.

Those white/black counters really stand out when mixed into the sea of black/white counters looming on your opponents doorstep. As if to say 'remember I captured your ship..as a matter of fact...two of your ships' muuhhuuhahahahaha.

Try facing a Kzinti MEC buried inside a D7V or D5V group. I'm about to face that. It's going to be like waving a red flag in front of a bull.

Russ and Bill have had a lot of morale shots waving black and red counters in my face. Of course, it didn't hurt that those counters had "plus" symbols on them.

Thanks for the advice all. I think I'll scrap the DF but keep the SDF.

The most fun is to garrison a captured planet with it.

Just out of curiosity what ships do you consider worth keeping?

Obviously, a captured DN will be converted for use as a flagship, but what criteria do you use when making that decision?

Just about any capital ship that is captured I will keep. But DNs,Tugs,CCs,Maulers are on the auto keep list, anything CA or smaller depends on what it is.

Any kind of heavy escort capable base hull versions of Gorn, Romulan and Lyran ships (they don't lose compot).

Any captured ship is a ship, if you have the money to repair and convert it. If you don't have the money to build your own, then you scrap captures to build your own. Simple - F&E is a game of pin count.

What about say a scout frigate? 4 economics to get it up, is cheaper than 5 to make a scout frigate of my own.
If you capture say a FED DD is it worth giving it to the lyrans so that they can now have a 4 pt scout of their own?

As a related question, if you are short of cash to build the full build, what do you give up first?

By Christopher E. Fant (Cfant) on Tuesday, May 04, 2004 - 12:58 pm: Edit

Build whose Fall schedule?

By John Doucette (Jkd) on Tuesday, May 04, 2004 - 03:27 pm: Edit

In general, if it'll take more EP to repair and convert a captured ship than it will to build an equivalent, I'll scrap if the ship in question is a CW or below, with the possible exception of certain specialty ships. It just doesn't make economic sense otherwise.

By Stephen Rasmussen (Razman) on Wednesday, May 05, 2004 - 12:24 am: Edit

What is the priority when you KNOW you cant afford the full build? Conversely what do you give up first?

Are the small ships most important? Or perhaps the carrier groups? Or maybe the command ships?

Typically in our games by turn 3 or 4 at the latest, the kzinti are reduced to doing some of the repairs and building only part of their build. This also happens to the hydrans. And i am sure other races have similar difficulties.

Prioritizing what gets built is an important part of the game, and i am curious as to what other people do?

By Christopher E. Fant (Cfant) on Wednesday, May 05, 2004 - 02:27 am: Edit

Well, lots of generalities here, but some thoughts.

If I am playing the Kzin, I have these priorities.

1. Build/Convert 1 CV per turn (use CVLs if money is tight)
2. Get all carriers using MECs
3. Build all FFK,FKE allowed.
4. Build as many FFs as you can afford.

I pretty much follow this with the Hydrans, except that I do not build Hydran carriers until I can get the IC/ID. I have built a CV once or twice.

By John Doucette (Jkd) on Wednesday, May 05, 2004 - 03:01 am: Edit

I tend to build all the capital ships I can, unless I have need of a smaller ship 

(carrier escort, for example). I even build the Hydran true carriers ;) I use them as uber-FCRs that I put in the line when I get caught in that really nasty battle I didn't want to get caught in.

As for conversions, sometimes I do, sometimes I don't. Repairs come first, then production, so when money's tight, unless there's a really neat ship to be had, conversions usually come on a catch as catch can basis.

I don't have one overall plan of what to cut that applies to each race, but rather a plan for each race.

**Kzinti:**
- Use up Free Fighters by Building/Converting CVs
- Full Construction of MECs
- Full Construction of FFK/FKE
- Full Construction of FFs
- Build enough Tugs to deploy all pods

This usually results in a BC & possibly a DN not being produced at some point, and the CL replaced with the 2 FF substitution. The DDs usually get built, since their is still money while they are on the build schedule.

**Hydrans:**
- Use up Free Fighters
- Downgrade (CA->CW, CW->DD) before giving up hulls
- Downgrade PDU construction to PDB construction before giving up hulls
- Convert rather than build CV hulls
- Build enough Tugs to deploy all pods
- Sacrifice HNs, then CUs if necessary.

This usually results in the Hydrans replacing lost Cruiser with CWs, and their average COMPOT goes down. However, the extra hulls help tie down extra Coalition forces in the region.

**Federation:**
- Maximize Carrier Builds/Conversion
- Maximize Tug/LTT construction to deploy all pods.
- Maximize Hull Construction (Downgrade or don't build heavier units if necessary)

The transfer to the Kzinti usually suffers when the Federation budget gets tight, but the Federaton usually doesn't have to cut too many ships (except when their is an overload of repairs), but usually ends up cutting down on conversion or substituting a couple smaller ships (e.g. CVS for CVA).
I'm kind of surprised to hear that about the DN. After all, those things grow up to be CVAs and SCSs. Moreover, the other CR 10 ships for the Kzinti are tug combinations (CV is CR 9, right?)

I admit i also make a point of building at least 2 extra tugs for the Kzinti on the first 2 turns. The TugC+VP+BP is a NICE command 10 ship that can be escorted from the beginning. And this means you now have 4 of them running around augmenting the dreadnaughts.

I also find that building the MEC is a priority over the frigates as long as i can afford it, ie till i get pushed offmap.

I am not certain whether its best to give up the dreadnaught or the frigates. Thats one reason for this discussion.

I have tried the hydrans, but i certainly havent mastered them.

I havent played enough to have a plan for any of the other races. What are the priorities for the Klingons and Lyrans? what about the Gorns or Romulans?

I also find that building the MEC is a priority over the frigates as long as i can afford it, ie till i get pushed offmap.

I am not certain whether its best to give up the dreadnaught or the frigates. Thats one reason for this discussion.

I have tried the hydrans, but i certainly havent mastered them.

I havent played enough to have a plan for any of the other races. What are the priorities for the Klingons and Lyrans? what about the Gorns or Romulans?
It really varies on what your intentions are.

The Klingons do very well with mostly generic builds and some scouts. But, my typical build with the Klinks after 171 or so is

D7C,D7V,D6M,8xD5,D5S,9xF5. I may or may not build the E4.

Klinks are pretty straightforward though. Build all your D5s, build carriers. Build scouts. You don't often have to give up anything if you play it right.

The Lyrans.....well, I do not like to send money to the Klingons, it is inefficient. Instead, I have the Lyrans build as many FRDs as they can pay the repair costs for, and still build their full schedule. Other than that, I have never had a problem build and converting everything I have always wanted with the Lyrans. They are the race that everyone should get to play with on their birthday. The Gorn are even better, with half cost field repair.

Roms.....way too many ways to play them. Pick one, and stick with it.

Stephen,

What you build decides your overall strategy, and conversely your overall strategy decides your builds. You have to decide what the goal for the race you are playing, then decide when you want to achieve that goal, and then maximize your chances of getting to that goal. What you build is one of the major decisions you have to make toward accomplishing your strategic goal. You cannot build toward an objective on one turn and then build toward another goal on the next turn.

Your play style also decides what you build. Are you the hyper-aggressive counterattacker on defense, or are you the fortress come and get me type. The builds for your play style is very important. Staying in your style gives you a comfort zone that allows you to play your best game. Building out of your style can distract you and cause you to lose your ability to play your best.

What type of player are you?

It is possible to be either of the types I named and win as the alliance. Me, I'am the aggressive type, but my best friend is more the fortress type.

And you thought you had a simple question.

Looking down the wrong end of a Lyran BC

Eric
"And you thought you had a simple question."

No, I KNOW that this question doesn't have a single simple answer, but I was hoping that a little discussion would give me some insights.

And it has.

---

**Quote:**

I'm kind of surprised to hear that about the DN. After all, those things grow up to be CVAs and SCSs. Moreover, the other CR 10 ships for the Kzinti are tug combinations (CV is CR 9, right?)

---

The BC and DN usually get shaved during the 'dark' times (Turn 3-6 depending on how the war is going) when I'm trying to maximize available ship count. My playing style is to have as many ships available to: a) pin as many ships out of the Capital as possible; b) have as many ships available to attack.

I find that 3 FFs (7.5 EPs) instead of a BC or 6 (15 EPs) instead of a DN, goes a long way to accomplishing that goal. I've occasionally skipped 3 escort conversions/substitutions, just to get 1 extra FF hull, since the ship count on the front was so close and I could reach a target if I had that **ONE** extra ship.

---

Its turn 7C (combat phase) and hopefully the the combat will be finished up tomorrow,

The Kzinti's were removed from the map on turn 5 (except for a stong fleet at the Marquis Starbase. A substantial portion of the Klingon and Lyran Fleets were based in Kzinti space.

Most of the Lyran fleet there has attacked the Marquis starbase (with minimal Klingon support) and two squadrons attacked both the planet in 1802 and BATS 1803. The BATS is dead, but a DN led reserve from the Barony went to the planet and killed half the Lyran squadron in one shot (roll a 6 for vbir, roll 6 on damage and I only rolled a 1). I had left acess open hoping that the reserve would go to the Starbase, which it might have been able to save but would have had to cripple itself in doing so (and with the Kzinti economy right now cripples might as well be kills). As it did not the Starbase will fall and the Kzinti Fleet if it does not go down fighting, will probably be trapped and take serious damage in the Kzinti...
player turn. I sent the Klingons across the Fed-Kzin neutral zone and they have destroyed 2103, 2004 (as well as 1805) and will destroy 2006 for minor casualties so far. The largest portion of the fleet went to 2106 and the reserve based at the the Fourth Fleet starbase went there. I will take the system but it will probably cost me some minor damage. 2008 survived, 2010 and 2012 both fell with ease both planets in the neutral zone were taken, but 2213 survived (I had horrible rolls, though I killed one Fed FF and crippled another). Now 2414 is interesting. I expected the 3rd Fleet reserve to defend against my main assault on 2012 or to help out at 2106. Instead it went to 2414 and will win. The Tholian border region of Klingon space is lightly defended. If the Fed forces move in there the starbase and those couple of provinces on the Tholian border can fall.
I could defend the area by shifting forces in retrograde. However if I do that, it may delay my plan to take out both the 3 and 4th fleet starbases. (I may still get 3rd but he can choose to just reinforce it and not have to worry as much about the 4th and the planets in its environs). It may also let the Kzinti fleet that is defending the Marquis base escape either to Fed space or maybe to the Barony.

So, is it worth taking a chance and losing the Tholian border area defences while killing the 3rd and 4th fleet starbases in return (and probably eliminating whatever Kzinti survive the marquis starbase battle)? Or should I shift forces in retrograde and defend the area?

Of course the other side is if you were playing the Feds would you take the opportunity to wreak some havoc there and lose the 3rd and 4th Fleet starbases more cheaply than otherwise would be the case?

(This all pre-supposes that the dice rolls don’t go horribly against me).

Troy, there's an old axiom of military operations that goes something like "if you're worrying more about what the enemy can do to you than what you can do to the enemy, you're in real trouble". What that (and the reverse corollary) is saying is that if you only think defensively, you'll eventually lose. In fact, you answered your question (and illustrated this axiom) with your following message 😊

In order to keep and maintain the strategic initiative, you have to hurt the Feds badly and keep on doing so. The Klingon territory opposite the Tholians is of secondary (or even tertiary) strategic importance. Who cares if the Feds get in there and muck the place up some? In order to do that, they'll be weakening their own key defences so much that they'd be hastening their own collapse. If you're still worried though, and based on the doctrine of making the enemy work for his victories, deploy a reserve to cover the area and call it good. No matter what happens, it's a win-win situation for the Klingons.
Yes, follow Patton....... 

Attack, attack, attack, don't worry about your flank, let the enemy worry about his flank.

Of course, the 7th FLeet starbase must go at the earliset opportunity.

I could deploy a reserve to cover that area, but, I was planning to deploy them to cover the northern area. If the Fed forces from the 4th fleet move on to their starbase I can create a battlehex through extended reaction and reserve onto it and probably kill it (the Fed will probably try to use retrograde from some hit and run attacks to get them back, but this will cost the cripples the 4th Fleet took) and the reserves were integral to my plan on trapping whatever Kzin forces survive the Marquis battle).

In any event, I am probably just going to ignore the TB area because I want to see what will happen.

Well after a bit of manouvre and using a couple of fast ships to help pin the forces in the TBS area, the Feds got a DN, CVS, CVB a cruiser and a couple of NCL's with a few lighter ships on to the Starbase which had a D7 I was able to react on to it as well as an F5L and 2 F5's (one crippled). The upshot is that the SB and BATS 2517 both died along with an F5Q while I killed an NCL and 3 FF's and crippled an NCL, CL, DD and a CVS. (I was also able to get my main fleet elements onto the 4th Fleet Starbase through reaction, and it will die tomorrow. Unfortunately it leaves me slightly out of position to kill the 3rd on the next turn and major reinforcements will be able to go into it).

Troy, crippled ships cannot react. (205.14)

That sentence was sloppily written. I was able to react the D7, the F5 ships were already on the SB.

Is conquering Tholia a viable Coalition strategy for the General War?

In light of events at Origins I wonder if anyone would like to re-evaluate their opinion regarding Tholia. I've always thought it was a lot easier than people claimed yet I have a hard time reconciling the casualties that could be better suffered elsewhere.
Would the Coalition be better off killing those ships over Hydrax/ Kzintai or against the Feds? Is Tholia an easier conquest than Hydrax/Kzintai? Is it more worthwhile than the other two? How drastically does the Tholian conquest change the direction of the game? Is the Coalition better off having the Alliance trying to reconquer a fortified Tholia in the late game rather than watching Remus or Klingon territory get devastated?

Pete always did say that I asked too many questions...

By Mike Curtis (Nashvillen) On Thursday, July 08, 2004 - 05:14 pm: Edit

In attacking Tholia from what I have experienced the sooner you do it the better. The key to taking Tholia is to kill their ships. As long as they have at least three ships the fixed defenses are invulnerable due to the web.

I have not run an economic analysis yet but will have it as part of my report on the attack on Tholia article I am writing. It will be on a cost/benefit ratio on the number of ships expected to be lost and the cost to replace them economically vs. what is gained economically.

In Gale Force the attack on Tholia was a scenario requirement that the Coalition could not ignore. It was not an economic question but a victory condition question for that specific scenario. The General War is all about economics and needs to be looked at from a different viewpoint.

By Bill Schoeller (Bigbadbill) On Thursday, July 08, 2004 - 05:32 pm: Edit

While attacking Tholia, the Coalition will lose (destroyed) 60 or so ships of their own choosing. While attacking Hydrax, the Coalition will normally cripple 150 or so ships (or lose a dozen and cripple 100). If the Coalition can afford to repair the 150 ships while maintaining its build rate it is likely to be better off in the ship count game if they take Hydrax, but the economic game is questionable.

Hydran space (assuming the Hydrans take Hydrax they should try to occupy Hydran space) is worth 9 at the capital, 4 for exterior planets and 12 for provinces for 25 income, but about 15 ships are needed just to garrison those captured planets/provinces. At Tholia the Coalition gets 22 income, but does not need to garrison them at all (they are liberated territories).

I think the overall answer as the Coalition must come down to the long term economic status of repairing 150 ships vs. killing 60, although since 15 ships are required to garrison Hydran space, you might look at it as 45 dead.

By David Lang (Dlang) On Thursday, July 08, 2004 - 07:19 pm: Edit

also you don't have to worry about the tholians trying to recapture their territory.
on the other hand hydran space captured also reduces the hydran income (and therefor the hydran threat)

the key thing in going after the tholians is to make your attack so that you don't face the same ships multiple times. as they are fighting behind web the longer they last the more ships of yours will be killed. if the tholians retreat and fight again in another location you will take more damage then if you kill them the first time you see them

Bill - couple of other things you need to add to that equation.....If the coaltion leaves the Tholians alone then they do not end up building a huge fleet and coming after you. They just become a bit of a pain for 10 turns.

If you leave the Hydrans with their capital you are going to find them become very offensive (even if the side systems are devastated).

Also for victory conditions the Hydran capital is worth more.

In GW the Tolians are just not worth messing with. Those ships are needed against the Feds.

However, one of the victory conditions is to hold three Alliance capitols. The Coalition could ignore the Feds (to ant extent) and just go for broke on the Kzinti, Hydrans, and Tholians.

Tholians do not count for the 3 Captured Alliance Capitols, Just the Feds, Kzinti, Hydrans and Gorns.

---

Quote:

(651.2) The Coalition wins instantly if it occupies three of the four Alliance capitals (Kzinti, Hydran, Federation, all three Gorn; not Tholian) at the end of any Alliance turn.

---

The only real justification in a GW campaign(aside from bragging rights) for going after the Tholians is those Klingon colony planets, and even that's suspect. My group has found that the easiest way to open up the KR supply route to the Roms is to smash through 7th Fleet's area and leave the lava lamps alone 😊
I have a vague plan to go after the Tholians in our new game, but it will depend entirely on how the first 6 turns of the game go ;) 

By Robert Padilla (Zargan) on Friday, July 09, 2004 - 03:48 pm: Edit

It's completely possible to smash the Hydrans Turns 4 and 5, repairing the ships in that assault and getting them into position to either mass invade the Federation southland, or wipe the Tholians in one turn on Turn 7. In my opinion, if you take on Tholia, you do it in one turn, or you do it never. The income gained can really make a difference in the long game, as it will help the Klingons deal better with exhaustion, where they would be giving up ship builds anyway, so it may come close to evening out.

By John Doucette (Jkd) on Friday, July 09, 2004 - 05:13 pm: Edit

See, that's why I doubt I'll do it; I want those ships as the second part of my attack into the Feds. One idea I've been toying with is waiting until the Roms can help and hitting the Tholians from both directions at once.

By Frank DeMaris (Kemaris) on Friday, July 09, 2004 - 05:18 pm: Edit

Robert: Doesn't that demand a cooperative opponent, tho? A Kzinti who helps bottle himself up in the north, a Hydran who kills his fleet in the south? If they don't, then how much do you wind up losing during the turns you are killing Tholians and recovering from it?

By Scott Hofner (Sshofner) on Friday, July 09, 2004 - 05:29 pm: Edit

Tim- I stand corrected, again, today.

By Tim Losberg (Krager) on Friday, July 09, 2004 - 06:07 pm: Edit

The Tholians can easily be taken in one turn, and overall casualties will be light, there will be much more dead then crippled so there is not a huge repair queue at the end... a T7 attack can still allow for a a T8 on the Feds, with a better chance of taking out the 7th fleet SB, and retros from Tholia going to 2416 for access to the 3rd Fleet SB. Hitting them on T7 is your best bet, as that gives you the smallest possible defence fleet over Tholia, the longer you wait the harder it is....

By Scott Tenhoff (Scottt) on Friday, July 09, 2004 - 06:30 pm: Edit

If the Tholians are gone, the Klingon-Rom Commercial Convoy will certainly gain both the Roms+Klingons lots of EPs (in the long run)

By Tim Losberg (Krager) on Friday, July 09, 2004 - 06:38 pm: Edit

especially since the planet is considered Klingon space, so a SB there is a valid CC destination.

By David Lang (Dlang) on Friday, July 09, 2004 - 08:51 pm: Edit

the feds gain the most defensively between turns 7 and 8 so delaying that attack is significant.

I think it would be interesting to consider a turn 7 fed assault to bag the defenses before the ships can move up to defend them, followed by a holding action
(mudslide style, grab territory, but avoid major fights) while bagging the tholians or on turn 10 when the feds are all huddling at their fixed defenses nail the tholians instead and then pick things off as the feds move

Frank:
Not really, and here's why. If I was to take out the Hydrans T4-5, then turn and take out Tholia on T7, I would not be wasting time and resources garrsoning Hydran space, since I get more income from the liberated Tholian space. I would just make sure that I obilerate all of the Hydran bases, so that their striking range will be severly limited, espically while rebuilding a shipyard. As for the Zin, well that's always a problem if you go Hydran first anyway, so what's new there?

I'd say if you don't take the Tholians T7, then the best bet is to wait until T10, as they only gain 3 more ships in that span of time.

You should always wait until turn 10. That way the Romulans can pin two Tholian Fleets for you.

We should also look at the long-term implications, a conquered Tholia will be worth a ton of victory points. (162 VP = 100 for captured enemy capital, + 42, double its economic income, + SB you build over the place.)

The Alliance simply cannot afford to leave this hex in Coalition hands. The Coalition will have plenty of time to fortify the place and Tholia will be a tough nut to bust mid-late war; SB w/stasis, 10xPDU, PFs, B-10, capital system benefit of seeing enemy battle-force before hand, etc.

PS - Brad is right, T10 also gives you adequate time to smash the Feds.

Agreed on the VP. I may have to try this on my next campain when I am the Klingons and see how it goes...

Turn 10 also will allow two of the BATS and the off side SB to be taken by the Romulans. The Romulans can also send some Maulers to help with the capital fighter reduction.

Well, invading Tholia T7, the way I see it the Kligons can pin all but the 3rd Fleet away from the capital easily anyway. So, if I wait until T10 to take em, they get a
bit more PWC, but the 3rd fleet would get pinned. It's about an even exchange really, and the sooner Tholia falls, the more income the Klingons get out of it.

And, given that the Tholian fleet in either case will be very small over the capital, why would you bother mauling at anything? Simply letting the damage fall will have the same effect, as the Tholians will have no ships in reserve. IF anything, maul the Tholian ships in that case to get rid of the darn web faster.

Robert read Joe's tactic. It works! If Mike hadn't used it he would have had a much tougher time. The tactic allows for specific and definite reduction in Tholian Compot each round.

I do agree that the VP benefit is much greater than the economic benefit. If you lose ships (and Mike did, 59 of them, worth approx. 300+ EPs) those would have to be replaced (fixed build schedules limits this). Also construction of defenses (bases, pdus, etc.) to hold this area also cost EPs further reducing the net gain (if there is one).

As the Alliance I would (still) support my opponents decision to impale themselves on the Tholians. At 60-90 Coalition dead that is many of my own ships saved/available for a future counter-attack against the Economically Exhausted Coalition (despite the 91 EPs he received in salvage).

Does anyone have good enough notes on what the Coalition & the Tholians had at Tholia?

It may have been posted previously, but I can't seem to find it now.

I seem to recall Mike Curtis keeping some notes on the side -- you may want to check with him.

Lar,

I read the tactic, but what I'm saying is to take Tholia T7, not whenever it gets attacked in Gale Force. The Tholians will only have one battle-line of ships and no reserves, so directing fighters is the same as not, as the Tholian player has nothing good to take damage on that will not reduce his COMPOT (other than SIDS, but can't really take more than 6 or risk the SB).

Doh - wrong topic
One of the things I have been working on in my current game as the Alliance is to avoid directing on coalition ships in order to force them to spend enormous amounts of money on repair and to slow their assaults as they are forced to repair large portions of their fleet strength. I see some problems with this strategy as my opponent can put battletugs and other large ships on the battleline without worry, but it has been effective in denying the enemy money and has arguable slowed the speed of their assault.

To redirect this argument, is it even possible to run a Alliance strategy where directed damage is the main way of playing or is it just too costly?

While I am playing the extreme in "letting the damage fall" it's because I want to see how it plays out.....

Darin, that's exactly how I've tended to play the Alliance, letting the damage fall (with certain exception; maulers, SFG ships, other obvious ones). What tends to happen, in my experience, is that, yes, the big ships survive in numbers much longer than they should, but Coalition repair bills tend to skyrocket. I've seen Klingon repair bills of 60, 70, even 80 EP once combat really gets going. Of course, the Coalition could self-kill, but that's fine with me, too, as I'd be killing far more ships that way as opposed to using DD as a standard tactic.

There are some cons to the approach. The main one is that the big Coalition ships are only damaged very rarely and hardly ever killed, at least until the casualties reach the point that the Coalition is forced to form battle lines without their cannon fodder. Once that happens, it's nice watching CA and D7 squadrons (sometimes divisions) cripple or blow up. But, ooh, how it hurts fighting DN squadrons and CA divisions ;) It also requires Alliance fleets that are formed around large groups of attrition units (larger than normal) backed up by a small core of heavies. Oftentimes, my heavies won't even see a battle, with the exception of carrier groups, unless I'm fighting over a key installation, and, even then, my Alliance heavies only tend to show up in the last 2-3 rounds of the battle, after most of my cannon fodder has gone.

Overall, I've found the strategy to be very workable, if a tad uninspiring, but the prospect of victory tends to make up for any blandness

Other than SFG ships and certain situations with carriers I don't direct on anything.....as I said....this is an extreme example I'm playing.

Another question is........wouldn't letting the damage fall be devastating against the Kzintis....they can't afford the repair bills.....
making a policy to never direct has the effect that you are seeing of the extra use of high-value ships.

what you need to do is to direct just enough to make him think twice about putting such expensive ships on the line, but in general your policy of letting the damage fall and clog up repair facilities and draining his treasury with the repair bills is currently accepted as the best tactic for the alliance.

What David L said:

NEVER directing is probably as bad as always directing. Predictability hurts the alliance.

Letting damage fall is generally the best way, but if you see a target of oppurtunity take it!!!

Don't forget to adjust to the way your opponent is playing. If they are alaways picking a BI in a situation, choose one to bounce him around a little. Anything to shake and disrupt the tempo.

Also if the coalition is goin kill the EFF, amke sure you make him pay by bouncing the Bi around- They cannot be certain of what you will pick, so occasionally that BI 8 round may well appear.

Letting damage fall on the Kzinti's ? You mean that I can trade ftrs for cripples, instead of dirdamed ships - love too ;-)

Actually again this is situational - the quickest way to force a retreat is to let damage fall.
Against an inexperienced Kzinti - ftrs die = retreat.
Better players know when the damage is falling to adjust the ftr/crippled escort ratio to maximise residence time in the battle.
It is still not as long as it take is you start dirdamming (especially EFF's). Each dirdammed EFF is roughly speaking one carrier group of ftrs that will last an extra round.

My opponent is DirDam EFFs he's hitting CD, scout tugs, other expensive targets. He's putting up as high a compot as a combined lyran-klingon fleet can accomplish. Battletugs on the line, battlegroups of CW and DW, etc......120compot lines are not uncommon.

I typically let the damage fall (but switch it out during games if my opponent
starts putting tugs on the line those will die nearly every time or other specialty ships to keep the coalition honest). I have seen an Alliance player DD every single klingon heavy hull. At first I thought it was a mistake but by T7 or so the Klingons were unable to field anything but a command ship plus a warcruiser/frigate lines... ouch

By John Colacito (Sandro) on Wednesday, August 18, 2004 - 03:42 pm: Edit

Ah, the old "to direct or not to direct" discussion.

IMHO, in the early war, you're never going to kill enough high-compot Coalition ships to make a noticeable long-term difference. They can build/replace almost a dozen compot 10+ ships a year. They will always have 120+ compot until maybe the Feds join and their nice ships are spread out on 3 fronts in multiple battles.

As the Alliance I almost never direct but Richard has the best advice; the circumstances of each battle will dictate. I'll direct if it will make a difference in a particular battle. Killing TGs whenever possible and crippling big maulers is a nice exception too.

My last two games saw the Coalition stop, or at least slow down, the production of big ships. Their repair bill was too high and they more than enough nice ships already.

On the other hand Jimi’s example goes contrary to everything I just said. Maybe he can provide more info on that game, I wonder how well the Coalition was doing otherwise?

By Jimi LaForm (Laform) on Wednesday, August 18, 2004 - 04:12 pm: Edit

Well, in my example, me and Tim were the Coalition while Will and Gary were the Alliance. By T7 the Klinks were nearly completely out of D6M, D6D, D6S, D7, D7C hulls due to massive Alliance DD's. The Alliance also self killed/crippled his own fleets. We the Coalition were in deep doodoo by this early point in the war due to inability to field hi compot lines and the inability to build lines due to lack of command.

By David Slatter (Davidas) on Wednesday, August 18, 2004 - 09:17 pm: Edit

If the coalition helpfully puts BCs/DNs/C8s/STTs/D6Ms/D7As/D6Ds/D6Ss on the line, I will endeavour to kill them. Failure to do so leaves me seeing a 130 compot coalition line with a mauler every single round.

By Ahmad Abdel-Hameed (Madarab) on Thursday, August 19, 2004 - 06:41 pm: Edit

In defending a capital, how many extra "self-kills" would you have to be causing not to be directing at juicy targets like D6Ms?

By David Lang (Dlang) on Thursday, August 19, 2004 - 10:52 pm: Edit

it depends how many D6M's are around. if there aren't many then it's worth a
LOT to take out the remaining ones and eliminate their benifit, if they have a ton of them it's worth almost nothing to do so (for this turn at least, it may be worth it to avoid faceing so many on future turns)

in otherwords no good answer

By Christopher E. Fant (Cfant) on Thursday, August 19, 2004 - 11:23 pm: Edit

That is the best answer for when to direct or not.

There is no good answer besides, when the situation warrents. And that is different for all players.

By Dave Whiteside (Ytside) on Thursday, August 19, 2004 - 11:29 pm: Edit

In the GW game in Origins.. When they took Hydrax on T5, I had an opportunity to let damage fall on a non-fighter heavy fleet...but I did a quick count of C8's & BTs and saw an opportunity to knock em down. In the end, Hydrax fell(it was going to anyway with or w/o DD), and the K had only 1 CR 10 ship on the board....the K fleet in turn did not suffer much other damage....from what i read above, I'm not sure this was wise?

By Christopher E. Fant (Cfant) on Thursday, August 19, 2004 - 11:35 pm: Edit

hey, one CR10 ship left is always a good thing.

By Stephen Rasmussen (Rasz) on Friday, August 20, 2004 - 01:54 am: Edit

My normal policy with the aliance it to direct on maulers and stasis ships when i can get away with it, and otherwise i normally let the damage fall.

My Hydrans HATE those D6M's. They must DIE.

By Tim Losberg (Krager) on Friday, August 20, 2004 - 02:34 pm: Edit

This sounds like a sneaky tactic, lure your coalition opponent into thinking you are not going to direct at all, then start killing those tugs 😄

By John Doucette (Jkd) on Friday, August 20, 2004 - 06:10 pm: Edit

I've been doing that ever since I started playing the Alliance. The only problem is, sometimes I forget my plan and end up lulling my opponent into a true sense of security 😕

By Jimi LaForm (Laform) on Friday, August 20, 2004 - 06:25 pm: Edit

Sounds like you got them right where they want you Jkd =P

By MikeMascitti (Lokiwormtongue) on Friday, August 20, 2004 - 09:01 pm: Edit

how about a Kzinti survey?

how many of you prefer building the CD instead of the CLD...and why?
I go for CLDs and SDFs.

The reason why is a tac note in a recent captain's log. ;-)

I don't build either, at least not in the early years; there are too many other ships I need aside from really expensive bombardment platforms. DFs suffice, in general, though if I have a few spare EPs and no construction slots left, I've been known to convert a lonely CL to a CLD.

That's about the size of it, Jimi ;) Our last game, around T10, we looked at the map and made simultaneous offers of surrender, we'd been doing so well

I use the Kzinti Drone-scouts in the early war to beef up the horrible scout deficiency, since the Lyran player in my group considers DWS's as his frigates, mass-producing them via conversion and dropping battle groups with three or four of the acursed things every time I turn around.

The choice between the CD and the CLD is one of survivability. The CD has two more defence factors, but it's a conversion that drops density by one, unlike the CLD. That's the trade-off you make. The CD is more likely to live, but the CLD is a better deal in a fight.

Technically, the SDF increases density by two (over the SF), but there's no way that thing's going on the line unless things have gone totally pear-shaped, since it's got even less defence. My CDs and CLDs keep getting mauled away, so I shudder to think how fast that little prince of a frigate would get torn to shreds.

I've often built/converted to the CLD or CD, but not once has either hull ever done drone bombardment. They get put in the line (in the form box if there's no dreadnought around) to fight the EW war, and then die in a loud, grotesque military manner, saving me from having to guess what will be directed away this time.

CLD all the way. It is amazing how much the Coalition hates it when the Alliance tries to even out the EW war. I have had very few CLDs survive a trip to the line.

An Idle thought?

Looking over the rules on monitors, Fairly cheap but relatively immobile. Add a
squadron of 6 fighters cheap too.

Does anyone else think a monitor is worth picking up for the defense of the capital system, (kzinti or hydran, possibly fed) ?

Obviously the initial 2 monitors cant be assigned there but what about a new built one?

On the kzinti front, it might make the carriers a little more difficult to employ, but on the hyran front the capital is gonna be packed with all of my biggest hybrid ships when he tries to assault it. 2 squadrons may come from the LAV in the form bonus, but i can afford to have another formal squadron on the monitor on the line.

As an added bonus it makes it a little harder for the coalition to get to my pdu's. No marine assaults till he directs it away. And i like watching battle lines evaporate trying to kill a relatively cheap unit.

Mark, if he is directing on a SDF he can't be directing on a CLD or CD so they may live a little longer then you would think.

Steven

A monitor with fighters IIRC costs at least 14EP, which is hardly cheap. It will be great to bolster a capital, but a highly dubious move anywhere else. The problem is that the most likely place to do this is Kzintai, and the Kzintis will usually end up having to choose between that monitor or 5 frigates. I'd prefer 5 frigates. It would be a bit more debateable if it was a choice between a monitor and 2BC.

How about a mix of CD and CLD ?

CLD for BG capable ships, CD for slightly more survivable scouts in the true scout slot.

Hell, I like CDs for the Battle line

As a Kzinti player I'll max build my CD/CLD's every single turn if at all possible. It's the only way to keep the Coalition honest in the EW war. As the Coalition player I'll kill every single CD/CLD that goes into battle unless it's in the form or scout position (i.e. if its on the line it'll die).
Chris

Now the question is are you speaking as a Kzinti or a Coalition player?

David Slatter (Daivas) on Monday, August 23, 2004 - 01:03 pm:

I prefer CDs on the battleline as opposed to CLDs on the battleline. CLDs are too tidily killed by maulers (10pts exactly). CDs at least require 16.

I tend only put them on the line defending SBs, but that isn't a hard and fast rule.

Mike Mascitti (Lokiwormtongue) on Monday, August 23, 2004 - 01:59 pm:

results of the CD vs CLD poll so far:

(3) Trent, JohnD, JohnR - CLD
(2) DavidS, Chris - CD
(3) Richard, Marc, Jimi - uncommitted?

Jimi LaForm (Laform) on Monday, August 23, 2004 - 02:01 pm:

If your asking for which I prefer, I prefer the CD for survivability, but typically build the CLD much more often... not sure which camp that puts me though =)

Craig Tenhoff (Cktenhoff) on Monday, August 23, 2004 - 03:07 pm:

I usually build a few of both and save them for important battles.

I like a few CDs to provide support from the Scout Box when I don't have or don't want to risk a tug. I build CLDs (and a few SDFs) to form a CLD/SDF BG. A CLD/SDF BG supported by a TG+SP can ruin the Coalitions EW advantage real quick. Of course it doesn't last too long, but if it helps win a key battle, its well worth it.

So mark me as Neutral

David Slatter (Daivas) on Monday, August 23, 2004 - 04:18 pm:

Actually, there is one nuance here. I haven't played the Zin long enough post-AO to get to this point, but when the CM's get really rolling (ca. turn 6-7), I would want to replace my CLEs with MECs pretty much wholesale - it's unlikely that CLEs would be destroyed that quickly.

At that point, I would probably unconvert CLEs to CLs then to CLDs. However, I'm not sure whether this is a discounted double conversion or whether the 1EP to unconvert is always paid whatever.

Jimi LaForm (Laform) on Monday, August 23, 2004 - 04:23 pm:

David, I start my MEC's asap.. which is T2 or T3 (can't remember when they start at top of head). The CLE's I leave as pin count for the rest of the game. Usually from 3 - 6 of em will die fairly early on so you aren't really left with too many though.
And if your double converting you always pay at least 1EP minimum

**By David Slatter (Davidas) On Monday, August 23, 2004 - 04:44 pm: Edit**

I start my MECs asap as well. But it might be as late as turn 6 before all my CLEs are replaced. Not sure. As soon as that's done, it's time for multiple MSCs... Poor vanilla CM hardly gets built.

**By Christopher E. Fant (Cfant) On Monday, August 23, 2004 - 05:10 pm: Edit**

DLF: As a Alliance player.

**By Dale Lloyd Fields (Dylkha) On Monday, August 23, 2004 - 06:06 pm: Edit**

Chris: Jus' checkin' 😊

I certainly, but perhaps irrationally, love the CLD. It is just such a beautiful little ship. I just love putting out a battle group with three of those things on the line. If a CLD ever appears on the line it has two friends. I'm a big fan of the DN+ADM, 2x3CV, BG line for the Kzinti so I love to pull out the CLD for that. That said, I tend to get more ship-turns use out of my CDs as I tend to use them for my CV-led fleets when I can put it in the form bonus to give me additional EW. I guess my CLDs die more frequently so I build more of them. After thinking about it, I hardly ever use the CD as my free scout. I ususally have my TGT+?xSP for the first couple of turns and my MSC afterwards. I don't mind my TGT+?xSP being blown up in the free scout position because they absorb so much damage, and a TGT+SP is only 6+3 EP to replace, as opposed to the EW similar CD which costs 11 EP to replace. If a CD of mine is going to be blown up, I'd prefer it be adding its 7 ComPot to my battle line. Or maybe I just have D6D envy.

I guess to sum up my experience, I don't tend to end up converting to many CDs as the ones I have tend to last a while. My regular opponent tends to laugh at my EW attempts by pulling out the D6S with a group of D6Ds or an EW-battlegroup. I do run through CLDs like cocaine at an LA party. Every single one of my CLs, CLEs and CLGs end up being destroyed as CLDs. My CL? crew know to file their wills when they arrive at the SB for conversion. But I still love the CLD. Even though it is a 9 EP ship. Even though it takes 10 damage to kill. Even though my opponent, when asked if he is directing, loves announcing that I get 1.5 EP of salvage.

**By Mark Ermenc (Mermenc) On Tuesday, August 24, 2004 - 01:02 am: Edit**

Um ... If you were to hand me a ship for free, I'd take the CD over the CLD. No surprise there. If you were to hand me a BC+CLD or a CD+CL, I'd take the first pair, please and thank you. A CLD takes fire for other fleet elements, the BC can have hopes and dreams of becoming a carrier, and the point of COMPOT matters to my little mind.

I suppose I should convert BCs instead of CLs to make it more expensive for my
enemies to kill off my EW (which they delight in), but I can't bring myself to loose that point of COMPOT.

As an aside, I don't think the CLE is a worthwhile conversion to begin with, so I don't have to convert back to do the CLD upgrade later. I'd rather just keep the CL as an ad-hoc escort. It's only one point of COMPOT difference, the carrier group is getting rotated out if it gets hurt, and it self-kills for exactly the same damage and salvage if push comes to shove. If someone really wants to target my escorts, I guess I'll just suffer, but ... as a member of my group is fond of saying, "I'd be happier WITH the dollar, actually."

By James Southcott (Yakface) on Tuesday, August 24, 2004 - 04:34 am: Edit

DavidS

IIRC the 2 step conversions applied only where the first step was to a different hull size, then the second step was to a varient (FF-DW-DWS). This may have been superseded, but if not then the 1EP reduction would not apply.

By Richard Abbott (Catwhoorg) on Tuesday, August 24, 2004 - 07:35 am: Edit

CL was acceptable to CLE right up until the rule changed to allow dirdam against inside ad-hocs.

I'll take the CLE now - and spin them down to CVE's later.

By Stephen Rasmussen (Rasz) on Tuesday, August 24, 2004 - 07:16 pm: Edit

Not that i'm an expert, but i like the CLD while they last...

One of my priorities early on with the kzinti is to match up my flagships with better ew platforms. The SF just doesn't cut it. My TGTSS will run around with DN, while my TGCBV will get 2 escorts and 2 CLD or CD.

Like others have noted, kzinti dont usually build many CL beyond their starting fleets. And The CM is almost always built as a MEC or MSC. The 6 CL at start soon become CLD. The CLD rarely see use outside of the form and scout boxes, except at the capital.

Once I get my CVA, I would try match those up with a CD and a MSC (ideally), but i havent managed to get that far in any games so far.

By Mark Ermenc (Mermenc) on Wednesday, August 25, 2004 - 04:12 am: Edit

Regarding the CL ad-hoc being directed against ... um ... please?

If they're going to blast the thing apart, you take the rest of the damage on the fighters/EFF in the group, and pull the group back. If it's a serious fight, you have several carrier groups there. If it's not a serious fight, you retreat when you run out. Either way, you're doing fine.
Yes, they may have forced the CVL group off the line (the CV groups shift around to get the at-start CLEs, and the BCE, which I convert as soon as possible) but they've only cost you a CL hull. You do make more of those, just not many. With allowable downgrade substitutions coming in, you may be making even more when cash gets tight. Far better that than some of the other things they could direct on.

Look, the Kzinti don't have to hold on THAT long before the MEC gets into production, and once you do, every EP spent on CL:CLE conversions is an utter waste, as you'll be self-killing those CLEs, assigning them to CVEs/TGCs, or unverting them. The MEC is your medium escort and, for a while, the only thing you use war cruisers for. (Mind you, you'll use so many of them, you'll be glad when the CW slip from PO comes into play.) Pretend the CLE is a bad dream. Use your one and only BCE to make yourself feel better about the whole thing. Welcome to modernization under fire.

In short, CLs are not meant to be CLEs, they are meant to be CLDs. BCs are not meant to be CDs, they are meant to be CVs. Naturally, no war is ever an ideal circumstance, and sometimes you just have to do a bad thing to get a necessary result, so you do what you have to do.

By David Slatter (Davidas) on Wednesday, August 25, 2004 - 10:28 am: Edit

Mark

The problem with the Ad-hoc CL is not its vunerability, but the fact that you cannot use it for CEDS retrograde/replacement, and you are down 1 COMPOT.

The former is pretty important.

By Mark Ermenc (Mermenc) on Wednesday, August 25, 2004 - 02:28 pm: Edit

I always assumed that it could retrograde with its carrier back to a base, as it was part of a carrier group. (ad-hoc escorting doesn't "go away" at the end of battle unless you want it to). Perhaps it can't repair there, but you can always ad-hoc something else in if you're attacked, as you "assign escorts" ... just break the carrier group open.

Besides, on your turn, you can retrograde everything that was in battle, then strat move ... just engineer the situation such that another CL/DD arrives at that base, and swap them around if battle hits. Break the group up so that it can react, and just repair it later. Yes, if the base falls, you missed out on wringing out some repair from that base, true, but you can still use CEDS repair to repair/replace the EFF if necessary.

On the enemy turn, you repair the CL/DD using regular repair. It doesn't matter,
as the CEDS counts against the regular limit for the turn anyway.

As for replacement, now that I think about it, I'll have to check that further. Depending on the interpretation of the rules ... that carrier group did loose an escort, and is thus eligible for a new one. You may yet be able to advance-build an escort to fill that slot, though it would probably have to be an actual escort, not a base hull. Probably not worth it unless you can get an MEC up there.

In the end, it may just be a reflection of my group's play style, but my usual adversaries don't bother directing on my carrier groups. They let me damage them, since I use carrier groups as damage sponges during the Kzinti early war era. There are usually plenty willing to step up and fill the slot.

By Dale Lloyd Fields (Dylkha) on Tuesday, September 07, 2004 - 04:46 pm: Edit

Now that many people seem to be waiting until T10 to attack the Feds (I assume to well decimate the Hydrans and Kzinti or mudslide the Fed), I've been wondering about the strategy of holding off the Roms T10-T12. This also came up as a point of discussion in the game I'm playing (we're at T7), and I'm curious to hear other thoughts.

I crunched some numbers on ship production for the Gorn and Romulans T10-T12, and I figured for no ship loses and no overbuilding:

Active T12 Romulan Forces to oppose the Gorn:
North Fleet - 52 Hulls, 54 2/3 SE, 392 DefCom, 16 Fighters (1 RESV)
Home Fleet - 70 Hulls, 77 1/2 SE, 720 DefCom, 21 Fighters (1 RESV)
New Construction - 36+ Hulls, 40+ SE, 255+ DefCom, 24 Fighters
Total - 158+ Hulls, 172 1/6+ SE, 1367+ DefCom, 61 Fighters

plus they get the TPD of another 23 hulls through strat and such for the end of T13C.

The Gorn will have able to attack on T12A:

2nd Fleet - 27 Hulls, 28 SE, 184 DefCom, 0 Fighters
6th Fleet - 22 Hulls, 23 SE, 151 DefCom, 0 Fighters
New Construction - 23 Hulls, 25 SE, 171 DefCom, 6 Fighters
Total - 72 Hulls, 76 SE, 506 DefCom, 6 Fighters

with another:

Home Fleet - 36 Hulls, 37 SE, 257 DefCom, 0 Fighters
T12A New Construction - 12 Hulls, 13 SE, 87 DefCom, 6 Fighters

available for RESV fleets and defensive positioning.
Now, the Gorn are certainly in no position to attack the Romulans. They face a 2:1 disadvantage on T12A. The Roms can put most of their North Fleet and new production on 4411 and the border BATS because the Gorn will not attack 4812 (this would only allow the Home Fleet to react over to save it and bring the Home Fleet in range of a counter-attack on SB 4806 for T13C. Even if the Gorn take care not to attack within 2 hexes of the Romulan capitals, the Gorn still have 72 Hulls vs. 101 or so (including a Home Fleet RESV for the Roms). Admittedly, the Roms will only have those 101 Hulls vs. Gorn 120 defending on T13C so both SB should live through T13C. T13A sees 132 Gorn hulls or so (likely get another OffMap ship) vs. 158 Rom hulls in Gorn space with another 30 or so in RESV or on the border. In the end (T15C as T15A the Fed can invade with their 6th Fleet if they like), the Roms can have 203 active ships while the Gorn have 142ish. The Gorn have five SB to fight at and have probably lost a couple, but probably haven't lost their Homeworld. And this doesn't even include Fed assistance which is the original strength of the 5th Fleet (14 ships-ish) plus any new construction.

My analysis: Even best case scenario (no Fed interference), I don't think the Roms could hold all three Gorn capitals. In this scenario, I would see the Roms pushing the Gorns back to their Homeworlds, but can't fully knock them out of the war. The delaying of exhaustion for the Roms will let them stay fairly competitive until the last part of the war, but won't advance Coalition goals. In this sense, I think the Romulans must attack the Federation. Maybe the Fed capital cannot be taken, but if the Fed can be bottled up, perhaps the Roms can use all their fleets to hit the Gorn, with perhaps some some Klingon help.

Comments are solicited. This strategy does not seem viable to me, but I freely admit I may be missing something.

The big point of the T10 invasion of the Feds is to after them with a large chunk of the Klingon Fleet, along with the Roms and some Lyrans to support.

If you were to hold the Romulans out of it, the Feds would be able to heavily reinforce the Western Front without pulling ships from the Rom border. The Romulans must keep the pressure on in order to give the Klingons a chance to roll over the opposition in the West.

There is another, riskier gambit, one which has been (semi)played out by the Coalition player in my last 2-3 games, and it boils down to essentially what Dale was musing about. The basic strategy is to pin the Kzin against their capital, smash the Hydrans, then hit the Feds massively on T9 or T10 using the Klingons while the Lyrans take over combat ops on the Kzin and Hydran fronts. The Roms, meanwhile, go after the Gorn with everything in a bid to knock the Gorns out before the Feds can bring force to bear. Since we've never gotten much past T10-
12, we don't know how well the strategy works.

We saw a similar strategy with the older version of F&E and it seemed promising, but what we're finding with the new version is that, with the extra rules and fewer number of ships, it's a tougher task than before.

One variant we have tried with quite a bit of success has been to hit the Feds on T9 with the Klingons (and any Lyrans that can be scraped up), then have the Roms join in on T10. The psychological effect of such a massive one-two hit cannot be discounted, along with the other, more tangible effects (diverting Fed reserves, applying pressure to the Fed fleet all at once, etc).

All of this would seem to make the hydran expedition an even better gambit.

Also the extra ships added to the various fleets make for a few more ships to attempt the expedition with. And fast ships mean the expedition has a threat of getting thru a little quicker.

also the biggest jump in federation defenses happens on alliance turn 7 as they move ships up to defend the bases, I don't remember exactly but IIRC this roughly doubles the number of ships that can defend the bases. If you can jump the bases before this happens you save a LOT of damage that you would otherwise take while assaulting the starbases

I would like to ask a question that i havent seen talked about here. How do people decide what BIR to pick? I would imagint that a decent captains log article could be written on that subject, but i dont know enough about it to write it.

There are so many factors that go into that, Stephen, it's almost impossible to answer.

I don't have any hard and fast rules, but some of the things that influence BIR selection, for me, are:

1) The desire to keep my casualties to a minimum, especially if fighting a battle I don't absolutely need to win. If I have lots of fighters and the enemy doesn't, I'll often pick a lower BIR, knowing that I'll take most of my damage on fighters and/or a frigate or two while my opponent will be taking hard ship losses.

2) The desire to maximize enemy casualties, especially if I'm fighting over an objective I must hold and/or I have sufficient reserves of fighters and/or ships that I can stand the pounding of a high-BIR environent for a few rounds before dropping low again. This is particularly true if fighting over fixed defences (all that
extra compot is such a nice damage generator).

On the attack, I might choose a high BIR even when I normally wouldn't because I know the enemy's fleet is close to cracking and if I can shatter his Fleet (capitalization intended), then the casualties I take in doing so are often worth it.

3) Situation dependent. If I'm making a raid to take out a BATS or FRD or something similar, for example, I'll attempt to pick a BIR that will give me a reasonable chance (at least 50-50) of scoring enough damage to cripple or destroy my raid target. I might end up taking more damage than I should, on a battle-by-battle basis, but the effects, psychological and physical, of taking out large numbers of the enemy's hardpoints cannot be overlooked. Unless, of course, you end up gutting your Fleet doing so 😊

Defending against an attack where I know I won't be able to hold, I'll oftentimes pick low, but if my compot is close to a threshold where I might be able to cause some significant hurt to the enemy at what should be a minor battle, I'll go high, and accept the higher losses in an attempt to cause greater hurt to the enemy. And it's great to be able to soak up a large chunk of any damage incurred from such a choice by sacrificing the gallant fixed defences 😊

4) Overall tempo of operations. If it's been a really bad (or good) turn or two in terms of casualties, my choices for BIR will often be dictated by the desire or need to affect either my casualties of my enemy's on a theatre or front level (barring specific battles over high-priority targets).

Even all of this doesn't come close to representing all of the factors that go into my calculations. Sometimes, I just get a bout of sheer bloodymindedness, •••• the torpedoes and all that ;)

I use all of John's criteria to a certain extent, but there is one that often overrides them

1) EW.

If you have EW shifts in your favour, pick low BIR. Otherwise, pick a high BIR.

Check out the math (carefully), and you will see what I mean.

As an aside, I will generally up the BIR if it means I can direct on a significant enemy ship as opposed to seeing all my damage wash away on fighters.
I always look to see what the enemy can do to me, and how I wish to absorb the damage. If I can predict what the enemy may direct upon, I will adjust the BIR to best absorb the remainder.

Example: I know the enemy always kills my maulers. I have a FHF, so I pick low BIR to try to avoid having it killed on round one. But later, I have only a SPF, taking only 22 to kill. I'll go high BIR, since it will die either way, and then I can absorb the remainder damage on fighters and carrier escorts. This prevents me from having "damage absorbers" on my line round after round, but never actually absorbing damage.

Obviously, the counter to this is for my enemy to not be predictable.

David Lang (Dlang) wrote:

do you intend to direct on something? (this can include PDU's) if so you want to pick a high enough BIR to be pretty sure of being able to kill it.

anything that gives you a BIR/die roll shift that your opponent doesn't get will be more significant at low BIR's (as David S states above), but this doesn't matter much for a single round, it only becomes really significant if you are going to be fighting a long time

in addition there is the question about what your opponent is planning to do. sometimes it's more valuable to pick a BIR that violates all the rules listed above just so you can mess up your opponent's plans (I've known people to pick their BIR with a D4 just so it couldn't be guessed by their opponent)

Pete D was a master of such calculations. if you got predeictable in your BIR selection he would go into a battle and pick the BIR that would give him _just_ enough points to achieve his objective (baring the double wammy of a bad VBIR and damage roll combined) or if he was in defensive mode, pick a BIR such that the opponent would either fall just a couple points shy of being able to achieve their objective, or would achieve their objective and take a lot more damage then they expected (if he was facing a line that could absorb 30 damage easily, but then started taking losses on good ships he would violate the normal BIR selection rules and go high, forcing the opponent to take 40+ points and loose a good ship)

Stephen Rasmussen (Rasz) wrote:

Is there an easy calculation to figure out what JUST enough is going to be?

John Doucette (Jkd) wrote:

That depends on what your objective is, Stephen. Are you attacking a BATS with the objective of destroying it? If so, you'll need to score at least 24 damage in order to cripple it, or 36 to destroy it by DD in one round. So, you look at your
compot, make some assumptions based on the probability of die rolls (i.e. avg die rolls are 3-4) and the liklihood of the expected BIR, the EW situation, the effect of maulers, etc.

Additionally, the relative importance of the objective comes into play. Do you absolutely have to take out that BATS in order to guarantee an open supply line for a larger, deeper strike (or for some other reason)? If so, you might pick a BIR that will make it a high probability you will achieve the required damage level, as opposed to picking a BIR that will provide a reasonable probability of achieving the required damage level.

In short, there is no easy calculation. The act of choosing a BIR is as much art as it is science, though you can "stack the deck", as it were.

Don't hesitate to screw around with your BIR choices if your opponent is trying to optimize their own results (eg: carefully crafted ship lines in a capital assault so that the Mauler gets just enough to pop 4PDUs).

OK, got a sticky issue I'd like to get opinions on (no peeking Jimi)

Its T11, Coalition invasion is in full swing. SB situation:
4th SB-not threatened, Feds out number Colition in the 6 hexes from the SB
3rd SB- Fell on just fell on coalition half of T11. 3rd Fleet is surrounded but in supply. mostly provinc raiders surrounding but in range of 3 full reserves back on the klingon border.
7th SB- still standing, cut off on the right (by the Klingons) and behind (by orion, the Roms neutralized it on T11).
6th SB- still standing but under seige by the entire Romulan Navy, it will fall T12.

Now here is the question, I currently have a turns pause in the west as the Klingons pulled south to take out the 7th.
The 7th has about 30 ships there, but are 60% frigates and POL's, they probibly only have about 4 rounds in then before they loose the SB and then will be cut off and crippled...
I have a path available to move them out and be able to retrograde to the 6th SB which will casue more havok among the roms then they would against the Klinks.

So the big question, do I abandon the 7th SB to its fate and re-inforce the 6th or fight it out at the 7th and risk loosing a good portion of the 7th fleet before it gets home?

Hmmm, lose two SBs and most of a fleet or lose 2 SBs.

I'd go with abandoning the 7th and fully reinforcing the 6th. You may still lose the
6th, but you won't lose a good chunk of the 7th Fleet.

You need to get ship parity as quickly as possible to slow the offensive, and losing the 7th Fleet will delay that.

LOL, if you saw the actual positions and fleet counts you would find that the Coalition, though having captured both Kzintai and Hydrax, have lost so many ships, and have had to not build so many ships that the ship counts between sides is not that heavy. Though the Kzinti's and the Hydrans have lost builds due to losing their caps, the Coalition navies have been hit so hard I am severly hampered in my ability to maintain 3 fronts.

Says the man who outnumbers me on all but the northern front

Bah.

HTO: Coal +40
ZTO: Coal -30
KI-FTO North: -30
KI-FTO Central: Coal +60
Rom-FTO: Coal +70
GTO: Coal -20

Total: Coal +90

Thanks Craig, that is how I was leaning, but I hate hate HATE giving up a SB for cheap....

oh well.

Well, if you aren't planning on fighting in front of the SBs, where are you planning on fighting? I would say giving away SBs for cheap is a real bad strategy. Not taking casualties against the 7th SB means those Klingon ships will be one or two turns deeper into Fed space. Shifting over to the 6th SB is great, except it looks like the Klingons are already at great advantage in the center. I would leave as much as I could on the 7th if you can threaten (or retake) the minor down there that cuts the southern Klingon supply line into Fed space. 30 ships on a starbase can do a lot of damage to the attacker. That is the place to burn the POLs! You can also take significant casualties with 30 ships and still survive an out of supply retreat very nicely (retreat before combat and fighting retreats make it difficult to kill a fleet that is determinedly running).

In summary, over a starbase is where you want those ships to fight; if your
opponent obliges you, I say thank him and stay. Being bypassed and sitting on your thumb is the real danger.

Nah, make the Roms pay. They really can't afford to take large amounts of cripples, and with the Gorn close to entry, if the Feds can gut the Rom fleet on T12, the Gorn should be able to have a field day, turning the tide on that front real quick. Learn to fear the DNT, about the scariest ship in existence (next to the B-10AA, but not a big lead in my opinion!).

Would anyone consider it to be a useful tool to have multiple forums one each for specic strategies and tactics for each race. As we have it organized now it's hard to find race specific strategies. I'm just looking at it from an organizational perspective. Something similar currently exists for SFB.

I've been trying to do some research for my current F&E game and it's been somewhat frustrating.

You have to fight at the SB's. You don't have to gut your fleet: take all the damage on fighters and the SB (if he's going to direct at ships then so be it). Even if it means you fight only 2 rounds it is worth doing.

James, my point is that the Roms are going to be on the short end of the stick when the Gorn come crashing into them, should they get their fleet shot up too badly over the 6th SB. The Romulans are not too well off when it comes to having either repair capacity, OR the means to power it, so giving them a cripple backlog right before Gorn entry can only be an Alliance boon.

Robert, that is what James is saying =)

No, I think James was encouraging me to fight at the 7th SB, even if only for 2 rounds of pointless combat.

You are right, I've re-read it, he was saying to only fight for a round or two then flee while Robert was saying fight to the death because the Roms just cannot afford to take the damage in the long run.

Well, I find that the Roms can actually fight very well killing off small ships like
SNBs that are decent salvage and crap to repair. Also, WEs make for good fodder and can easily pay for the repairs of the good ships. Just have to find the balance you are comfortable with.

Chris, that is true, but given that the Gorn are about to come in, self killing so much may be very detrimental in the long run. Well that and they only have so many SNBs, and killing WE kinda stinks as they can become KEs.

Also true. But then I see the entire Romulan navy as expendable if it aids the Klingons.

that sounds funny coming from the dude who says he likes to run his Lyrans "independently"

Tim, give up the 7th if it means that you got a shot at holding the 6th. even if you can't Jimi and Rob make a good point...you can hurt the Roms more by concentrating over the 6th

Darin, it would be nice to sub-divide this topic but how exactly would you do that?

Perhaps, but the Lyrans are a different beast. The Roms will eventually be cutoff and there is not a lot to be done about that. The Lyrans on the other hand are the elite shock troops of the Coalitions. Making 140 point battle lines is fun

Mike:

good question.....Alliance and Coalition is not the way to go...

I think they should be split by individual race.

Robert, I wasn't really disagreeing with you - the original question was should the 7th SB be abandoned to reinforce the 6th? IMO even if the federation leaves only 10 frigates at the SB then it is worth doing. You understand I am not recommending this, It really ought to be more, but if you really think the rest would be better at the 6th SB then so be it.

with 10 frigates you get two rounds of combat (if damage is taken on the SB and it's fighters) at 100 compot which is a little over 50 damage on average. About
10-13EP (depedning upon the number of fighters/F5) for no loss to the Federation. This is the absolute minimum that could be achieved. If you left 11 ships + scout to make a line of 100 compot+SB you would improve it to 20-30 for very little damage to the federation. More if you leave more ships/are willing to cripple some to fight more rounds. Those sorts of figures are significant for the coalition who are about to be seriously strapped for cash.

If you relocate everything there might be a danger that the Coalition decide not to take down the 6th SB and just kill the 7th for free - that depends upon the game situation though which I can't really assess.

What Mark says is very valid - if abandoning the 7th means that you get to keep the 6th then fair enough.

By Robert Padilla (Zargan) on Monday, November 15, 2004 - 09:24 pm: Edit

James,

I know that you were not really disagreeing with what I was saying, and I do see merit to your point also, but I just don't see 10 FF hurting the Klingons any, even under the guns of a SB. I would try to base a reserve or two off of 3210 and either let the Klingons overattack the 7th, or perhaps setup a situation where the reserves could save it. And if it gets overwhelmed, then you can still reserve to the 6th and make it more painful, if needed!

By John Doucette (Jkd) on Monday, November 15, 2004 - 10:03 pm: Edit

Personally, I think giving up any starbase as a freebie is bad for business. These are the ultimate casualty causing strong points outside the capitals and they should always be defended, even if only with stuff that could become a semi-decent battle force with the addition of a reserve.

Having said that...

7th Fleet cannot stop the Klingons from blowing the starbase to atoms, but it can make the Klingons work for it, instead of just sending in some stuff of their own. I'm not saying defend the SB to the last, but defend it until the BG is gone, at least, extracting the maximum from the Klingon fleet in casualties you can, then falling back to the east side of the Orions. 6th Fleet will have to win or die on its own (with the aid of reserves); 7th Fleet is needed as a fleet-in-being against the Roms. By keeping 7th Fleet active (or, more appropriately, the core of 7th Fleet), the Feds then have something they can easily, with the application of part of a turn of war production, turn into a force that the Roms will have to allocate something more than stuff against or risk a reversal in the southern Federation.

At some point, 7th Fleet may very well have to be absorbed into 6th, but that time is for when/if the Roms approach the inner Federation defences.
The purpose of 6th Fleet is not to hold the Romulan attack, it's to bleed it white; the 6th Fleet SB (and 7th Fleet SB) is as dead as Count's SB, so just write it off mentally and if it actually survives for a while, bonus.

Well, I would think that making a big stand at the 6th would bleed the Romulan's quite white, as it seems to be certain it will fall no matter what. Hopefully there are some deeper defenses in Fed space after the 6th (maybe another SB was setup from one of the internal BATS?). If not, then the fall of the 6th may very well see the Roms annexing quite a bit of Fed space.

If the Klingons attack an undefended base they can move in with high EW and attrition units and go for extremely low BIR and potentially take the base without taking any casualties at all.

Starting off with 48 compot at BIR 2 you average 20%, and with EW this can be knocked down to 15% or about 7 points/round to the Klingons (or if the base goes to high EW it's compot drops significantly and the resulting damage is about the same) at 7 damage/round the Klingons take it on fighters, meanwhile the ~100 compot Klingons will be doing ~20 points/round to the base which will kill the base in less than 3 rounds.

If you keep 10xFF there then each round you will be at ~BIR 5 with ~90 compot which results in ~30 points/round of damage to the Klingons which WILL damage ships in addition to the attrition units. Meanwhile the Klingons will do about the same damage to the base and take about the same 3 rounds to kill the base, with some chance of the BIR going even higher which would hurt the Klingons more.

So on the one hand you have the attacker loose 3x7-8 fighters and on the other you have them taking 3x30 damage (much of which cannot be on fighters).

It's definantly worth defending the base, even if the defenders never take a single point of damage (although as others have noted, if the ships would make the difference between saving and loosing the other SB save the base)

And if the Klingons decide to direct on the FF's while under the guns of the SB, thank them. It then becomes a case of the attacker doing 18/round to the base plus 6 to a Ff plus 6 wasted damage while they take ~30 to their fleet.

One thing you have to consider is that whatever fleet is at the 7th will have a very hard time extracting itself out of the region...

I do not think that the 6th will survive, there are simply too many Roms (but he may chicken out for a 3rd time :P )

However, as several people have stated, the Roms are facing a 2 front war, any casualties I create will have a big impact on the next 2-3 turns which could make
the difference on both fronts, with the Roms weakened, I can throw more forces at the klinks, or just hold back the klinks and pound the roms back to the stone ages....

By James Southcott (Yakface) On Tuesday, November 16, 2004 - 12:10 pm: Edit

BTW is the game reported on the 'reports from the Front' part of the BBS?

By Jimi LaForm (Laform) On Tuesday, November 16, 2004 - 12:18 pm: Edit

James, no it is not, but we can put it out there for your browsing pleasure if you so desire. If we do so though, we probly wont be posting econ or even specifics as this is a FtF game but we can give general reports of fleet area actions. In my opinion though, if we do not post specifics it would make it too hard for the outsiders to follow.

By Tim Losberg (Krager) On Tuesday, November 16, 2004 - 02:13 pm: Edit

Quote:

BTW is the game reported on the 'reports from the Front' part of the BBS?

no.. the first time we didn't post up and it is turning into our best game.

Basic rundown of the game.

T1 Lyrans do a south attack, putting most of Red Claw at 1105. T2 Coalition raids Kzintai. 1/3 of the outers stripped, Kzinti reduced to 6 PDU's, Counts SB falls. 
T3 Dukes SB falls, 2nd Raid on Kzintai. Hydrans destroy the EB SB, entire EB fleet crippled
T4 Kzintai Falls
T5 Hydran 1st Fleet SB falls
T6 Expedition SB falls
T7 Marquis SB falls. Kzinti make their first retake attempt on Kzintai, Kzintai make failed attack on 1807
T8 Hydrax Falls, Coalition takes huge losses but Hydrans get badly mauled when trying to retake.
T9 Klingons destroy 0316 from under the Hydran fleet, 2nd Fleet SB finally falls, Klingons upgrade 2215 to SB Kzintai attempt to dislodge Lyrans from 1202.
T10 Klingons attack the Fed border taking out BATs from 2615 to 2008 and Planets 2715, 2214 and 1910 Romulans clear3215 to 3812 and take planets 3415. Feds Kill 2416, 2517 2519 and 4010, devestate 2518. Fed/Kzin clear off 1802 and 1504, kill 1707 1807. Hydrans re-capture 0519
T11 Klingons kill Fed 3rd Fleet SB, Roms neutralize the orions.
Dang, two capitols down and the Coalition is still mustering a substantial offense against the Feds? That would be impressive.

I have played my butt off as the Coalition this game. But there is one major problem, and that is my inability to maintain this offensive at all now. I have more SE's in the HTO but this has severely impacted my KTO and FTO theatres. In the KTO I am about 30SE's less then the Kzinti navy (all Lyran ships btw with the exception of about 15 Klink province/planet capturers and about 5 or 7 Klink specialty hulls). In the FTO, any major assault will take the wind out of my sails so fast you wouldn't have the time to eat a bowl of cereal. Before the Gorns entire I have maybe a 140SE advantage (that includes the 70 or so cripples I have straggled all over my map). When those Gorns enter the war I should start to stumble back like a drunk trying to tiptoe through the tulips.

As an edit. I am able to outship the Alliance anywhere that I want, but that means 3 other theatres are being left out in the dry (which is what I am doing in this game). I have effectively left myself in a pin count war in the HTO. I do have SE advantage, but most of that is just frigate/destroyer/fighter counts with a few heavy hulls to back them up, nothing for the Hydrans to truly worry about. In the north the Kzinti/Feds are running around rampant. I have forced Coalition advantage in Southern and Eastern Fed space (but am not threatening the 4th SB or Northern Fed space at all - I only have like 9 ships in that entire theatre). The Rom fleet will take a huge beating to crush the 6th and then its all downhill from there.

Plus the Kzinti WILL be taking back their cap this turn (we had misread the rules and were making retaking much hareder then it really was). They have their shipyard back so I think they wil be able to keep it, to kick them off again the Coalition willl need to take too many units from the other theaters.

Hey, what was the mis-read of the rules you're talking about? Just curious as I always thought it was just a reverse capital assault?

We were allowing the conquerers to take 10 damage on each and every planet.

Ow!!! That's a boatload of free damage! Good thing you caught that one.
aye, our mistake on that one prevented Kzintai from falling last turn.

Well, having had our group's first experience with a successful Expedition, I must say that my initial fears that bringing the Feds in early would backfire seem, for the moment, unfounded. It does make the first few turns of Fed involvement interesting and much less orderly than normal, to say the least, but just starting the third turn of Fed activity (T7), the Klingon position is looking much less rosy than it does usually, though the Lyrans are also in far better shape (and have taken out the Hydran border defences, 2nd SB, and the BATS linking the capital to the Old Colonies).

How easy/hard have others found stopping the Expedition to be?

Unless properly considered, stopping the expedition is extremely difficult.

For the Coalition, success in stopping the expedition relies not only on PIN ability within Klingon space, but a strong presence along the border threatening their homeworlds. If the Hydrans run the expedition but loose their cap in 2 turns, then it really wasn't worth it...

If the Coalition finds themselves both unprepared against the Hydrans AND the feds, things will be extremely uncomfortable for them (points to Back to the Front)

The somewhat unusual circumstances I'm in have sparked a thought for me. How exactly does one go about defending and assaulting the Federation/Klingon capital (really, any multi-SB hex)? In all other capitals, there is a hardpoint (the SB) and multiple softpoints (PDUs). The defender will then probably defend each soft point once or twice if just to take damage on the PDUs, but the real fight occurs at the SB. Any future hardpoints are built at the same location (though perhaps not anymore) so it really doesn't change the dynamic. But the Federation and Klingon capitals are different because they start with multiple locations with SBs. Now, the capital-capital can be stronger because it can get to 20 PDUs as opposed to just 10, but those PDUs are soft targets and can be whittled down. How would one go about defending and assaulting those other SBs? I would assume that the same tactics apply to the single SB fight, namely that you kill the defending fleet first and then the other SBs are toast. But lets say in any case SB#3 is being attacked and the 4xPDUs are killed. If the defender continues to fight at this hex until the entire fleet takes the maximum allowed damage, SB#2 with its 4xPDU and SB#1 with its 8xPDU are going to fall pretty cheaply and the defender wasted some rounds with extra ComPot. Should one instead, as the defender, just take the first couple volleys on the fixed defenses, blow up the SB and then retreat to SB#2, repeat, and then make a stand at SB#1? The attacker would like to face the minimum amount of extra ComPot and should encourage
fights at SB#2 and #3, I would think. Should the attacker NOT direct on any fixed
defenses, even PDUs to encourage the defender to cripple his fleet at weaker
locations? I have only thought about this for a short time and I would be, as
always, interested in hearing other people's thoughts.

By Jimi LaForm (Laform) on Wednesday, November 24, 2004 - 05:05 pm: Edit

I would not ever just sacrifice those extra SB's. They are there to hurt the enemy
fleet over. If I'm defending the Fed capital then I'm probably defending tooth and
nail (unless the Kzin and Hydran theatres are still strong). It is pretty important
that you trade your SB's for lots of enemy ships.

By Christopher E. Fant (Cfant) on Wednesday, November 24, 2004 - 07:16 pm: Edit

Dale,

It really depends on how many ships are involved (as usual).

If you can save the capital by sacrificing for cheap SBs 2 and 3, then do it.

If you are going to lose, and you KNOW it, then fight hard over all of them, as it
will do more damage in the long run, and you need to keep the attacker crippled
for a few turns while you recover offmap.

By John Wong (Johnwong) on Thursday, November 25, 2004 - 03:00 am: Edit

Dale you get to see his attacking fleet first. So that will help a lot.

By Dale Lloyd Fields (Dylkha) on Friday, November 26, 2004 - 09:28 pm: Edit

I've been thinking about this some more, and I guess what I'm trying to say is
that, without the complication of the PDUs, fighting at one SB has just the same
effect as fighting at either of the other SBs. If the attacker has enough forces to
win no matter what happens, and there are no PDUs anywhere, the attacker
takes the same damage if

1) The defenders fight the first two rounds each at two of the SBs, resolving 66
damage on each, and then fight to the end of the fleet at the last SB, taking 66
damage on it in the last two rounds of the capital assault.

as if

2) The defenders fight at each SB equally and take damage on the fleet first, then
take the last 3x66 damage on the three SBs.

Now, the PDUs change this as fighting at each location does deal different
damage to the attackers. If I have the standard set-up: SB+8xPDU, SB+4xPDU,
SB+4xPDU, fighting at the SB+8xPDU helps the defender out more than fighting
at either of the other SBs. So first scenario: the attacker only offers attacks on
SB#3 (SB+4xPDU). If on the first round, the attacker kills the 4xPDU, it benefits
the attacker if the defender continues to defend that SB because the attacker is
taking less damage for every part of the defender's fleet crippled. So if the
defender knows he will lose the hex, it would seem to make sense that the
defender should continue to fight at SB#3, resolving all damage on minus points,
the planet and the SB (3 rounds?) and then only defend SB#1 and SB#2. This
maximizes the amount of damage that the attacker will take for the same
damage dealt to the defending fleet.

Now, as Chris says, it depends on how many ships are involved. If the attacker
doesn't even have the strength to drive the defending fleet away if this were just
a SB-in-deep-space battle, then the defender should absolutely defend at every
single SB battle because he won't lose a single one of them.

I think what I should be asking about is the gray area inbetween: when there are
enough defending forces to save the capital given optimal play, but enough to
lose it given, er, pessimal(?) play. Are there any established strategies for either
side in this? Let's say the attacker kills the PDUs beneath one SB. At what point
does the defender abandon that SB and fight at SBs with PDUs? Is there anything
the attacker can do to draw the defender out to fight at a lesser advantage? I
suppose that my question might be unanswerable because it is too dependent on
the psychology of the particular players and the moment.

By David Lang (Dlang) on Sunday, November 28, 2004 - 01:00 am: Edit

Dale, that depends on how many specialty ships each side has.

if one side has lots of specialty ships and the other side is short then the side with
more specialty ships will want to fight more battles at once so that they will have
specialty ships in the battle while their opponent doesn't

you also don't want to give away the extra SB too cheaply because then the
attacker may target your remaining SB and leave you fighting without one.

and losing the 'extra' SB will hurt your strategic movement allotmnet, and your
conversion capacity (fairly important at the capitol for both the feds and the
klingons)

By John Smedley (Ukar) on Monday, November 29, 2004 - 05:54 pm: Edit

On stopping the expedition:

I believe that good alliance play will see a successful expedition by turn 5 alliance,
unless the Klingons and Lyrans are positioned far too defensively on turn 3. With
fighting retreat and fast ships, it really is difficult to both prevent a traditional
expedition and prevent the Kzinti and the Hydrans from linking up to put a
Hydran ship in Kzinti space (from which it will eventually reach Fed space). I
presume the Hydran supply tug would also be an asset, though I've never used it
for it's intended purpose since it must start on the expeditionary SB (which,
contrary to it's name, is not a good starting point for an expedition).
No matter how good of Alliance play, shall stop the COalition from conducting an Espionage Raid to attempt to cripple the Alliance supply Tug on a 2-5 chance once you start the Expedition, and can't trace supply back to Hydran space.

And what is wrong with the Coalition being positioned 'far too defensively' on Turn 3? I know that I generally always set up that way, but then I am not in a race to drop Hydrax by Turn 4, so maybe that is the difference. I've discovered that pushing the Hydrans back in 'waves' not only allows the fixed defenses to fall fairly cheap, but also has the effect of seriously limiting the start of a Turn 4 Hydran expedition (not arriving Turn 4, starting). Dropping those three Hydran SBs has to be done before taking the capital, or those green buggers just get even more painful.

I try to raid the Hydran Homeworld on turn 4. Send in 50-60 ships (West fleet and turn 3 production) and hit each SB with 20-30 ships (Home Fleet gets 1st and Exp, Lyrans get 2nd), while hitting each bats with 5 or so ships (SR gets 3 on the East, new production gets 2 in range, the Lyrans handle the other 3 bases.

I do not need to stop the Expedition cold. I only need to make sure it does not reach until turn 6. I count how many ships the Hydrans can start on the border, subtract the number of ships at the SR SB, and put that many ship on the bats at 1415/1417. The Hydrans can reach 1917 on turn 3 (after retreating), and I will need to pin them on turns 4 and 5 (allowing them to retreat toward Fed space at moving 1 hex they get 2 hexes per turn), and can reach on turn 6. If they send less than 10 ships I will try to force them to retreat away from Fed space with 30ish ships to control their movement (Hydran Herd), and if they send more I will just pin them and limit them to 2 hex advance per turn so they do not arrive before I take the capital on turn 5 (which will happen if 20 or more hulls are stuck in Southern Klingon space).

The Hydran only have 70 or so total hulls at start, and when I hit them on turn 4, I will have about 130 Klingons (counting all turn 4 construction), and 40-50 Lyrans (Red Claw and 1/2 of Far Stars). Assuming there are 10 Hydrans at each SB there are 40 hulls left to defend the capital on turn 4, which will do a good job defending it, but will lose (or cripple/numerous SIDS) the perimeter SB's. All repairs from the Kzin front head south to beat up the Hydrans after raiding the Kzin hard on turns 2 and 3. The only defense I hae seen that is effective against this strategy is an extremely aggressive Kzin. I leave ship parity against the Kzin (4-5), where if the Kzin are defending their capital against a possible capital assault (cripses don't go to Hydran front in this case), will leave very few hulls forward.
Don't forget that attacking the Hydran capital on Turn 4 will allow that reserve the Hydrans set up using the OC ships to move (since the provision is either a SB was destroyed, OR the capital is attacked). Those extra 7 ships may save a SB if you only attack with minimum force.

Robert,

Maybe nothing is wrong with a defensive setup. But I mean defensive in general, not just against the Hydrans. The coalition needs to block at least 4 separate routes to Kzinti space, along with the traditional block at the Klingon waist and sufficient force to stop a more southerly route near the galactic rim. The defensive deployment I'm taking about takes at least 150 SE to do correctly, and most of these will be in the Klingon interior. That means minimal gains against the Kzinti on turn 3, and the majority of the coalition out of position on turn 4.

I admit that I have never faced the Mudslide - it is probable that this strategy will work well against the expedition, as the coalition emphasis is on force conservation not attack. Waiting till turn 5 to begin the major assault just means your forces are nastier, and the fact that the homeworlds will have a hoard of PDUs is irrelevant, since you were not intending to attack them anyway.

And I know that I have never tried a mudslide, nor do I think I ever will, but I still do generally setup my Klingon forces a bit deeper than normal, including using the TBS down south instead of sending them to fight the Zin. The Home Fleet, SR, West Fleet, and TBS all by themselves are already most of that 150 SE number you used, and since I would send at least all of Turn 3 production down there also, that should about cover it, with no major impact. The nice thing about setting up that way is that it all together deters the Hydrans from attacking the Klingons, and if the Lyrans basically setup all on the EB SB, nothing of importance will be lost if the Hydrans do attack.

The Klingon west fleet is of little use stopping the expedition, as it can be pinned by Hydran forces from the Homeworld and the expeditionary fleet, which were not going on the expedition anyway. I guess if the west fleet is not set up within range of Hydrax it could be of some use - I've never seen anyone do this, however.
An interesting trick is to launch the Expedition with a Reserve Fleet during Klingon Turn 4. The Supply tug is part of the Reserve and if placed properly, can reach a majority of the BATS along the Klingon Border. The Reserve then moves to one of the border BATS, saves the BATS, and then along with the 1st Fleet ships in the area, heads into Klingon space on Hydran Turn 4.

If the Klingons retro to stop it, the Hydran's don't go, and have feinted a bunch of ships out of position. If the Klingons don't retro, then the Hydrans can assess their chances and launch the Expedition.

The Hydran's lose a turn of progress towards the Federation (launching on 3 instead of 4), but get to use the Supply Tug on the Expedition (if they go) or fake out a bunch of Klingons (if they don't go).

If a decision has been taken by the Coalition to attempt to stop the Expedition, does that then mean that the Coalition is effectively opting for Case Green (Hydran's first)?

In order to stop the Expedition, the Klingons will, presumably, have to pull so many ships off the Kzin front (or not deploy them there) as to seriously weaken any drive on Kzintai. That, or the Lyrans will have to shift the bulk of their forces south at the outbreak of war so that they can drive for the Hydran capital while the Klingons make a max effort push towards Kzintai.

Do the Klingons have the ships to pursue Case White while still attempting to stop the Expedition? What does 'stopping' mean? Preventing the Hydrans from reaching the Feds at all or simply delaying them until T7+?

I will not that I've succeeded with the Expedition in my current game using Expeditionary Fleet (though with a hole being punched open by Home and 1st). I charged across the Empire, reaching Fed space on T4 with one of the LGEs, then charged back again on T5-6. The Klingon player didn't really make a serious effort to stop me, since he was heavily committed to attacking the Kzin. I think he certainly could have, had he wanted to, but he would have been forced to abandon the attack on the Kzin capital.

I guess the additional question I'm posing is: Is the Expedition now so attractive that launching it has become a standard strategy?

I charged across the Empire, reaching Fed space on T4 with one of the LGEs, then charged back again on T5-6.

LOL
I hate the expedition thing, because it is such a game killer. If it succeeds (in a sensible timeframe) then the coalition loses if it doesn't then the coalition get an easy time taking down Hydrax to the point where they have probably already won.

Is it a mandatory tactic? - I doubt it, but all the additional little rules do seem to have made it much more difficult to control.

---

*By Robert Padilla (Zargan) On Wednesday, December 01, 2004 - 10:58 am: Edit*

Yes, but where is that reserve fleet parked Craig? It would have to be on the Exp. SB, or maybe at the Capital or 718, anywhere else is just begging to get pinned. And if the Coalition are going to wipe all three SBs on turn 4 anyways, odds are the reserve with the tug just got pinned. It's very easy for the Klingons to stop that reserve from being able to get anywhere meaningful, even if they forward deploy ships in Hydran space and just let them sit in the lanes, not fighting. They have plenty of E4s and F5 for that duty.

Not counting Hydran new production for Turn 3 (assuming they want to have two decent reserves), the ship numbers are a total of 98 SE for the Hydrans, counting all fleets, to 153 SE for the Klingons (counting West, HF, SR, TBS, and Turn 3 production). Of those 98 Hydran SE, only the 1st Fleet (21 SE) has a chance of running the southern Expedition route, plus PWC (another 13.5 SE). So deploying about 34 SE on 1618 would stop that route cold, still leaving about 119 SE to stop the route across the 'waist' of the Empire. And to be honest, if the Zin have managed to hold a retro point like 1105 for the Hydrans to try and use for the Expedition through Zin space, then I have to wonder what the Coalition was doing the first two turns, when the Zin are all but at their mercy.

And, none of that has to mean that the Coalition is going to cream the Hydrans, as they can easily strat any ships away once the threat of the Expedition is over.

---

*By John Smedley (Ukar) On Wednesday, December 01, 2004 - 01:03 pm: Edit*

You do not need 1105, although it is a good option. Either of the adjacent Bats is as good, and even if they have all fallen, all that is needed is for the Kzinti to have a Tug in position to be a supply point, then tow out an FRD for retrograde (The FRD is toast of course). I typically move an FRD to 1202 or to the Duke's SB (whichever is safer) on alliance turn 2 for this purpose. The point is that the Kzinti have several possible retro points, and it is difficult for the coalition to kill all of them.

Is it a mandatory tactic? For me it is, unless I see that there is no possibility for success. I've succeeded in the expedition in my last three general wars that had normal starting conditions (We tried the wayward wind in there as well, and the expedition is IMO impossible with this starting condition).
I think that the effect of the expedition on the game needs to be examined. This was the motivation for my "Romulan Reaction" proposal last year.

Well, I can not speak for all Coalition players, but my goal is usually to drop the Duke's SB on Turn 3, so if you tow an FRD there Turn 2, it will be dead when I attack the SB on Turn 3 no matter what, as it can not get away and if I want it, it can be directed on the line since it has to be included. Same is true of 1202 should I see the Zin foolishly (in my opinion) place an FRD there.

---

Yes, but where is that reserve fleet parked Craig? It would have to be on the Exp. SB, or maybe at the Capital or 718, anywhere else is just begging to get pinned. And if the Coalition are going to wipe all three SBs on turn 4 anyways, odds are the reserve with the tug just got pinned. It's very easy for the Klingons to stop that reserve from being able to get anywhere meaningful, even if they forward deploy ships in Hydran spacew and just let them sit in the lanes, not fighting. They have pleanty of E4s and F5 for that duty.

---

The Capital is the hardest to pin, so the Reserve goes there.

The idea here is to force the Coalition to respond to the threat of the Reserve, not necessary use it. If they attack the Capital to pin the reserve, the OC is released. If they spread E4/F5s (with a command ship) around, there are fewer ships to hit other targets. If they commit the Klingon Turn 3 builds and TBS, then the Hyrdans have taken pressure off the Kzinti, for at least a turn.

Another thing, watch the Retrograde paths from the 1st SB Assault if somehow the BATS behind it survive (i.e. Reserves). All of a sudden, a lot of attacking ships may not be able to retrograde to a position to slow down the Expedition. Then what? More new builds have to be diverted, taking more pressure off the Kzinti.

The Hydran's are going to get pummelled. The idea is to force the Coalition to deal with the Hydrans on the Hydran terms, as opposed to on the Coalition terms. Doing so buys the Kzinti time, and just one or two turns, is all the Kzinti need before the Federation entry and the support the Federation can provide.
Robert

Yes, the Klingons can win anywhere they like. The question becomes can they win everywhere, given that the Kzinti reserve fleets are unpinnable at this point. The Kzinti do not need to hold the Dukes SB or 1202 or 1105 or any number of Bats to assist the expedition - they need to hold one of them. Often this is 1105 - typically it is taken on turn 2 by the coalition, liberated on turn 2 by the alliance, and the coalition attempt to retake it on turn 3 is blocked by a Kzinti reserve (most people do not attack an already devastated planet with forces sufficient to deal with a reserve fleet). All I'm saying is that even if the coalition does take 1105 and reinforce it, there are other options.

By Robert Padilla (Zargan) on Wednesday, December 01, 2004 - 04:00 pm: Edit

John,

That may be true, but I know the way I play, if the Zin want to trade damage over a devistated planet with no fixed defenses, then I am happy to maul them for it. And that early in the game, yes they can win everywhere at once, after all it's only the Kzinti front at that point, very easy to be superior, even if the TBS and Turn 3 builds go south.

Craig,

I always send both the TBS and Turn 3 builds south, but that does not mean I am going Hydran first, it just allows me to stop the Expedition cold every time.

By Craig Tenhoff (Cktenhoff) on Wednesday, December 01, 2004 - 04:49 pm: Edit

Robert,

I found that when my brother did that in our last game, it gave my Kzinti some extra opportunities to do damage.

Not sure if that was an oddity due to my brother's deployment at the time, the additions from AO, or a combination of the two. Not enough data to draw a conclusion 😞

By Scott Tenhoff (Scottt) on Wednesday, December 01, 2004 - 05:10 pm: Edit

Well at the time, I was going to do the Turn 4 Smash-o-Rama on Hydrax.

David then losing our data, then me missing moving ships down there rebuilding the map, just ruined everything