I think using production override to build an extra SR is going to be a waist of EPs. The limit on off map survey ships is not changed, the override costs and extra 5 EP, and the most you gain out of the two extra turns of survey duty for that ship is 2 EP.

If you are close enough to picking up a new off map province that adding a single survey ship to your off map survey area could get you that province you're going to gain that province on next turn anyway without spending an extra 5 EP to get that survey ship early.

Also note that survey ships do not start producing survey points until the turn after they move to the survey form as all movement comes after survey in the SoP.

(542.21) ...the ship is moved by any legal movement system to the off map survey area of the owning race, then (on a later turn) moves to the separate survey ship record form.

True, but I just realized that if you use production overrides on your first turn of survey ship building, you save several years. This way you are effectively building survey ship #1, #3, and then one year later #2. So you really getting about 14ish survey points early. The thing is that you are moving up all surveyed provinces by 14ish survey points. So you get many of your provinces one turn early which means multiple bonuses of 2 EP. Now that I'm back at my computer and can redo my charts I'll make one last (I promise!) table of the Klingons starting from T1 (when they start building their survey ships). I think the final cost savings is worth it in a purely strategic sense (though tactically, it still might not make a good idea).

As to the Hydrans, the PGR has a YIS of Y174 which is turn 12, and the LNH-Q can start surveying in Y175 which is turn 14. Note that while the LNH-Q cannot survey before T14, there is nothing in the rules which prohibits its conversion on T13. Check it out: AO (525.23Q), pg. 23 top-right. So you can convert it on T13 in the Old Colonies, send it to the far outback on T13 and it can begin surveying
T14 (Y175). The problem with the PIC (Hydran CA-SR) is that it is only 3 EW and has fewer fighter factors than an NSC (so they aren't as useful in the free scout position). If you convert the PIC to a PIV, you can have: PIV + NEC + AH = 8 + 8 + 3 = 19 ComPot (which is the ComPot of 3xDD with the leader bonus). Now admittedly, you gain the 3 EW which may be (okay, is) extremely useful to the Hydrans. But 13+8 EP is a lot to pay for that ability.

Okay, Klingons and survey. The O part is using the override on T1. I think I made a mistake with the Klingon 3 survey ship province column, but it is fixed now. This table should accurately represent the following setup:

T1 - Buy 1st survey ship (5EP) and pay for slot (3 EP). 1st survey ship travels with base 2 survey ships to the Far Stars
T2 - Buy 2nd survey ship (5 EP), pay for 2nd slot (3 EP) and start surveying with 1st survey ship and 2 base survey ships.
T3 - 2nd Survey ship starts surveying.
T4 - Buy 3rd survey ship (5 EP), pay for 3rd slot (3 EP)
T5 - 3rd survey ship starts surveying.

In the case of the overrides you have:

T1 - Buy 2 survey ships (10 EP), pay for two slots (6 EP) and override (5 EP).
T2 - Both new and both original survey ships start surveying. Buy last survey ship (5 EP), pay for last slot (3 EP).
T3 - Last survey ship beings surveying.

Again, if I screwed up anything let me know.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>101.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>108.5</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>108.5</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>136.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>122.5</td>
<td>143.5</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>136.5</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>171.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>115.5</td>
<td>150.5</td>
<td>178.5</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
And here is the table I think that would be of most use to everyone. The "Is this worth it?" table. The following lists the incremental money you get for each level of surveying. One column is the same as before: the 1 survey ship vs. 0 survey ships. But now you can directly see the benefit of having 2 survey ships vs. 1 survey ship. The most distinctive part of this table is the diminishing returns. For example, buying one survey ship (8 EP total) nets you a total bonus of 86 EP by the end of the game. But buying a second survey ship only gets you an additional 68 EP (154 EP total vs. 0 extra survey ships). A third survey ship only gets you an extra 45 EP over having two additional survey ships. And overriding a survey ship on turn 1 and then producing your last survey ship on T2 nets you only an additional 14.5 EP over just waiting and building them on T1, T2, and T4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>1 vs. 0</th>
<th>2 vs. 1</th>
<th>3 vs. 2</th>
<th>3O vs. 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anybody want anything else?

I thought a survey ship cost more than 5EP?

I only put in the additional cost associated with making a cruiser into a survey ship. I figured everyone would build the cruiser anyway or use an existing cruiser. I did not take into account any loss from not having that cruiser in active service. I wasn't sure how to quantify the economic effects of that. I would rank the effect of loss of the cruiser from active service as:

High - Hydran, Romulan
Medium - Klingon, Lyran (DN building), Fed, Gorn
Low - Kzinti, Lyran (BC building)

if the Romulans can't build the PE (does that fall under the obsolete category?). I give the Kzinti a low because whenever I play my BC tend not to come out except for big battles because they get toasted otherwise. So they are mostly unused. The Klingons could be argued as high except that they have enough cruisers that they won't miss the variants until after the war with the Federation.

But as I said before, I don't know how to economically quantify this so I just left it out.

So... Late War, directing to *cripple* Romulan K-series ships. Effective, or just plain rude? I've also debated the purposeful directed crippling of FALs.

That is rude. Doesn't mean it's not effective though... 😊

If I need to direct on something because of overwhelming fighters, I will at least consider directing on the K-series ships. Especially since he is now in 50% exhaustion and every ep counts.

What are your best pursuit forces for a given race at:

1. Historical entry into the General War
2. Mid-GW (Y176 or earlier)
3. Late War (Y185 or earlier)

Sub-categories for the line items above:

a. Highest compot force
b. Specialty force (be creative - does not need to be high compot)

Ground rules:

- Units must be available for production
- Units must be eligible for pursuit
- No duplication of a specific ship type (no 6xDN, but DN and DNH are okay
- Must use existing ships only from F&E modules (2K,AO,CO,FO,PO,SO)
- Carriers or special ships must account for their escorts/consorts
- Prime teams, fighters & PFs can be used
- No battleships (too easy)

Use this format:

Lyran 3b: DNH, DNP+6xPF, STL, DNWP+6PF, CCX, NSR+SCP+6xPF, 3xPT = (108AF-106DF, 3EW, Capture PT)
Notes: Guaranteed pursuit; hard to kill; good EW; X-ship kills attrition units free, two maulers

I'm not sure that the example force is legal (see (307.22) and (FO-515.26)). Regardless,

Kzinti 3b: [ACS+HDW-e+DWE], BCX, CCX, CDX, 3xPT = (67AF-71DF, 2+4EW, Capture PT)
Notes: Gets the (523.392) persuit modifier, 15 free-replacement attrition factors, pretty good vs. direction, X-ships kill 3 attrition units free, counts as having 10-pt mauler, enemy non-X EW reduced by one point.

The historical Federation CVA escort group of two DE and one ECL does not mee the requirements of your pursuit force.

Trent, unless something has changed a CVA+ECL+2DE is a valid group.
No duplication of a specific ship type (no 6xDN, but DN and DNH are okay)

thus not allowing 2xDE

Chuck,
Can we make this:

>2. Mid-GW (Y176 or earlier)

Y177 or earlier?

There are a huge number of ships that role in at that time that are over shadowed by the X-ships of Y185 or less.

Ground rules (addenda -- ohhhh that word....):

- Exception: Historical carrier groups and unbreakable groups are permitted (how's that?)

Tim:

Sure - Chanfge to read:

'2. Mid-GW (Y177 or earlier)'

Kzinti Start of War:
a. DN,DNL,'TGC-VV+BCE',CC,TGC-BB
64 Compot, 6 fighters and 16 points of CEDSable damage can be taken, auto-pursuit success.
b. DN,DNL,TGC-BG,'TGC-VV+BCE',CD
60 Compot, 2 EW, G for capture attempt and plenty of damage absorbtion in the CV group.

PTs could be added to up Compot by 2 or 4, but I was assuming they didn't have any available at the start of the war.

Hydran Start of War:
a. PAL,LGE,LB,LM,TG+BP,DG
80 Compot, 23 fighters. Should not take any real damage in pursuit.
b. PAL,LGE,SRG,TG+BP,LB,LM
73 Compot, 2 EW, G for capture attempt and 23 fighters. The SRG could be vulnerable, so some minus points may be in order for the pursuit.

By Robert Padilla (Zargan) on Wednesday, May 30, 2007 - 01:46 pm: Edit

Kzinti Y176:
a. DN,DNL,CVH+MEC+DWE,BT, 2xPT
68 Compot, auto-pursuit and 8 fighters. Plenty of CEDSable damage if needed too. I seem to be having trouble breaking 68 Compot for the Zin.
b. DN,DNL,CSV+MEC+DWE,TGC+BG, 3xPT
60 Compot, 2 EW, a G for captures and 8 fighters. Auto pursuit and an extra PT just in case it's wanted.

Hydran Y176:
a. PAL,LGE,IC+MKE+DWE+DWE, 2xPT
83 Compot, 38 fighters. Auto-pursuit. Enough said
b. PAL,LGE,PIV,BT,RGR,PGG, 3xPT
73 Compot, 5 EW!, 2 G's for capture, auto-pursuit and 26 fighters. Extra PT just in case.

By Trent Telenko (Ttelenko) on Wednesday, May 30, 2007 - 02:26 pm: Edit

Robert,

This:

>'TGC-VV+BCE',

...is not legal.

CV tugs with six fighter factors require two escorts.

By Trent Telenko (Ttelenko) on Wednesday, May 30, 2007 - 02:37 pm: Edit

Gorn

Gorn Y177
Lizard DN Stampede!
DNH (16), DNT (14 Mauler), DNG (14 Marine), DN (14), DNC (13), DNL (11 Fast), 3xPT. 86 attack factors, Zero EW, and a capture PT

Notes: This force has 1) a DNT mauler with 14 directed damage points and a ship capture bonus, 2) Auto-pursuit thanks to the DNL, 3) A marine capture bonus thanks to the DNG, and 4) Zero EW, making it vulnerable to a -2 EW shift.

By Trent Telenko (Ttelenko) on Wednesday, May 30, 2007 - 02:56 pm: Edit

Federation Y171 Early Entry Pursuit Force
CVA, 2xE2A SWACs, ECL, 2xDE, CVL, DNL, 3xPT, MMG

This force has 63 attack factors/3EW, or 57 attack factors/6EW, with 67 defense factors.

Notes: This force has 1) Auto-pursuit, 2) 18 fighter factors, 3) variable EW up to 6EWP, 4) The prime team ship capture bonus, 5) a Marine Major General on the ECL to generate a marine combat ship capture bonus, and 6) the CVL is in the formation bonus position with the scout bonus versus directed damage attacks.

By Robert Padilla (Zargan) on Wednesday, May 30, 2007 - 03:18 pm: Edit

Doh, you're right! I've always thought that they counted as two ships unless escorted, but I thought they just needed one escort. Well then let's try this:

Kzinti Start of War:
a. DN,DNL,'TGC-BV+BCE',CC,TGC-BB
63 Compot, 3 fighters and 16 points of CEDSable damage can be taken, auto-pursuit success.
b. DN,DNL,TGC-BG,'TGC-BV+BCE',CD
59 Compot, 2 EW, G for capture attempt and plenty of damage absorption in the CV group.

By Robert Padilla (Zargan) on Wednesday, May 30, 2007 - 03:40 pm: Edit

Kzinti Late War:
a. 23rd Fi-Con,DNH,CCX,CDX,DN 2xPT
86 Compot, 8 EW, Auto-Pursuit with X-ships, 12 fighters and 12 PFs, and some attrition killing from the two X-ships.
b. DNH,CCX,BCS+HDWE+DWE,TGT-SG, 3xPT
69 Compot, 4 EW, G for captures, extra PT for captures, auto-pursuit, 3 fighters, 6 PFs and 23 points of CEDSable damage.

By Trent Telenko (Ttelenko) on Wednesday, May 30, 2007 - 03:44 pm: Edit

Federation Y185 Pursuit Force
CVBG Pursuit!

CVBG – [SCS, GVX, NAE, HDW-E, DWE], CX, plus 3xPT, MMG, Mega-F14, Mega-F18, Mega-A20, Mega-F111 Markers -- Attack Factors either 90 with 4 XEW, 3EW or 94 Attack factors, 1XEW, 3EW and 91 defensive factors

Notes:
1) Auto-pursuit due to X-ships,  
2) X-mauling via the CX,  
3) Mauler ship capture bonus,  
4) 1 enemy EW level reduction due to two X-ships,  
5) Two enemy attrition unit loses due to X-ships,  
6) Prime Team ship capture bonus,  
7) MMG provides Ground ship capture bonus while on NAE,  
8) 15 fighters, 19 heavy fighters to absorb general damage.

By John Robinson (John_R) on Wednesday, May 30, 2007 - 03:52 pm: Edit

Trent - 4 problems with that last group, though it may just all be a typo

1) You have 7 ships. I don't think a CVBG gets you around the 6 ship limit for pursuit.  
2) You have 3 carriers in the CVBG (SCS and 2xGVX)  
3) You have 2 GVX (only 1 allowed by rule)  
4) You have 2 GVX (no duplicates)

By Trent Telenko (Ttelenko) on Wednesday, May 30, 2007 - 04:01 pm: Edit

John,

Re-edited, see above.

By Dave Butler (Dcbutler) on Wednesday, May 30, 2007 - 04:58 pm: Edit

I'll point out that (321.42) prevents a MMG from functioning, unless you're somehow pursuing a base (OpBase from SO?). Also, some of the forces that have MMG also have 3xPT, and (522.43) indicates that a GCE and a PT aren't cumulative. Further, a number of the forces that use MMG suggest that his GCE be put on either (a) a ship with less than 7 offensive COMPOT (counter to (521.811)), or (b) an escort (which would cause it to lose its escort abilities, again by (521.811)), or both.

By Tim Losberg (Krager) on Wednesday, May 30, 2007 - 05:55 pm: Edit

Trent, also you need all X ships/fast for auto pursuit having X and non X gives you a +1 (auto for most purposes, but not if there was a rejected approach offer)

By Trent Telenko (Ttelenko) on Wednesday, May 30, 2007 - 06:19 pm: Edit

Dave,

You are correct. Rule (321.42) eliminates the use of MMG for pursuit.

And you are also correct that Prime teams and ground combat ships are not cumulative for a ship capture bonus.

Three rewrites are inbound.
By Trent Telenko (Ttelenko) on Wednesday, May 30, 2007 - 06:32 pm: Edit

(Gorn Y177)

Lizard DN Stampede!
DNH (16), DNT (14 Mauler), DNG (14 Marine), DN (14), DNC (13), DNL (11 Fast), 4xPT. 86 attack factors, Zero EW, and two capture PTs

Notes: This force has
1) The DNT is a mauler with 14 directed damage points or can modify a ship capture roll per (308.47),
2) Auto-pursuit is guaranteed thanks to the fast DNL,
3) This force has three additional capture bonuses. A (521.5) marine capture bonus thanks to the DNG and two (522.43) prime team capture bonuses. These bonuses are not cumulative, but more than one can be used, as the only one bonus can be used per destroyed ship,
4) Zero EW, making it vulnerable to a -2 EW shift.

By Trent Telenko (Ttelenko) on Wednesday, May 30, 2007 - 06:36 pm: Edit

(Federation Y171 Early Entry Pursuit Force)

CVA, 2xE2A SWACs, ECL, 2xDE, CVL, DNL, 4xPT

This force has 63 attack factors/3EW, or 57 attack factors/6EW, with 67 defense factors.

Notes: This force has
1) Auto-pursuit thanks to the fast DNL,
2) 18 fighter factors,
3) Variable EW up to 6EWP,
4) Two prime team (522.43) ship capture bonuses for two separate destroyed ship capture attempts,
5) The CVL is in the formation bonus position with the (308.52) “scout bonus” versus directed damage attacks.

By Trent Telenko (Ttelenko) on Wednesday, May 30, 2007 - 06:43 pm: Edit

(Federation Y185 Pursuit Force)

CVBG Pursuit!

CVBG – [SCS, GVX, NAE, HDW-E, DWE], CX, plus 4xPT, MMG, Mega-F14, Mega-
F18, Mega-A20, Mega-F111 Markers -- Attack Factors either 90 with 4 XEW, 3EW or 94 Attack factors, 1XEW, 3EW and 91 defensive factors

Notes:
1) Auto-pursuit due to X-ships,
2) X-mauling via the CX
3) CX has Mauler ship capture bonus (308.47) modifyer for a single destroyed enemy ship if not used for mauling.
4) 1 enemy EW level reduction due to two X-ships,
5) Two enemy attrition unit loses due to X-ships,
6) Two prime team (522.43) ship capture bonuses for two separate destroyed ship capture attempts,
7) 15 fighters, 19 heavy fighters to absorb general damage.

By Michael Lui (Michaellui) on Thursday, May 31, 2007 - 03:19 am: Edit

Hydran 1a: Pal, LGE, LB, LM, DG, Tug+BP, 3PTs. (84AF-82DF, Capture PT)
Notes: Guaranteed pursuit, 23 fighters to absorb losses.

Hydran 1b. Pal, LGE, LB, LM, Tug+BP, SRG, 2 PTs. (77AF-81DF, 2 EW, Capture PT)
Notes: Guaranteed pursuit, 23 fighters to absorb losses. (81 DF because they will have to direct on the SRG to C/K it.)

Note: This is the same as Zargans but with PTs in it. (You can only do so much at the start of the war.)

Hydran 2a: Pal, LGE, [IC, MKE, NEC, DWE], 3 PTs (85AF-96DF, Capture PT)
Notes: Guaranteed pursuit; hard to kill; 40 fighters to absorb losses! (You need a STL and 24 damage points to kill anything except a DWE in this force.)

Hydran 3a: LBX, REG, [IC, MKE, NEC, DWE], 3 Mega Fighters for the IC, 4 PTs (93AF-96DF, Capture PT, Mauler)
Notes: Guaranteed pursuit; hard to kill; 36 fighters to absorb losses. (You need an X-ship and 30 damage points to kill anything except a DWE in this force.)

2b and 3b: The Hydrans can't make up for the loss of the Pal/REG in trade for a ground combat ship when a PT will do the job just as well. They also can't bring along enough EW to make the trade of ~13 AF worth a 1 shift difference. (80x.25=20//93x.225=21)

By Michael Lui (Michaellui) on Thursday, May 31, 2007 - 03:35 am: Edit

Trent

The GVX is a medium CV and requires 2 escorts. It only counts as a single ship
CV on raids.

Micheal,

F111 CV's can act as single ship carriers for most purposes starting in Y180.

See Rule (527.21 FO).

Before too many people go overboard on PT, note that only three can function (2 for COMPOT, 1 for capture). See sixth sentence of (533.41) and the last sentence of (522.43).

Did everyone miss Ted's note about needing all 'fast' ships for auto pursuit? Or did someone counter it and I missed the post?

No, we're just ignore that fact because we're figuring this pursuit is after a battle in the hex and we're chasing down a few cripples. In this case 6 ships with a fast one included automatically catches the retreating cripples (and escorting warships). Otherwise pursuing a full fleet with 6 ships is a REALLY bad idea.

Missed that one. Thanks.

Romulan 3b:
(a.k.a. "Firehawks, ho!")
FHX, FHF, FHP, [FHU+BHF+FHM], 3xPT
= 57-56(8H6)~1 EW or 53-56(8H6)~2 EW
Notes: +1 on persuit; X-mauler; three (!) capture chances (308.47); PT bonus on one capture attempt; good vs. directed damage.

If you modified the Hydran 2b line to:

[IC + MKE + LNH-E + NEC + DWE] plus LGE, you'd have a force which makes it impossible to kill or even flip anything worth-while since the only single ship is in the form bonus. Now, if you're going the psy-ops route I would actually suggest:

LGE along with [IC + MKE + LNH-E + NEC + AH] because while you may drop another 3 compot (1 damage) the frustration and hopelessness on your opponent's face is reward enough.
True, but depending on what he has crippled, and how many, I'd prefer the extra 9+ compot to try to maximize the damage output on the retreating force.

If he only had 1-2 cripples I might go with your suggestion (if I pursued at all), but if he has 8+ cripples he probably can't do enough damage to kill the Paladin without catastrophic damage on the rest of his ships.

And the AH suggestion is a nice touch.

---

Kzinti Y185 Pursuit Force

CCX, BCX, CDX, DCS, HDW-E, DWE, 3xPT, Mega-fighter marker
73 Compot, 2 EW, 4 X-EW

1) Auto-pursuit due to X-ship/Fast Ship die bonus,
2) X-mauling via the CX,
3) Mauler ship capture bonus for X-ships,
4) 1 enemy EW level reduction due to two X-ships,
5) Three enemy attrition unit loses due to X-ships,
6) Prime Team ship capture bonus,
7) Seven fighters, six PFs to absorb general damage.

---

Tholian Y185 Pursuit Force

DDX, DHW, DH, DP, NCV, CWE, DDE, 3xPT, Megafighter marker
70-74 Compot, 0 EW

1) Two Webcasters in Formation or CV group provide;
   ..a) A cumulative -1 ship capture bonus
   ..b) A 50% reduction in one enemy ship Compot
   ..c) A +2 compot increase
2) Snare refit for CWE
3) X-ship auto-pursuit bonus
4) Eight points of X-mauling
5) Prime team capture bonus
6) Six fighter factors

---

Tholian Y177 Pursuit Force

58 Compot, 0 EW

1) One Prime Team ship capture bonus
2) 12 fighter factors for general damage

Your Y185 Tholian force has 7 ships in it.

Hence why it's so good - how many opponents would notice it

Also, it increases the usage of all those under used counters? How many other players have well worn Fed and Klingon counters - and unpunched Tholians

Good catch though and your correct!

Whoops!

Corrected force below:

Tholian Y185 Pursuit Force

DDX, DHW, DP, NCV, CWE, DDE, 3xPT, Megafighter marker
70-74 Compot, 0 EW

1) Two Webcasters in Formation or CV group provide;
   ..a) A cumulative -1 ship capture bonus
   ..b) A 50% reduction in one enemy ship Compot
   ..c) A +2 compot increase
2) Snare refit for CWE
3) X-ship auto-pursuit bonus
4) Eight points of X-mauling
5) Prime team capture bonus
6) Six fighter factors

Early war Romulan Historical F173+

Tricksy Rommies or Something for Everyone:
CON, SUP, SHR, KRM, KC9R, DMH with SpC and SkG modules, 3xPT.

Compot = 77~1 EW or 70~4 EW
1) Fast ship
2) Mauler capture bonus
3) Marine capture bonus  
4) PT capture bonus  
5) smallest hull is a 10 for hostile directing  
6) 4 fighters  
7) 1-4 EW

why not replace the Condor and KC9R with two more SUPs...Compot of group goes up 1 and you now have 12 fighters instead of 4.

Because in Y173 you may not have 3 SUPs. By Y175 that should be easy enough to do though.

Rules of the competition, naturally. ;-)

-no duplication of a specific ship type. 27MAY07 12:30PM Chuck Strong

Many of these alliance pursuit forces are very poor. They are assuming pursuit against a weak coalition fleet, about 60 compot or less with no mauler.

For instance, including a Hydran DG in a pursuit force is a dodgy business. Coalition has a mauler, and only needs 12 to kill it, which will make you pursuit somewhat phryrric. Good coalition players have a bad habit of making sure pursued forces have maulers. This is especially the case since these are *optimal* pursuit forces, which are therefore likely to be pursuing dangerous fleets.

The coalition of course do not have this problem until alliance X-ships come into play. At that point however, pursuit forces should be adjusted as appropriate.

Killing the DG would be 14 points unless your mauler is the STL. But you're right that pursuing a force with a mauler is dangerous.

It has never made sense that a retreating force can use maulers without penalty. If the mauler turns around and dumps as much power through the mauler it is going to be going the wrong way with no power for defense. SFG ships die when used by a retreating force. I think a similar rule should be in effect for maulers. Perhaps if a retreating mauler shocks it dies outright (role for possible capture in addition to any other capture role).

I agree, Daniel - though I'd go one step further, saying the mauler can be dirdam'd at 1:1. Sacrifice the mauler for the pursuing cruiser, and hope they don't
kill anything else. If the pursuers don't kill the mauler (going after other targets), *and* you don't shock, then the mauler can turn and get out of there, barely.

---

By Daniel G. Knipfer (Dgknipfer) on Monday, June 18, 2007 - 08:40 pm: Edit

The only reason I didn't give the 1:1 dirdam is the Mauler is probably going to try to avoid getting in the middle and would only be an easy kill if it shocks. If it shocks it is easy to kill or capture, but otherwise is still a moving ship, unlike an SFG that has to park.

---

By David Slatter (Davidas) on Wednesday, June 20, 2007 - 05:36 pm: Edit

It may be unrealistic, but right now, that mauler in the retreat fleet is very dangerous. Especially as you will have to be fantastically lucky to kill it, assuming you did not have better targets anyway.

---

By Grant Strong (Phoenix) on Tuesday, June 26, 2007 - 03:37 pm: Edit

Romulan Pursuit Force Y182
{DMH-E-C + MGH-M} + ROC(form box) + CNH + KC9 + FHX + 3xPrime
120 Compot, 1EW
116 Compot, 4EW
Special: Auto Pursuit, No Shock Mauler, +1 to capture from Prime Team, 1 Killed Attrition, and 1 less of opponents EW, 36 points of PFs to absorb damage.

---

By Michael Lui (Michaellui) on Wednesday, June 27, 2007 - 01:36 am: Edit

Sorry, but your Romulan force is calculated wrong.

1. The difference between 1 EW and 4 EW is 8 AF, not 4. (AO, page 65)

2. The opponent doesn't lose any EW points until there are 2 X-ships present. (AO, page 19, 523.381)

3. I get 110 AF at 4 EW and 118 AF at 1 EW. Where is the extra 2 AF coming from?
36 PT
4 PT
2 DMH
12 MGH
15 CNH
14 KC9
14 FHX
13 ROC

---

By Grant Strong (Phoenix) on Wednesday, June 27, 2007 - 01:50 am: Edit

Edited:
Y183
DMH-E-C + ROC + CNH + KC9 + FHX + K7X
120 Compot, 1EW
112 Compot, 4EW
Special: Auto Pursuit, No Shock Mauler, +1 to capture from Prime Team, 2 Killed
Attrition, and 1 less of opponents EW, 36 points of PFs to absorb damage.

By Michael Lui (Michaellui) on Wednesday, June 27, 2007 - 02:20 am

*AHEM*

You forgot to list your 3 PTs.

By Grant Strong (Phoenix) on Wednesday, June 27, 2007 - 02:30 am

Version 3:
Y183
DMH-E-C + ROC + CNH + KC9 + FHX + K7X+3 Prime Team
120 Compot, 1EW
116 Compot, 4EW
Special: Auto Pursuit, No Shock Mauler, +1 to capture from Prime Team, 1 Killed
Attrition, and 1 less of opponents EW, 36 points of PFs to absorb damage.

By Michael Lui (Michaellui) on Wednesday, June 27, 2007 - 02:32 am

You could have just edited your post. Your 4 EW Compot needs to be readjusted
to 112 and your "-" attrition factor needs adjusting too.

By Greg Ernest (Grege) on Wednesday, June 27, 2007 - 09:54 am

Michael: one can only edit one's posts for 30 minutes on this BBS.

By Joe Stevenson (Alligator) on Wednesday, June 27, 2007 - 11:42 am

Greg,

that's 1 hour

By Grant Strong (Phoenix) on Wednesday, June 27, 2007 - 11:59 am

lol, one of these times I'll actually get it right.
Version 3:
Y183
DMH-E-C + ROC + CNH + KC9 + FHX + K7X+3 Prime Team
120 Compot, 1EW
112 Compot, 4EW
Special: Auto Pursuit, No Shock Mauler, +1 to capture from Prime Team, 2 Killed
Attrition, and 1 less of opponents EW, 36 points of PFs to absorb damage.

By John Robinson (John_R) on Wednesday, June 27, 2007 - 02:02 pm

Hey, look at that! Grant is awake before noon!

Edit: Wait - its even more shocking. Before 10:00am (I forgot he is on Mountain
time)
After seeing such a line it's difficult to admit that Romulans have a problem. ;-)

Nothing that can't be fixed with a 12-step program.

I don't know. Reducing conversion cost by 11 EP is asking for a bit much.

Heh, the problem with that line is there is just two years of war left. By this point, against whom are the Roms going to be victorious and get to use a pursuit force?

Sorry that I got in on this late.

Fed 185 Super Pursuit Force:
DLM(H), [SCS+GVX+DDX+HDW(E)+DWE+E3SWAC], 2 Prime Teams, 7 points of Megafighters.

This force has 44 fighters, a 4-point scout that is _very_ hard to kill, -1 EW to the enemy force, kills 2-points of attrition units without their contributing to the damage absorbed, and 10-points of X-ship Mauling.

There are several problems with your force and its' write-up.

1. Put in the total compot so everybody doesn't have to go look it up.

2. The SCS needs 3 escorts. You only have 2 as the DDX is escorting the GVX as per 523.352 because it cannot escort the SCS.

3. The DDX does NOT count for any X-ship bonuses as 523.352 eliminates them in the last 6 words of the rule.

4. You also can't maul from inside a CV group.

The GVX can not be escorted by non X ships.

As part of a CVBG it would be escorted by non X ships so it is not allowed in the CVBG.
Nick already ruled that the GVX can be part of a CVBG as a single ship carrier, as any other F111 carrier can be after Y180.

Ahmed,

Note as well that the Federation DLM(H) is an A20 CV. All A20 carriers require escorts per the relevant subsections in rule (532.0).

By Ahmad Abdel-Hameed (Madarab) on Sunday, September 16, 2007 - 01:05 pm: Edit

Michael, I'll post my revised response after I get a question answered by Nick.

Sorry for the delay.

Trent, while the DLM(H) is indeed an A20 CV, I think that you may be incorrect in this particular case. There are two specific examples of A20 carriers that can operate unescorted in the NHA and NVA (taken from the SIT). In addition to the DML(H)'s specific case, the rules for the HDW(H) (525.23H) are linked to the rule for the HDW(V) (525.23V) which specifically allow them to operate as single-ship carriers. The DML ought to operate in all ways as the HDW does. Am I reading and interpreting this situation correctly?

By Dale Lloyd Fields (Dylkha) on Sunday, September 16, 2007 - 04:39 pm: Edit

Um, guys. I have looked through every single SIT that I have and I can't find the DLM. What expansion is it in?

By Jason E. Schaff (Jschaff297061) on Sunday, September 16, 2007 - 05:45 pm: Edit

It was in a CL. I'll check after dinner to see which one. Basically a conjectual Fed DNL with DWH modular capability.

Cheers,
Jason

By Jason E. Schaff (Jschaff297061) on Sunday, September 16, 2007 - 06:32 pm: Edit

CL27 for the DLM.

Factors: 10-11 F (1) / 6 + HDW module (any except escort)
Sub for DN for 18 EP, convert from DNL for 3 EP
Command 9; available Y180

The associated SFB MSC lists the ship as both UNV and CJ.

Cheers,
Jason

By Ahmad Abdel-Hameed (Madarab) on Sunday, September 16, 2007 - 06:51 pm: Edit

Dale, I was going by the on-site Adobe SIT that's in the forums here.
Michael, I should not expect immediate gratification from Nick. He'll get to it when he can. I would certainly entertain any reasonable argument from you or anyone else about what rules prohibit the GVX from using its special X-ship powers while part of a carrier group or more specifically in this example part of a combined 3rd-Way carrier group.

"Must use existing ships only from F&E modules (2K, AO, CO, FO, PO, SO)"

Thanks. I was going a little crazy wondering why I didn't remember it or couldn't find it.

Peter, you are awesome! I haven't gotten SO and I thought that I heard that it was there. I'll revise it further based on that.

Ahmed,

See Rule (527.21) NVH in FO. It states:

"All carriers of A20s must be escorted as carriers at all times."

That is as definitive as you can get.

Interestingly enough, that re-post you put in the Q+A section says it can be part of a CVBG that only consists of 2 ships. The GVX and another CV. Either a single ship CV so they will not need any escorts, or a regular CV that will take extra command slots for the missing escorts. Either way that's a VERY vulnerable CVBG.

I seem to be talking to you a lot today, Trent. lol That rule does not apply to the GVX which carries F-111s. Even so, that rule and the SIT seem to completely contradict each other in the cases of the NHA and NVA.
The F111 carrier rules state that those carriers are PFT's with no escorts or medium carriers with escorts starting in Y180. This makes them reliably nasty single ship raiders, IMO.

The GVX CVBG ruling was not quite as I thought, which Micheal pointed out.

The A20 thing is separate and -- I think -- in a very confusing location.

The one nice thing about it is that a DLM(H) can be escorted by two adhoc fast ships if you really want a fast CV group.

Use a CF and a DDF as escorts (3-7) and (2-6) escorts and have at it. You have 25 compot for three ships.

You could even double that up with the DVL and the same escorts in a CVGB.

Michael

_____________________________
Quote kay here is a breakdown of the Kzinti starting OOB and builds through turn 4. It maxs out Escort builds, but I honestly do pursue that strategy myself as the Kzinti and think its a prudent thing to do. I only included the CV's Escorts and things that are likely to be converted to escorts. I did not include CL's as I almost ALWAYS sub them for 2xFF (need that hull count) but I didn't up the FF count on turns with a CL either. From this you will need to consider how many of these ships might have gotten killed to have a reasonable idea of what the Kzinti have available starting A5.

Starting Kzinti OOB
5xCV 4xCVL 5xCVE 3 sets of CV pods
6xCLE
14xEFF
7xFF
4xFFK
2xFR

T1 Builds
CVL -> CV
1xFCR
1xEFF
2xFFK
1xFF

T2 Builds
[CV MEC EFF]
MEC
2xFKE
FF -> FFK

T3 Builds
[CV MEC EFF]
2xMEC
2xFKE
1xFFK
2xFF

T4 Builds
[CV MEC EFF]
3xMEC 2xFKE 1xFFK 2xFF

Total Hulls Available A5
9xCV
3xCVL
5xCVE
3xCV-Tug
3xFCR
6xCLE
9xMEC
18xEFF
6xFKE
7xFFK
12xFF

Now the Kzinti will have lost some light escorts during the preceding turns, perhaps even a CLE or MEC also. Although some of the CL's that began the game paired with CV's would have been converted during repair to CLE's most likely.

What is reasonable to assume to have lost T1-4? I don't know but there are plenty of hulls here to maintain an attrition battle with the Coalition as I have outlined above. 15 heavy escorts 24 light escorts 9 CV's and enough CVL CVE FCR and CV Tugs to keep spare fighters.

And if one is forced putting FF's in place of EFF's is an option, it just hurts loosing the escort bonus when you do that.

The problem I see is that you only have 12 heavy carriers in your whole
production line, even if you never lose one (at some point the Coalition will get lucky) Let's assume 12 heavy's and 3 CVLs. Even with stuffed lines the most number of battles you can fight is 6-7 and still have a full force. Even worse is you don't have a lot of staying power.

What I mean is if you go into a long battle assuming 2 CVs in the line like you suggest against the coalition you can go 10-11 rounds before everyone of your carriers is missing an escort. This is why the Klingons are not aggressively going up against you on your turn. He doesn't have to, you have limited your carrier groups and limited the number of offensive places you can attack.

In this case I would not try to CEDS you like my tac note suggest because you are limiting the size of your own fleet well enough for me.

Most Kzinti players I have seen maximize their carrier production (ie 2 CV/turn and maybe the CVE depending on cash) So after initial OOB of 5 CVs they will have another 8 CVs by C5 plus the tugs that they sub for BCs once per year (You make the tug sub so you can get all those unique hulls from all the Captains Log tac notes which are too numerous to mention).

This is why I didn't think you could have many extra MECs because you have only 2/3rds the number of CVs and 1/2 the Tugs I assumed.

A Kzinti with 13 heavy CVs and 4 Tug-C and 3 Tug-Ts in its fleet can really cause a lot of panic for the Coalition. With only 9 CVs and 3 tugs you don't make the coalition worry about their SBs with a medium size fleet and a reserve fleet or two, the coalition can handle you at a SB.

In one of the Captains Logs there is a tacnote on using your wet navy fleet (BCs, CMs, DDs etc) on your turn and the Carrier fleet on the Coalition turns this way you can stay on the map easier.

Lastly, my note was specifically about helping the coalition fight a few rounds on a more even footing. Example: Any Kzinti carrier fleet it doesn't matter the specific content, comes out an attacks a province garrison or a ship at one of the non capital planets. Typically a reserve fleet moves there or a fleet can react to the hex. Again it doesn't matter the composition of the coalition fleet, this battle is normally one or two rounds long, so the kzinti fleet shoots up the coalition fleet letting the damage fall. So then the coalition either directs at 50% or lets the damage fall and the Kzinti burns their fighters. So all I was saying is that now the Kzinti has to direct on something he doesn't really want to (whether you can raid them or not is not the issue). It is just a way to mitigate the amount of damage that the coalition has to take.
I do make the maximum number of TUG-C I just didn't include them as I was speaking of CV's and I only mentioned I had three Pods. I believe at this time I would have 3xTG-T and 4xTG-C perhaps one more TG-C it depends its late 😊.

I thought I was doing pretty good getting one CV out a turn. I cannot imagine scraping together the funds to get a second out. In the game I am currently playing I actually have one more CVL as instead of converting a CVL I converted a BC into a CV.

Maybe I go too heavy into conversions. I converted 4 BC's into CD's and 2 BC's into BF. I cannot recall the other conversions I did, but its in my AAR 'Two guys blowin' stuff up'

I am also building 4xPDU every turn. I would love to see your builds where your managing 2xCV a turn.

Although your TT building PGB's I was thinking on my drive home from work (and someone had poseted it also) that if you plopped all four on one planet it would be ALOT harder to kill them because you could stack your line and get MUCH higher compot by not having to spread your stuff out. Then I would be concerned about you getting to the hvy escorts and crippling them.

---

**By Michael Parker (Protagogus) on Thursday, December 06, 2007 - 03:23 am:**

> even with stuffed lines the most number of battles you can fight is 6-7 and still have a full force. Even worse is you don't have a lot of staying power.

---

I only need to stay 4 rounds (1 for every TT you have setting up a ground base) plus if you put up a mauler that I can DD add a round for that.

You will kill an EFF/FKE every round I stay. On the rounds I try and DD a mauler it will get nasty as I will be dialing up my BIR to try and assure 28 damage out of my 84 compot line (if you put up a mauler I will dial in the DBF to up my Compot by 8) meaning I will need 35%.

I will be looking at bringing in 9xCV's for my lines. 3xCVL 5xCVE 2xCV-Tug (one was likely used to CV raid) and 3xFCR for 57 spare fighters. I don't plan on
having to stay more than one round in each of 4 battles to kill your TT setting up the base. But I want to be able to kill a mauler if it shows up so I will need the extra CV group. When I am just killing a TT I will be picking most likely BIR 1 to minimize my damage, I just want to score the 14-18 points to direct your TT and not give you enough to cripple an entire CV group. You will kill the outer escort I will take the rest on fighters.

It will get interesting in battles where you bring maulers however that will be fun (by fun I mean intense... if you've seen the movie 'The Good, The Bad, and the Ugly' remember the final gunfight where they are all waiting for one guy to flinch!

Although I admit my thoughts had been predicated upon you building in 4 separate locations. I THINK it would be harder if you built all 4 in one place, then you could stack your line and put up higher compot without... Mmmm wait I just realized something. if you put all 4 TT's in one place they would all have to be on the line.. and they DO count against CR so you would lose 4 ship slots.. so maybe that isn't a good idea *ponders* I need bed.

Hopefully we can continue this

By David Slatter (Davidas) on Thursday, December 06, 2007 - 06:17 am

Michael

Who says the Zin will get the compot to kill a mauler? When that mauler comes up, the Zin will be seeing a line like this AT THE MINIMUM, assuming that the Zin are on the offensive, and trying to kill a base.
And yes, coalition reserves generally are that good when they are saving bases.

C8(adm)-3D7C-D6M-D5S-[6 ind fighters][3D5-3F5L] BATS. {D6S scout}

124 compot, 8EW, but more likely 121 compot 9EW to get a 2-shift on you.

Say you have..
DN(adm), 3 times[CV-MEC-EFF], 2CC {TGT-SP}
110 compot, 4EW

Pretty much optimal turn 4.

And you choose BIR4? Bad move buddy. Because the Klingons might choose BIR4. And 40% is now very possible for the klingons, which will vaporise one of your CV groups. Sure, you will probably get the mauler back, but the opportunities to get his mauler without losing CV group are not certain. You want about BIR 4. The klingons will try to get you 2(no mauler or BATS killed) or 8 (dead CV group).
If you pack your CV groups, only fielding 2 and accept a little lower compot, then the coalition is ok with that as well. They go for your DN instead. Basically, attacking a Klingon BATS is an ugly business until those CVAs come along. And note those klingon lines have no lyran help, or any stasis ships. One stasis ship there, and you are in all sorts of trouble.

Another point - both you and the klingons will eb playing minus point games in the approach battles if there are any. That usually favours the klingons who have more "spare" CCs or so to overcrible and get -8, while your "spares" tend to be DDs and CLs, only overcripling for -5. You certainly won't want to overcriple a CC, as it will get killed when you retreat.

By Michael Parker (Protagoras) on Thursday, December 06, 2007 - 12:51 pm; Edit

Well hopefully they won't have a BATS up. I mean its possible, but this is predicated upon 1401 right after the capitol falls. I am assuming he doesn't have a BATS up.

I need 28 Damage to direct the Mauler.

I won't KNOW the Mauler is up so I am using lines like I have said

DN (form)
SC (free)
[CV MEC CLE FKE]
[CV MEC CLE EFF]
Ind Fighte Squadron
CVL (support echelon for Inf Fighters)
CVE (see CVL above)
DF (DBF line)
DF (DBF Line)

I will dial the DF up since I see a Mauler. So that will give me 84 Compot and 1EW

His line remember will have to include the Theatre Transport setting up the ground base. He also said it will be mostly Lyran's defending here. So I will use a Lyran line.

DN+ADM BC BC BC STT CW CW CW DW DW DW DWT {DWS}
This will give the coalition 96 compot and 2EW

Now some of the TT's will be crippled from raids, but I am saying he puts his mauler where he isn't crippled and where he has the heavier DWT's as opposed to FFT's.
I am looking for 28 Damage to kill that STT. EW is even. Here he is looking for 44 with his mauler to cripple the smaller CV group.

I will need 35% to kill the mauler where the coalition will need 50% to score enough to cripple the CV group. I really didn' concoct this I just took something reasonable for a Coalition line. Let's say he gets a 98 point line so he only needs 45% to kill my CV group I am sure he would know what he needs to score and would form his line appropriatly (would need 102 to make 42.5%)

Even picking BIR 4 there is very little chance he will score to cripple the CV group. without a VBIR + he cannot score it. if VBIR +1 he has to roll a 6 with VBIR +2 5 or 6. I can make it worse by picking 3 then he needs a 6 on the VBIR and 6 on his roll 1 in 36 chance. Assuming he picks 4 (he might try and psych me but that seems unlikely, he wants to kill my CV group I am here really to kill his DWT and get the Mauler if I can.)

So with BIR 7 that is a 50% shot to kill the mauler. If not I kill the DWT. His mauler still might shock which causes problems in a multi-hex system as the cripples can be directed on at 3-1 I believe.

Yeah he might roll box cars (well he won't throw both die at once but ya know what I mean) and cripple the CV group. But I will take a 2.78% chance at a crippled CV group in order to have a 50% chance at his mauler.

I assume your thinking I am attacking a BATS. I am not doing that at all not over the Kzinti Capitol, if we have to go there then we need to talk about how I can stop the TUG from setting up a MB which I think would be VERY hard in 1401.

Michael,

No, I am talking about your general philosophy not the battle at the capital now. This is why your opponent is not aggressively reacting to your forces. You can only effectively attack for so many rounds on each combat phase. So 9 CVs are really not enough to require a lot of coalition forces, they will pop your capital and then hold it. But won't necessarily care where you attack they should have enough to keep you from taking any hex they may want to keep.

As to making 2 CV groups per turn is not that difficult build the one by sub and then convert either the CVL(most likely) or a BC as your major conversion. The biggest expense is the fighters 12 EP. Also most of us don't make extra escort conversions except to replace destroyed escorts. I have generally use CEDS retro grades and only replace the escorts on the heavy CVs. I never replace CVE or unconverted CVL escorts that I steal for the Heavies.

What I was saying about if you attack a BATS or a SB which often is a counter
attack target for the Kzinti. This is because of an FRD park at the SB or a Lyran BATS upgrading to a SB. You will have a tough time winning the approach battle if you overstuff the CVs. If you don't overstuff you can possibly win the approach but in the first battle coalition may just let the damage fall, forcing you to CEDS your own CVs damaging 1 or 2 CVs. David's battle force above is not unusual although I don't normally feed the fighters up (because the D5s and can take the damage or the Kzinti Directs on something a Mauler if it is in the line or a CC if not). I know your going to talk about raids but there are enough ways to stop the raids or at least mitigate there effect to force you to come into these hexes.

After you hit that one hard target you won't have the heavy Compot to force another large battle. This is bad for the Hydrans and even worse for the Feds as you are not pinning down enough coalition forces. And too many coalition hulls make it to T7, which could make Fed capital extremely vunerable to capture.

The standard Coalition attack is the Molasses attack, which forces the Kzintis to fight more battles than he can afford. This is an old tactic, but I feel it is one of the best, where the Coalition attacks everywhere so that the Kzinti player generally loses 10-12 hulls per turn (because of the SB and Capital assaults). I have even seen a player just direct on the Kzinti fleet for the first 6 turns (he won the game for the Coalition I was the Gorns and was the only alliance player to not lose his Cap). He was able to weaken the Kzinti enough to delay their counter attack until the Fed were under siege.

The heavy CVs are the back bone of your fleet giving up an opportunity to build or substitute for one seems like a sin to me. If anyone else has ideas about how many CVs the Kzinti needs I would appreciate their comments.

By Michael Parker (Protagoras) on Friday, December 07, 2007 - 09:31 am: Edit

Ed,

Okay if we are onto a different sort of topic, that is cool as it is one I would like to hear your thoughts on.

Could you please show me some example builds where your building all you can, and managing a CVL->CV conversion every turn also?

I am building a CV every turn, and saving the CVL's if my capitol falls, I expect to be able to convert the CVL's then its a 4+4 but I might be able to swing it.

With spending 28ep every turn for 4xPDU, and converting two drone ships (I feel I need those) and a fast cruiser (I also need those) I just didn't have the cast to convert the CVL. And with 9 CV's I honestly feel I barely have the escorts I need if I convert every one I can.

I feel I HAVE to get both the MEC and the FKE's out at max levels to stiffen my
CV groups. I also build the BCE but that is a 1pt conversion.

I also want it to be made clear, my tactic of overstuffing all the CV groups was when I wanted to try and avoid as best as possible loosing anything when I was smashing TT's setting up Ground Bases. I don't ALWAYS overstuff, and yes it would be VERY hard to win a determined approach battle at a SB with overstuffed CV's without both an Admiral and Command point. I think I could use both to get three overstuffed CV's into my BattleForce.

Normally I would run a CV group with only two escorts so I could get three of them onto the line. with the 9 CV's and 3 TG-C+2xVP that gives me a dozen credible CV groups. The CVL's and CVE's play at glorified FCR's as well as the 3xFCR's I have. and the FCR's will sub in as emergency escorts of the battle really requires it. This gives me not inconsequential staying power even for a battle over a BATS or SB to kill FRD's.

But I am VERY interested in your economics for getting the 2xCV's built every turn. As believe me if I thought I could afford it I would do it. Building 1xCV I am using all my FFF and cutting close on EP's every turn.

You can check out my builds in the 'From the Front' topic there is a thread 'Two Guys blowin' stuff up a GW AAR' if you want to see what I have been building and comment.

---

Ok, here are 3 Zin builds in the context of an enemy concentrating on hydrans (but not overmuch). and also killing Zin escorts. (NB the lastest expansion was not in play)

1) Builds TGC,FF,FFK,FCR,2EFF,LAS,4PDU,extra pol
   BC+CL+FF->CV+CLE+FFK
   2BC->2CD
   BC+CL+FF->BCE+CLE+EFF
   2CL->2CLE

2) Builds TGC,2MEC,3FF,FKE,FFK,DDV,2PDU,2PGB
   CVL->CV
   2BC->2CD
   EFF->FKE

3) Builds FFK,FKE,5EFF,3FF,CM,2MEC
   CVL+CM+FF->CV+MEC+FKE

As you can see, I was having trouble escorting my existing carriers, let alone having enough for new carriers. And yes, I subbed an FF for a CV!
Okay here are my builds from my GW game. There are problems as I didn't properly check the YIS date for the FKE and started building them straight away, I also think I sometime needed to convert when I subbed but that is a minor problem as I had the extra conversion facilities I just wrote it as a substitution. I have a tentative T3 Kzinti build at home on paper but it still might change.

**Turn 1**

**Builds**
- TGC sub BC
- DD
- 2xFKE sub 1xCL
- 2xFF (1 built at 1704)
- 4xPDU (capitol)

**Conversions**
- 2x BC->CD (1 ea Dukes Counts)
- BC->CV (Homeworld)
- BC->BCE (Marquis)
- FF->FCR (Marquis)
- FF->FFK (Marquis)
- BC->BF (Baron)

**Turn 2**

**Builds**
- [CV MEC FKE] sub BC CM FF
- MEC sub CM
- 2xDD
- FKE FFK sub 2xFF
- 4xPDU (Capitol)

**Conversions**
- BC->CD 1304
- BC->CD 1706
- BC->BF Baron’s SB

With this build there is just no way to get the 4+4 for a CVL conversion. Turn 1 I had to convert a BC to a CV as my major conversion and unless I gave up the once a year Tug substitution I had to sub out my one BC slot. I could have overbuilt a BC and converted it into a CV to get a second but my Lord that seems fiscal insanity. I suppose I could have not produced the TUG-C but they are so versatile. I would also love to make an FCR every turn that is allowed, but I don't have the money. Heck an extra FCR every turn is almost as good as an extra CV, as it allows you to replenish the CV's fighter group, and emer sub for the lost light
escort allowing me to put the CV group up another round.

As it is I would also like to do another round of CD's (or some CLD's) and a BF but Turn 3 looks too lean to afford even a single conversion of those three. CD's and BF's are nice to have, but not at the expense of PDU's MEC's FKE's or parts of my build schedule. I should be able turn 3 to do a CV group, 4xPDU (to get the capitol to 20) my FKE's all the other CM's to MEC's and build the rest of my schedule including a Tug-C substitution.

The Coalition didn't raid your cap on C3? Is he focusing on the Hydrans (lots of ships to block the expedition)? If not you probably have won the war. Even with the Roms improvement they need support and the only way for that to happen is for the Klingons to swarm over the Fed border. If your still around C4 or C5 this is bad for the Coalition.

Its A3, I am deciding my builds at the moment.

with the arrival of the com con from the feds I will have 92ish EP (92.75 I believe). He has not raided the capitol although I believe he plans on it. I currently Hold Duke's SB but will likely lose it C4 but I think I can prevent a Raid on 1401 from doing much as I will have 20PDU's and about 110 SE's there. Oh he can come in, I think he has about 170 some odd SE in Kzinti space at the moment (that is including static fighters to impede Kzinti movements) and 225 some odd in Hydran space awaiting my moves. I have 140 Kzinti SE's with about 40 of those at Duke's at the moment.

Ok for 92 Ep you can build a CV (CV+MEC+EFF), BC, CL, 2xCM and 5xFF for 58 EP. A second CV group with CV,MEC and FKE by converting the BC to CV, CM to MEC and FF to FKE for 20 EP and use your Major conversion, thats 78 EP leaving you 14 Ep to repair ships. Now the Cap planet is maxed do you have a Monitor there to force the extra round?

Next, it looks like coalitions is going for a Hydrans first approach by your discription, is the expedition practical? If not, you have 2 choices you can hit the two Bats and the SB on the Lyran boarder and put the Lyrans out of the Hydran fight for a few turns (preferred). Or if that is too well defended you can go up the spine of the Neutral zone to the major planet at 0810 and devastate that. Don't go crazy with attacks the Hydran ships are so good they can put a hurt on the Coalition, but if you fight all the time there will not be any big ships left.

As for your battles at the SBs how did he fight at the lyran SB did he sids, let the damage fall or direct on your ships until you left (this is what I prefer, the Kzinti usually will let the damage fall so I can cripple a lot of ships and if I can get the Kzinti to retreat I don't have to worry about pursuit battles for my cripples). His
way of attacking that SB will give you a good idea as to how he will attack the capital. However watch out if he can get a few SAFs to the Cap. that can just ruin your day. Let me know on that.

I am surprised he didn't at least come and devastate the outer systems, this can usually be done by moving a good sized force to the CAP on the same turn as the Duke SB attack. You move the first fleet which will be the fleet that has the farthest to go to reach the Cap, the Kzinti won't want to react because if he does the rest of the Coalition forces will bypass the SB and go to the Cap. This forces you to spread out the static fleet you can still hit the coalition ships, but he should be able to burn a Minor planet a round after the approach (Assume 2 approach battles 3 rounds at the Minors and maybe two rounds at the single Major system. I generally don't go the the Cap system as most of the specialty static fleet ships are there.) This sucks income from the Kzinti and keeps forces stationed at the Cap. instead of the SB.

This is how I have seen almost all coalition forces fight, because they generally have at least a 3 to 1 advantage in ships in the early turns they can take a lot of cripples and destroyed that you can't. The old saying you can destroy 20 Coalition ships and cripple 40 more, by destroying 10 of your ships and crippling 20 more. He will come back for more. But after 2 turns of that you won't be there when he comes back again.

You're mistranslating what he said. THIS turn he can finish building the last 4 PDU's.

Indeed. If I didn't have to spend 28 on building 4xPDU I would sure do the CVL->CV as well as some more CD's and another BF. as it is I will barely build my schedule, do the escort subs, and get the 4xPDU down to top me off.

The Carrier is more important than the PDUs those PDUs will last one turn doing extra damage to the coalition for that turn, but the carrier will be a thorn in the coalition side for years to come.

I don't see the need for that many CDs I know you do raids like crazy but risking a BC hull seems a large risk for small return. I used the CDs as scouts until the MSC showed up. You can use the SDF or DF for your raiding and only risk a FF hull for the same drone bombardment result.

BFs are nice but also seem to be an extra not a necessity. Maximizing your CV production is the number one goal of the Kzintis. Your fleet of 9 CVs and 3 Tug-C carriers can fight a maximum of nine rounds before you cannot put three full CV groups in the line.

Example if the CO comes in knocks down the PDUs that takes 6-7 rounds. So now
you have the SB and your fleet in 9 rounds you have lost at least an escort off each of 9 carriers, so in one more round you will either start losing CVs or have to leave. This will be cheaper than SIDSing the SB, and in the long run the CO will have reduced your fleet to a nuisance. You will say the CO will have to destroy most of their fleet but it is only one extra round (8 to SIDS vs 9 to reduce your carrier groups) In addition, when you lose your shipyards you will only be able to create one CV group per turn.

If I saw that you were not building max carriers I would go to both SBs on turn 2 and Direct at your fleet until you left. Then the SBs are easy kills. On turn 3 I go to the Cap and Raid the outer planets, anytime you do not put up a full line I blast your ships. On T4 I Come again blow off any PDUs in the Cap, if I can take it great. If not I come back on T5 and by then your fleet is devastated.

Yes, this uses a lot of CO ships but by only crippling and not self destroying (except while taking down the PDUs which can't be avoided) the only chance you will have to get kills will be in pursuit battles (max of 3 ships) or by directing(1 ship/round). The biggest problem the Zin has is that the CO outnumber them 3 to 1 at the start and the CO also out produce the Zin 3 to 1.

You will say this takes pressure off the Hydrans but during the first 3 turns the Hydrans are not active. And with a bit of planning the repairs from the early can be strat to the Hydran front. The CO will lose specialty ships but they are going to lose them anyway, so by putting the Zin out of the war early, the CO can put the out Hydrans by turn 7.

By Michael Parker (Protagoras) on Saturday, December 08, 2007 - 08:23 pm: 

To build fleet units or static defenses is a major strategy choice that is made.

The point of static defenses is that they build geometrically. I will have 20 PDU's up when the CO comes to kill my shipyard. That is an additional 180 Compot to my fleet. Without getting to involved in the specific numbers now, I can easily have a starting Compot of 350+

The question to me being, how much will I cost the CO to take my shipyard? I think you will maximize that by building PDU's

I could be wrong, it might be that converting the CVL's is better, or subbing BC's as CV's although that will mean no Tug's which I really dislike.

I assume as the Kzinti that I WILL lose my Capitol, if the CO wants it they can take it. Putting 20 PDU's up by turn 3 is something I believe I should do unless it means loosing hulls. My first priority is to build every hull I can by hook or by crook, then to save 28EP to build the PDU's. With my 9 CV's and 3 CV Tugs and 3 FCR's I will last most likely 12 rounds, as for three of my CV groups I will substitute an FCR as an emergency escort to keep my CV's on the line. In fact I
will likely begin to run short of fighters before I run out of Viable CV groups. What I will do is extract my pound of flesh from the CO coming in. There are many examples on this board of the type of casualties expected in assaulting the Kzinti Capitol with full PDU's I won't belabour that point. 7-8 rounds with PDU's two of them with over 350 compot by virtue of a Monitor. Then I have plenty of staying power so that the CO will likely decide to SIDS the SB to death rather than try and run my fleet off.

As for the CD's and BF's. I do like to Drone Raid, but in addition the CD is a ship I can put on the line upon occasion to also get extra EW. And later in the war, alot of my ability to make any contribution to the Alliance case can very easily be counted by my ability to field credible Drone Raids. DF and SDF just don't cut it raiding well defended targets, they can be easily crippled by a good reacting ship, whereas TUG+2xBP CD or if I can go from the Map 2xCD makes a nearly unassailable Drone Raiding force, this is important as you will not be able to replace your raiders while off the map. And even when your shipyard is back.. are you really building CD's CLD's MCD's DF's or SDF's? Your likely trying to get as many hulls out as you can. If you WANT CD's you have to build them early and be careful with them. In fact the loss I regret the most in my current game is a CD that died. BF's are important for help with Raid interception in your Capitol then later once you come back to the map, it helps in pursuit until you get x-ships, the extra hex in range is nice, but being double ships count for pinning is their greatest asset, and once the Kzinti sure can use.

As for the CVL conversions. I could forego the CD and BF conversions and do them earlier. But I honestly do not have enough escorts to adequatly escort what I have in my opinion. Building a suite of quality escorts for 12 CV's is impossible even with me doing as many escort subs as I can. I could have extra CV's but I would be running low on escorts for them. I also see it like this.. While I am offmap rebuilding my shipyard, I have 5 CVL's that if I can scrape up 8ep (very hard most turns) I will convert them then catch as catch can and exit the dark days of no shipyard with as many or nearly as many CV's as your method, and more specialty ships and I did more damage to the CO. At least that is my theory!

By Michael Parker (Protagoras) On Saturday, December 08, 2007 - 08:57 pm: Edit

Quote:

If I saw that you were not building max carriers I would go to both SBs on turn 2 and Direct at your fleet until you left. Then the SBs are easy kills. On turn 3 I go to the Cap and Raid the outer planets, anytime you do not put up a full line I blast your ships. On T4 I Come again blow off any PDUs in the Cap, if I can take it great. If not I come back on T5 and by then your fleet is devastated.

Yes, this uses a lot of CO ships but by only crippling and not self
destroying (except while taking down the PDUs which can't be avoided) the only chance you will have to get kills will be in pursuit battles (max of 3 ships) or by directing (1 ship/round).

As the Kzinti I am primarily interested in maintaining and indeed maximizing my shipcount for the inevitable showdown at the capitol. If you were directing at SB's your directing escorts. At turn 2 I will have 7 CV's 3 CV-Tugs and 3 FCR's. This will give me 13 rounds theoretically. Although in practice I will likely start running out of fighters before I run out of viable carrier groups. Just a guess I will probably have 9 rounds I can last on Turn 2 and will leave likely due to a lack of fighters. You would have 2 extra CV's with your build recommendation but if those are coming as CVL conversions that is only 4 extra fighter factors not much extra staying power.

As for self-killing or not, I will say as the Kzinti I am NOT concerned in general over how many kills I score. I am very reluctant to fight anywhere except over a hardpoint, and I am almost exclusively letting the damage fall. I am taking shots when I can via raids at the CO repair facilities. Not that I won't take a shot at particularly juicy targets.

How do you figure you can stay 13 rounds? With 3 CV in the line, can stay 7 rounds if there all at the same location. Where are all the fighters coming from? 3FCR+5CVL+5CVE=39 fighters plus the ones on the 60 on the CVs and Tugs. The CO forces will do more damage than it takes to CEDS off a EFF. So you will either give up fighters or SIDS to resolve the extra damage. In addition in most cases you won't be able to bring all of your carrier forces to one battle.

You commented last month on a player in the solo battle he killed both SBs on turn 2 with the CO. His Kzinti, player tried to save the Klingon SB, I submit his CO forces wouldn't have lost as much if he had directed.

As you said the Kzinti ship counts are what matters I would happily let you have your shipyards if I could reduce you fleet to 1-2 CV and a few escorts. Now I know it is not going to possible to destroy every ship you will retreat before then. So my directing will force you to leave the SB earlier than you might want to because you are worried about losing the ship count that will be necessary at the Cap.

Next,
As for self-killing or not, I will say as the Kzinti I am NOT concerned in general over how many kills I score. I am very reluctant to fight anywhere except over a hardpoint, and I am almost exclusively letting the damage fall.

Way back in 1992 Owen Riley who owned Task Force Games at the time (They produced all the SFB stuff that ADB Designed) and a very good player did an article in Captain's Log #10 on Kzinti defense almost all the tactics are still valid. He said that "The main Kzinti goal is to Kill Klingons. F&E is a giant relay race in which the Alliance and Coalition are both affected by earlier moves. If the Kzintis allow too many Klingon ships to get to the end of turn 4 alive, the Hydrans fall faster which affects the Feds and on and on" Its a very good article it is only one column though.

That is one of the reasons I do not self kill unless I have to. Also crippled ships in excess of the North repair compacity can be Strated down to the SR SB where the can greet the Hydrans.

But again my main question is how do you figure you can stay 13 rounds? And that you will run out of fighters first?

I try not to self kill as the Kzinti...I do deal DirDam to every mauler I see (that I can do enough to kill it outright).

How do you figure you can stay 13 rounds? With 3 CV in the line, can stay 7 rounds if there all at the same location. Where are all the fighters coming from? 3FCR+5CVL+5CVE=39 fighters plus the ones on the 60 on the CVs and Tugs.

I was following what I thought was your calculus which I quoted below. Basically adding in the FCR's as you seemed to suggest that you would drive a CV off each round so 12 CV's was 9 rounds of 3xCV. Adding FCR's extends that time. Perhaps I did not understand what you meant, but it seemed you were saying Kill an escort each round after 9 rounds then I would only have 3 CV groups with
escorts. When you said 3 full it seemed (and still seems) you mean full of escorts. So I came back with 3xFCR extends the staying power. And I would have 6xCVE's available

______________________________

Quote:

Your fleet of 9 CVs and 3 Tug-C carriers can fight a maximum of nine rounds before you cannot put three full CV groups in the line

______________________________

I said theoretically on round 2 then clarified I will quote myself.

______________________________

Quote:

At turn 2 I will have 7 CV's 3 CV-Tugs and 3 FCR's. This will give me 13 rounds theoretically. Although in practice I will likely start running out of fighters before I run out of viable carrier groups. Just a guess I will probably have 9 rounds I can last on Turn 2 and will leave likely due to a lack of fighters.

______________________________

Then I pointed out that if I had built an extra 2xCV and had done so by converting 2xCVL that would only be 4 extra fighter factors overall in the battle(s). Probably not enough to last an extra turn in this battle. Its possible 4 factors will be enough to stay one extra round but doubtful. Also to be clear I meant 9 rounds over both SB's so if I stayed 3 at counts and 6 at Duke's that would be great.

Also we were talking about a Turn 2 Coalition assault of the Count and Duke's SB's. I did not mention this, but my idea is not to kill myself over the SB's I will likely give up the counts cheap and put my reserves into Dukes where I hurt more klink hulls. Depending upon how my escorts are doing I will stay at counts just long enough to avoid real damage then retreat, at Dukes I will likely put up other ships to absorb damage and try and stay a little longer. It becomes a matter of calculating what I can replace escort wise compared to excess I have at this point (and not alot excess on turn 2) so that on turn 3 I have adequate escorts for all my line CV's. This calculus is fundamental to me. Fielding CV groups turn by turn includes first not getting them killed, and secondly having adequate escorts. Its why I build as many escorts as I can, and also why I don't think building more CV's early is more helpful than Drone Cruisers or Fast Cruisers and PDU's(now if I have the excess EP YES I will do the CVL->CV I just never have the extra 8ep). The extra CV's produced are a mixed blessing, I just
won't feel I have the escorts to adequately keep them flying. They will be glorified FCR's just like my CVL's usually are, although occasionally CVL's do get escorts and fight. I just WON'T kill myself fighting over either starbase. I will fight until I have to start taking real damage, then I am gone. I am reserving all my 'Macho' stay till it bleeds for the capitol, although even there I purpose to retreat with the core of the Kzinti fleet intact.

I will comment on your Owen Riley quote in a separate note.

As for Own Riley's statements one way to kill klingons is to make them suffer taking your capitol. Although I would submit the simplified statement "your goal is to kill klingons" could be alternatively expressed as "your goal is to limit the hull count gap between the Alliance and the Coalition" I also apply the ground rule "All other things being equal kill a Klink hull over a Lyran when practicable"

The reason I prefer it be stated as I have done is because I think its important to realize your goals are twofold. Inflict damage on the coalition while preserving as much of your fleet as possible.

While I know it was not meant this way using the statement "your goal is to kill klingons" taken in a vaccum suggest that sacrificing the entire Kzinti and Hydran navies to inflict maximum casualties is acceptable.

So the Kzinti strategy should be to inflict losses where practicable with the goal of trading escorts and fighters for real damage to the coalition. You want to preserve your fleet, and build up capitol defense to inflict maximum casualties upon the Coalition. At this point you are trying everything you can to take pressure off of the Hydrans. Its rather a domino effect.. the REAL goal is to do whatever you can to make the CO assault on the Feds less than optimal. As the Kzinti you do that with a bridging goal of trying to relieve the pressure from the Hydrans, all the while preserving your fleet. If you make things easier for the Hydrans you in turn make them easier for the Feds come turn 7.

I choose a course that doesn't just inflict maximum casualties upon the CO but rather minimizes the hull count advantage they have. Or I should rather say I choose one that I THINK does that, but its important I think to know your specific goal.

I build max PDU's (until I get 20 on the capitol) as that will increase the damage the CO takes, at a time when they will be self-killing hulls for me. At most other times I let the damage fall to clog up the CO repair facilities. This dovetails with other things I like to do.

I build the maximum amount of hulls every turn. I religiously build the 2xFF for 1xCL for example. You need shipcount to start to narrow the gap. Also over hull
you have means another one the CO has to deploy to garrison your space.

I build as many escorts with the Kzinti as I can once I have built every hull. I first want to sub/convert every FF into FKE, then every CM into MEC, then every FF into FFK (for later cheap conversions into FKE and also to use as damage absorbers in BG's) The purpose here is to give me staying power, and to beef up my CV lines. The WORST thing that can happen is to field a substandard escort suite like say [CV DE EFF] and have a mauler cripple the entire group when [CV CLE FKE] would have added just enough not to allow that. You also want to have enough escorts so that you can escort everything you might want to fly. And so you can take a licking on your light escorts one round (like loosing 9 of them) and still have enough to escort all your CV's the next round.

Next I build every Drone Cruiser I can. Raiding with DF/SDF's is fine if your picking on the periphery. If your gunning for his FRD parks you will have a substantial unit react unto you, perhaps with a unit already present in the hex. a C8 + POL can make quick work at hurting SDF 2xDF or later SDF DF when you have to raid from the pool. Whereas 3xCD is much more survivable. Also the CD will serve you well as fleet scouts that can upon occasion venture onto the line. Especially during capitol assaults when you know they will not be directing on it.

Lastly Fast Ships. You only get one a turn, you won't be building DNL's as the Kzinti as you need CR10 hulls. The BF counts as 2 SE's for pinning purposes, its most important aspect. It will require two CO hulls to counter it in garrison. It also extends your range from the off-map by 1 hex, but only if you have a credible number (I try and shoot for 2xDNL 4xBF) to keep a threat. And later on they will season you groups to provide a bonus to pursuit.

All of those build decisions come from following my basic strategy to try and catch up (or not fall behind as fast) in the shipcount. This is to me what will allow me to relieve pressure on first on the Hydrans then on the Feds. It won't eliminate it, it will just relieve it some. The less of a numerical advantage the CO has, the harder it is for them to operate.

---

By Adam Hickey (Ahickey) On Sunday, December 09, 2007 - 12:52 pm: Edit

Great post Michael. You should consider polishing it and submitting it for publication in CL.

By edward kroeten (Edkroeten) On Sunday, December 09, 2007 - 04:10 pm: Edit

I think we just have a different philosophy on the Kzintis, I agree with you your ship count is the most important thing for the Kzintis. Our differences are you spend your points to raid and build PDUs, I would rather get the full fleet of carriers as this will keep me in the war longer than the PDUs.

Next as to Fast ships I use them for the guaranted pursuit, as the Kzinti outside of the first turns pinning is not a big concern. If your going to a target either the
CO will have more SE than your entire fleet or you will be able to get there. So the one extra pin is not a big deal to me. 2DNL and 4BF is not really a credible threat what are you going to hit a BATS? The one or two reserve fleets that are always there will take care of fast ships. If the CO has to leave a fast ship or two to catch you then that is fine.

Quote:
Also to be clear I meant 9 rounds over both SB's so if I stayed 3 at counts and 6 at Duke's that would be great.

Also we were talking about a Turn 2 Coalition assault of the Count and Duke's SB's. I did not mention this, but my idea is not to kill myself over the SB's I will likely give up the counts cheap and put my reserves into Dukes where I hurt more klink hulls.

This just goes to my point by hitting the SBs in T2 for 9 rounds of heavy combat I get 2 SBs this is extremely cheap.

Then if the CO uses the two tacnotes that I just submitted he can attrite the Kzinti fleet both before and after the Capital falls. If the Zin gets all 4 of the SAF at 4 different locations (even with raids this spreads the Zin pretty thin) then he used a lot of assets to get them reducing his fleet. Or you can ignore them and have four SAF at the Cap. By escorting the SAF with 2 D5s as escorts it takes 40 points to Direct on the SAF. That makes the SAF a tough nut to crack, and forces the Zin into open space battles where the CO can further reduce the Zin fleet.

Ed,

I agree we just have a different philosphy. I would like to see your proposed Kzinti Builds say turn 1-4. It would be alot easier to compare capacities to hurt the coalition. I think we both sorta of have the same idea of WHAT we want to do as the Kzinti just different ways of getting there.

The fast ships as I said are to me important as to ship count. 2 hulls for pin purposes is two hulls. Its not QUITE as effective as two real hulls because I cannot have them in two places at once, but if the CO is counting hulls and putting enough to pin me out, that is an extra CO hull on garrison duty rather than smacking' Hydrans and Feds. The 2xDNL 4xBF force is actually more useful as a threat than anything else. Here is a list of CO bases that can be hit from the offmap with an all fast force that CANNOT be hit by speed 6.

0502 0504 0705 0906 1107 1307 1407 1507 1707

Granted most of the klingon bases could be hit from the Marquis with a speed 6
fleet, but what it does is in addition to upping your ship count for pinning, and helping in pursuit, is it makes the job of covering all the bases that much harder. The reserves will have to consider covering 0502 0504 0705 too, Else 2xDNL 4xBF 3xIND Fighter Squadrons will destroy them.

Quote:

This just goes to my point by hitting the SBs in T2 for 9 rounds of heavy combat I get 2 SBs this is extremely cheap.

How does building on T1 an additional CV (in lieu of a Tug-C or convert from a CL) allow you to stay longer on C2 than I. At best its 6 additional fighters. On T2 the Kzinti assuming he is not willing to burn CV's to keep the SB's gets runned of from the SB's because he runs low on fighters. I don't see how an extra 6 will translate into much better results. Even if it allows you to stay an extra round (it certainly won't allow more than an extra round) is that compensation for what it took to get there? If you converted a CVL turn 1 then its ONLY 2 extra fighters and your not staying an extra round by virtue of 2 extra, so you ended up subbing the only BC on your schedule. The only BC eligible to be your Y168 Tug btw, and instead of paying 8 for a Tug-C you pay 12+12 for a CV. I assume you are converting a BC and using your FFF there. I build an FCR on T1 also, are you building 2xCV and an FCR? An FCR is almost equivalent to a CV on T2 for the purposes of staying power over a starbase. Not quite but almost.

As for the SAF's yeah that is a rough one for the Kzinti. You want to Drone Raid them when you can. Its horrific to contemplate an open space battle though for the Kzinti that is playing right into the CO hands. I sure don't want to see them over the capitol either.

One thing I have to admit however. A large part of my building of CD's and BF's is because I like them. They are neat toys! And they are toys you cannot afford to build if you don't build them T1&2 by T3 your too strapped for cash. if you don't build them early you cannot build them before you regain your shipyard, and even then your economy is hard pressed to support them. So I am inclined to build the CD and BF not JUST because I think they give me some options I otherwise wouldn't have.. but because it is a game, and I want fun toys to play with!

What I meant by the Quote was that by directing on your ships you will leave earlier than if I let the damage fall. It really doesn't matter how many carrier you have on T2.
My point was on the building max carriers vs PDUs the other EP you spend are too small to make a huge difference. But here would be my builds just quickly say T1 4PDUs 1CV + Tug, T2 2PDUs, 2 CVs, T3 2-3 PDUs, 2CV (Money from salvage and WYN, plus I lost 2 conversion sites), T4 if cap is still there 2-3 PDUs, 2 CVs (Commercial Convoy money) T5 No Capital, No Money, 1CV from CVL. But I will strike out of the Barony every turn try to trade cripples on my turn and Fighters and CEDs on his. Force the CO to put a ton of ships out to defend everything (because he who defends everything defends nothing) Also I prefer to if I can scrap the money together to convert the BCs to CVs because an BC that goes in the line even at a SB assault get blasted by the people I have played against.

I don't have anything against spending the money on PDUs but I just think I get a bigger bang for my buck with the CVs (The PDUs live one battle round, the CVs will be around 10-15 turns) Looking at my build schedule it is not all that different than yours

T You Me
1 PDU 12 12
2 16 14
3 20 17
4 Maxed 20

I agree play to your strengths if the fast ships work for you go for it. But if you like fun ships play as the Hydrans or the Romulans they have all the cool ships. I always get the Gorns or Lyrans all boring ships, there fleets end up being all command rating 10 ships too.

Yeah I don't think we are that far off. In fact with only building one CV turn 1 we have identical builds there.

I will work up a T2&3 build using my economics from my GW game and see what happens when I do 2xCV.

In this discussion, would your proposed Kzinti builds change if you could build survey ships?

I can build Survey Ships, its just the Kzinti do not have the funds to do so.

This is actually a harder question that it appears to be on its face. The ONLY way the Kzinti could reasonably build Survey ships is to have more EP. So I will rephrase your question and hope I am answering the spirit of what you asked.

Rephrase: If you had an extra 5ep (the cost to do an SR conversion) each turn for the first three turns of the game would you do them?
The conversion is BC + 5ep->SR.

I would have to say if I had the 5EP extra T1-3 I would have spend it on a CVL->CV conversion turns 1&2 and found a way to get the extra 3EP a turn to afford them. On T3 I would likely have used the extra funds to do some conversions to have extra escorts for the 2 extra CV's.

I would LOVE to have Survey ships for the Kzinti, its just they have so many other needs just to stay in the game. So even if you handed me the funds, I would spend them some other way, and its not trivial sending 3xBC hulls offmap for the Kzinti.

Michael, also don't forget the extra 3 EP you must spend in the off-map area for the "survey supply lines," etc. That means the TRUE cost of the conversion is really 8 ep, not 5.

Also, the fact that those cruiser hulls are not on the line is also significant.

It's been a BIG investment for me to max out on survey ships as the coalition player in our game - 'cause that six less cruiser hulls on the line, in addition to the 16*6 = 80 eps invested into survey ships (base cruiser (8) plus the 5 ep conversion plus the 3 ep support). However, according to my math - which may be wrong - the added income from survey will pay off in the long run; especially when I need it most in the late game.

Note, also, that the 32 eps spent on survey ships (conversion plus support, not counting cruisers) could have purchased 3 overbuilt CWs. Thus, all this surveying not only cost me 80 ep's directly, but also represents an opportunity cost of 9 cruiser hulls on the line. That's pretty substantial - a whole battle line almost. Maxing out early also cost me tugs - which represents another opportunity cost.

However, again, I'm hoping that it pays off in the long run when I'm hurting for $$ to build my basic production schedule. Thus, maxing out on survey ships represents a "slow but steady wins the race" strategic decision - which may or may not be good considering that the coalition must crush the Zin and Hydran quickly. We'll see how it goes.

I had completly forgotten the 3ep infrastructure cost. So yes 8ep a turn, I would definatly do the CVL->CV conversions then as they are exactly 8EP.

The opportunity costs are huge as you say. That being said, I wish I could invest the funds in Survey for the Kzinti, as they also will be hurting for EP's. Its just not feasible for me in the early part of the game.
I'd seriously consider bringing my survey hulls on-map.

There is something to that. The Klinks get two more scouts and the Lyrans get three tugs that are also scouts. However, you'd suffer economically in the long run. By C12 you would have lost 122 survey points for the Lyran and 96 survey points for the Klingon. That means 5 provinces (almost 6) for the Lyran, representing 10 income per turn, and 4 provinces (almost 5) for the Klingon, representing 8 income per turn.

I've performed a thorough (but not elegant) analysis of Klingon and Lyran economic performance based on maximum survey ship production - compared to standard survey production. Here are the results: [Survey Analysis for Klingons and Lyrans](#)

The results are clear. Here are the talking points for those of you who don't want to look at the detail in the spreadsheet (assumes all average die rolls):

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>One survey ship means a rough total of 110 extra economic points over the course of the campaign to either the Klingons, Lyrans, or Kzintis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>On Turn 19, the Lyrans would have rolled more total survey dice compared to the &quot;standard&quot; system for the entire game.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>For the Lyrans, the break-even point (where cost is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>For the Klingons the break-even point (where cost is recovered) occurs on Turn 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The difference to the Klingons is telling in the beginning, as the average dice work out in their favor in terms of getting provinces early</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A total of 183.5 extra EPs will be earned by the Lyrans as a result of the 48 ep investment (plus opportunity cost) over the course of the game, including the effects of exhaustion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A total of 206 extra EPs will be earned by the Klingons as a result of the 48 ep investment (plus opportunity cost) over the course of the game, including the effects of exhaustion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>389.5 grand total additional income for the Lyrans and Klingons over the course of the game by pursuing maxed-out survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Most of the precious additional earned income accrues during the exhaustion periods, meaning that real hulls are being built at roughly 0.8 EPs per DefPot (assuming most ships cost less than 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP per Def Pot), translating to...</td>
<td>486.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Additional cruiser hulls at the beginning of the game</td>
<td>389.5 income versus 80 investment represents a 487% return on investment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compared to the direct cost of 80 EP and opportunity cost of 9 additional cruiser hulls at the beginning of the game</td>
<td>By Ted Fay (Catwhoeatsphoto) on Wednesday, December 12, 2007 - 02:29 pm: Edit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't you love compound interest???? 😁</td>
<td>By Michael Parker (Protogoras) on Wednesday, December 12, 2007 - 03:21 pm: Edit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted,</td>
<td>By Michael Parker (Protogoras) on Wednesday, December 12, 2007 - 03:26 pm: Edit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have the Klingons beginning Survey on Turn 2. I believe they cannot begin survey until turn 3. It is sure possible I am wrong, but check the discussion in our 'from the front' thread and see what you think.</td>
<td>By Ted Fay (Catwhoeatsphoto) on Wednesday, December 12, 2007 - 03:58 pm: Edit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted,</td>
<td>Michael,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Also there is a consideration for your analysis. You can put colonies off-map for each 5 off-map provinces you have. I think you have to have a full 5 though. so 1-4 is 0 5-9 is 1 10-14 is 2 so #prov mod 5 basically. This would allow you some additional income also. Especially if you move your COE to the offmap it can build up even more income.</td>
<td>You're right about the error in Klingon stats. That does make a significant difference, as shown on the revised chart. In particular, assuming average rolls, there are some curious cut-off points where Klinks expect to be within 0.5 survey points of a new province. Thus, shifts in luck on the rolls are are important to them. Also, they don't break even till turn 14.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However, I think the case is still quite strongly made that - at least from an econ perspective - maxing out on survey ships is the way to go. You're still looking at somewhere on the order of 40 extra hulls by turn 24 - which will make a HUGE difference against the Feds.

Even if those EPs are not spent on new hulls, they still make an enormous impact. For example, that extra income can be spent on field repairs, which over the long run would make a telling difference (being able to attack and defend with more ships on the opposing phases).

Here's the revised survey analysis.

Ted,

Some more *sighs* wish I could think of these all at once. Whenever the Klinks and Lyrans have a few turns under their belt they can probably afford to move a prime team off to help survey rolls. That would I think add +2 to one ships rolls every turn. You can only do it one time though.

Also when HDW's get introduced your allowed to build the HDW-Q which is a survery ship. It can be done over and above your Survey limits and I am almost positive does NOT require the 3ep infrastructure surcharge.

Michael,

Wow at HDW-Qs. The +2 survey per turn is not so bad - ends up being something like +48 survey points for the Lyrans (roughly another province) over 24 turns. Total of 2 extra provinces - but still, with compound interest that's probably an extra 50 econ points or so through the end of the game. I'll have to tack one of those on to my survey ships. 😊

As for HDW-Qs, I'll have to see when they come out. Of course, by then, the extra survey might not be worth it as the real power of survey comes from the compound interest - and in the late stages of the war you're looking at 40 or 50 survey points per province. I'll have to analyze that one in more detail to see if it's worth it.

I think its 1ep to make the conversion to the Q mission but am unsure, then the opportunity costs of a HDW which is not insignificant, they are very nice to have.

The HDW-Qs are still under the 3 extra survey ships limit. It was ruled on somewhere.
The only problem with them is that MOST of them come late-war ~Y180. Of the 2 which come early, JGP+LNH, the JGP cannot adopt mission Q and the LNH is restricted from surveying until Y175.

So, for the races that send their 3 extra survey ships off-map before HDW-Qs come out, they don't save anything on the infrastructure cost because there are no rules for getting the EPs back that were already spent for the extra survey ships. On the other hand, they do get to bring a survey ship back and use it as a survey CV if they wish to convert it. And there are always the rules for on-map survey too.

Michael Lui,

I was almost positive it explicitly said that the HDW-Q was over and above survey limits in the rule itself.

Nope. I thought so too when first reading it, but it was definitely ruled on somewhere (maybe by Nick) that the HDW-Q was still under the 3 extra limit.

Michael Lui,

You are exactly right on that. I guess it was a case of me hearing (reading) what I wanted to hear!

It plainly says the HDW-Q counts AGAINST the 3 additional Survey ships, you just get to save the 3 ep infrastructure costs I suppose.

So I should edit my one up there to say

I was almost positive it explicitly said that the HDW-Q was NOT over and above survey limits in the rule itself.

Ted et al.

You might want to check the Archive through January 24, 2007 as I went through every single empire and did their survey results adding one, two, or three survey ships. In addition to doing all the calcs for all the possibilities I also list out the additional EPs (so how much more does 1 get you than 0; how much more does 2 get you than 1, etc.). Just so you don't have to recreate all the work that went
into them. The Klingon one at the end of the archive also includes using a production override.

By Ted Fay (Catwhoeatsphoto) on Thursday, December 13, 2007 - 12:51 am: Edit

Dale, thanks for the reference! I wasn't following the F&E boards back in January. Looks like your price point/gain happens at 4 survey ships for the Klinks and 5 for the Lyrans. Good to know for future games - I'll save the EPs. However, at least you saved me the analysis!

Some kind of nice mathematical formula would be kewl - probably would involve an integral to account for compounding gains. However, I lack the skill to design one.

By Dale Lloyd Fields (Dylkha) on Thursday, December 13, 2007 - 03:21 am: Edit

Ted

If you want the excel I used to create these I could probably provide (I think I still have them). Myself, I would love to write a little computer program to roll the dice and then sum the probability over N realizations. I dislike just using 3.5 per die. I want to put a one standard deviation on each number to get a sense of the range you might expect. I think a program would be easier to do than a math function (but that may be my bias).

By Ahmad Abdel-Hameed (Madarab) on Thursday, December 13, 2007 - 07:57 am: Edit

It's easy to treat this as the binary solution set of leaving survey ships off map/building new ones for survey and making them available for use in battleforces. I could see using a mixed approach where you leave them to explore during the early part of the game and then utilize their combat capacities once surveying becomes harder and you've reached exhaustion anyway. This has got to be especially true for the very "tasty" survey ships like the F-CVL with its fighters or the L-SR with its tug abilities.

By Michael Parker (Protagoras) on Thursday, December 13, 2007 - 09:38 am: Edit

I can certainly see the Feds building more survey ships and 'exchanging' them for the CVL's those are very nice SSCV's.

The only Caveat with the Lyran SR's is that if you did NOT include them as a Tug build when you built them, you HAVE to count them as one when you bring them on the map.

Not sure about the Exhaustion though, it seems to me that is when you want the Survey. Even though the income is being pared down also, its more income which your desperate for. Although there is perhaps a case for bringing the SR's on-map for 1ep per turn and keeping one off-map doing high risk survey.
By Ted Fay (Catwhoeatsphoto) on Thursday, December 13, 2007 - 10:22 am

I could see using a mixed approach where you leave them to explore during the early part of the game and then utilize their combat capacities once surveying becomes harder and you've reached exhaustion anyway.

Yes, there is something to that. Your break even point happens at turn 14 if you max out - meaning that after turn 14 it makes sense to start pulling out your survey ships. I'll have to do another spreadsheet to see if you get substantial gains by leaving the survey ships on till, like, turn 24. If not, then pulling them out might be the best thing due to diminishing returns and the continuing need for more hulls. Must think more on this. However, I'm convinced that either maxing out on survey - or nearly maxing out (1 less SR) is the way to go economy-wise.

By Robert Padilla (Zargan) on Thursday, December 13, 2007 - 10:24 am

The Feds only have 3 CVLs and one COV off-map at the start of the war. The rest are 2 CLS and 5 GSC (542.141).

By Michael Parker (Protagoras) on Thursday, December 13, 2007 - 10:56 am

I would leave the COV myself, I don't see what is so special about it. But the 3xCVL's are nice to have. SSCV's with sensors. They can go on Drone Raids as the one ship without drone factors but with sensors. They can add scout functions to a fed 3rd way CVBG.

So eventually build 3xGSC's and replace those CVL's to come on map for you!

By Matthew G. Smith (Mattsmith) on Thursday, December 13, 2007 - 11:13 am

But they're not CVL's. The off map survey ships are GSC's.

But, you can get a bit of what you want by building CLS's and sending them off map to replace a GSC which you then convert into a CVL.

That may be an EP cheaper than just building the CVL outright, we'll know after the SIT update when the costs for the CVL and GSC are fixed.

(Right now the GSC costs more than the CVL for some reason, and there's no listed cost to convert a GSC into a CVL.)
You cannot create any more CVL's nor COV's except to replace losses, and I guess I mean, I sure PLAN on putting the CVL's back onto survey Duty, it seems silly to take them out. They won't help you much when your getting hit early in the war. But when you can send some GSC's you can send them out to replace the CVL's you pull onto the map to do all the cool things SSCV's with scout functions can do.

By Robert Padilla (Zargan) on Thursday, December 13, 2007 - 01:41 pm: Edit

The COV is noce because it's a 4 EW scout, and it has a G factor. It goes very nicely with a MMG for a bonus ship. But yes it's not as useful as a CVL in general.

By Michael Parker (Protagoras) on Thursday, December 13, 2007 - 02:39 pm: Edit

Ahhhh I hadn't thought about that a scout you can add with the MMG and then use the G factor on *grins*

By Adam Hickey (Ahickey) on Thursday, December 13, 2007 - 02:58 pm: Edit

I think the limit on CVL's and COV's should be lifted now that everyone can make survey ship carriers. As it is, a literal reading of the rules allows everyone *except the Feds*--the permier surveying race--to make additional survey ship carriers. It doen't seem right, and in our game we've houseruled the restriction away.

By Ahmad Abdel-Hameed (Madarab) on Thursday, December 13, 2007 - 03:05 pm: Edit

Matthew, I think building CLS's will be prohibited under any rule set because they are "obsolete".

By Michael Lui (Michaellui) on Thursday, December 13, 2007 - 03:28 pm: Edit

--- Quote: ---

I would leave the COV myself, I don't see what is so special about it. The COV is Nice because it's a 4 EW scout, and it has a G factor. It goes very nicely with a MMG for a bonus ship. But yes it's not as useful as a CVL in general.

---

Are you two kidding? Put a MMG and a Prime Team on this and go re-read the Commando Raid rules (320.4, page 3, PO). Give this ship 1-3 escorts and you can go strip MAJOR PLANETS of PDUs. Like the one at 2518 if the Klingons don't kill the 7th Fleet SB (or the BATS at 3016 and 2816) or the minor planet at 1407 if they don't kill the BATS at 2004. For that matter, you could put 2 SIDS on a BATS if you roll good and then drone raid to cripple it.

By Michael Parker (Protagoras) on Thursday, December 13, 2007 - 03:45 pm: Edit

Michael Lui,

I must admit I don't know much about Commando Raids. I will look them up, but if you want to explain it ;) I don't mind being lazy!
That's not a bad idea, but if you have to commit that many ships to the Commando Raid, it's going to limit what you have left to raid with. And they don't get six slots until like turn 15 or so. Not to mention, if the Feds can afford to be without those ships early in the war, the Coalition is probably doing something wrong.

You don't have to commit very many slots at all. It just depends on what you are attacking and if you want to use the commando attacks with a crippled ship (gives you a -1 on the roll). You can get by with only 1 extra ship as a consort if you want to hit a BATS, BUT you can hit a SB with this and you would probably want 2-3 for that.

True, and it is a very good use of the unit.

Matthew, I think building CLS's will be prohibited under any rule set because they are "obsolete".

Oh yeah. I forgot that one.

Edward

Sorry to disagree -

'If the Zin gets all 4 of the SAF at 4 different locations (even with raids this spreads the Zin pretty thin) then he used a lot of assets to get them reducing his fleet. Or you can ignore them and have four SAF at the Cap'

How do the Coalition get SAF's in 4 locations?

There are only 3 planets within range of 1401 (1202, 1502, and 1504).

Yes, you can move them up under Operation Movement...but it's risky and they will take a while to get into position.

Turn 3 (Klingon Turn 1 and 2 builds) - Move to say 1404 (after everything else
has moved, so they don't get into a battle).

Nothing can defend them, so you need to remain forward deployed to pin them out - or you SM them, costing you 3 SM points per SAF to a planet you captured and held on turn 3 (lets be generous 1504!).

We will assume 1202 is also captured on turn 2 as well - but I doubt both 1504 and 1202 can be held on Alliance turn 2.

So turn 3 - just 2 SAF's

Turn 4 - we get another 2 there - and they are dotted around.

On turn 5 - unless the Coalition has ignored the Hydrans (and if so, how comes the Kzinti still own 1401??) - they have 4 in range - who as the Coalition is going to want to assault on turn 5 - and capture on turn 6 - when they ideally need to be ready to invade the Federation on turn 7?

Basically, SAF's can't be spread out - there is just too many ways to attack them, as they either move (and create a Battle hex), or are in a hex which is attacked on the Alliance turn.

By Paul Howard (Raven) on Monday, December 17, 2007 - 05:11 pm: Edit

Kzinti Carriers -

Sorry, I was actually laughing at this debate.

1st - Whats wrong with the CVL?

It's 12 compot

It's can be escorted 'well'

3 CVL's can be supported by an Independent Squadron to keep 18 fighters on the line.

2nd - The Kzinti, are perfectly suited to fighting multiple battles, in multiple hexes, for multiple rounds.

We have 7 CV's (by the start of turn 3)
We have 4 CVL's
We have 5 CVE's
We also have 4 TGC's, and 3 TGT's

One thing everyone has forgotten, is that the Kzinti can actually have 6 Tug Carriers - as they have 6 VP pods!
4 x TGC+VP+BP (so are light Carriers)
1 x TGT+2VP (so is a Medium Carrier)

(On Turn 3 - only 4 TGC's, Alliance Turn 4 will see another TGC arrive)

We will assume, every single Light Escort built on turn 1 and 2 (7 EFF's) has been killed, plus 3 extra EFF's (some of the CVE's have given up there EFF's!) have also died.

So, on turn 3, what can the Kzinti field

7 x CV
4 x CVL
5 x CVE
4 x TGC+VP+BP
1 x TGT

They need to defend (or attack) several areas -

We have
1 x BCE (H)
2 x MEC (H)
6 x CLE (H)
11 x EFF (L)

Plus we have
8 x CL
Lots of Frigates (and DD's, but they only have 1 more compot than FF's, but 1 less than CL's!)

How to get 21 Carrier Groups

2 x CV+MEC+FF (23)
5 x CV+CLE+FF (21)
1 x CVL+CLE+FF (17)
3 x CVL+CL+EFF (17)
1 x CVE+BCE+FF (14)
4 x CVE+CL+EFF (14)
3 x TGC BV+FF+EFF (16)
1 x TGT+FF+EFF (13)

What do you direct on?

Yes, the compot is lower, but the worst Carrier Group is the TGT with 13 compot - the CVE's are 14, and they rest are higher
12 rounds of combat, and either the outer escort, or Ad Hoc escorts are dead - BUT the Kzinti still have 9 untouched Carrier groups - enough for 3 full lines of Carrier Groups.

(The FCR's could be used, for another couple of rounds).

So, thats 4 seperate battle hexes (how many battles did the Kzinti want?) - enough to fight 3 approach battles AND a full line at the target.

Fighters - well the each time a Carrier Group loses it's escort - it also loses it's Fighters.

So, that's a minimum of 15 (FF plus 3 Fighters - without a Mauler) damage per round taken and each line could take another 15 or so fighters.

Replacement - can come from FCR's ,Aux's or bases reacting in fighters.

Compot - yes, it lower, but if your happy to go through 3 approach rounds, and direct and kill a target each turn - are you worried?

Example Line

DN, 2 x 3CVL (1 x PT), 1 x 3CVE, 1 x 4 pt Drone, 6 Fighters Fed Forward, Scout.

Compot is around 72 . However, 25% is enough to get 18 - enough to kill a E4A on a Carrier group, or kill a DW or F5.

But what is there the Coalition can kill?

Lets sat the Coalition have a line of 95 (reasonable, if the Coalition are defending multiple locations) - and they also roll well (lets say 27.5%) - 26 damage. OK, with a Mauler they can crippled the DN, or can cripple any Group (with a Mauler).

If the Coalition don't direct, cripple any 2 of Carrier/Escorts in a group (but not all 3), and lose some fighters - and as the Coalition do you want to lose a hull and NOT kill an enemy hull? 😊

(As mentioned earlier, if a Group is crippled, the FCR reduces the chance of it being killed in Persuit).

If the Kzinti need to be in alot of places, at the same time, they can do, and they can do it well.

By using Ad Hoc - it tremendously adds staying power, by allowing all the groups to be used.
(Clearly, if CW/FO is not used, this is out, but some of the Kzinti problems are not there!).

Ad Hoc to get to the target - so, use the Kzinti Carrier Groups - all of them!

By Mike Curtis (Nashvillen) On Monday, December 17, 2007 - 05:19 pm: Edit

Paul, you need to write this up as a tac note and submit it.

By Paul Howard (Raven) On Tuesday, December 18, 2007 - 03:43 am: Edit

Mike - will do.

I wasn't sure if the 21 Carrier Group Note had been done!