Not that I am aware of.

Paul,

Please note that these groups:

>4 x CVE+CL+EFF (14)

Can be placed in a six ship (315.0) battle group.

A DN (or BT), 2x(3CVL) and a 6BG with CVE+CL+EFF line is possible with an Adm or command point.

Paul,

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

Kzinti DD's are 6/3 units.

Their DDE's are 4-6/2-3 SC 4 heavy escorts.

Trent

That will teach me to think of the ship types and compot of the top of my head.

So, yes the DD is as good as a CL (i.e. 3-6 when Ad Hoc).

The CVE - Well, depending on what mood SVC is in when he mentions the CVE (I can never tell) - it may or may not remain BG capable! He might just like pulling our 'Kzinti' legs :)

Can someone please help? I am new to F&E and playing That Gorn vs Romulan scenario in Captain's Log #10. It's called Reptilicon Revenged, and I am wondering how The Romulans can possibly win this one-any ideas? I hope that this is the right topic. Please give me any suggestions you can. I also posted this in Q&A
That's a fairly vague question, but I'll do my best to answer.

The key is looking at the victory conditions. It's all about attack factors on ships.

The Romulans have a big advantage that they have fighters, and the Gorns do not. Since crippled ships count as their crippled factors, the idea is to exchange fighters for cripples.

The Gorns start out with a maximum of 266 attack factors; the Romulans start out with at least 195 in just the North and Home fleets alone. If the Roms don't enter the Gorns 2nd fleet area, their attack factors drop by 94, making it 195 to 172; the Roms start out with an advantage. If they roll better for the Home fleet release, it's even more in their favor.

If the Roms build more carriers, they can maintain their advantage. Use maulers to blow away the Gorn BATS/PGB early in the fight to keep their compot low.

The Roms can win this fight.

I have played this scenario a few times but it has been a while. From what I remember the Romulans play to win and the Gorns play to draw. In other words it is rather easy for the Romulans to win while the best the Gorns to hope for is to get a draw and not lose.

Joe-thanks-I will try those suggestions

Art wrote:
>>It's called Reptilicon Revenged, and I am wondering how The Romulans can possibly win this one-any ideas?>>

Huh. I like this scenario, as it is nice and quick and fun. But my experience in playing it a few times is the same as what Russell said--the Romulans have all the advantages (more ships, fighters, cloaks, maulers), and generally, the Gorn's best outcome is a draw (i.e. either the Romulans win due to the Gorn's messing up or the game is a draw)--I'm hard pressed to see a situation where the Gorns win, let alone win easily. Perhaps you are misunderstanding something about scenario or rules?

-Peter

When I played this Rodger D. Morgan over an extended weekend we had to add
the Fed 6th Fleet to the Gorns. We added them kinda like the Feds send the 4th fleet to the Kzinti. It was clear the Gorns were Dead On Arrival.

If you are having problems crushing the Gorns with the Roms I would suggest you aren't getting the most out of your carriers and aren't using fighters (or building them) properly.

Eh--the Romulans don't even have that many fighters--just some WHs here and there. The issue is, more than anything else, that the Romulans have more ships, which is always the big issue in F+E; having more ships means being able to do more than your opponent (I know Larry knows this, just pointing it out for Art's sake). Even using the 3-4 result for the Romulans (which I did every game of this I played to avoid too much randomness), the Romulans start with 41 ships to the Gorn's 27 (I'm not counting unreleased fleets or the wacky Gorn BCs), and the Romulans build 9 ships a turn to the Gorn's 6 (both overbuild a lot, but mostly zero sum there, in terms of total hulls in play). Then the Romulans have some Maulers and some WH carriers to take free hits on. And then cloaking device whamdiggery. Yeah, the Gorns have better ships. And a couple CR10 Battle Tugs. But the Romulans have, again, the ship advantage. Meaning that they pin all the Gorns somewhere, and then attack bases and planets that aren't defended with what is left over.

All the games I have played (with an opponent and as a solo game) have ended in a draw--the Gorns can force a draw if they don't screw up, but the Gorns can't really win unless the Romulans do something really questionable. Which is why I am wondering if Art is misunderstanding something important about either the scenario or the game rules in general.

-Peter

We played with CVwar. So the Roms had AuxCvs. Since you had some 3rd gen ships on the build schedule, you COULD escort them. An AuxCVA is nothing to sneeze at with the low density lines in Reptilion. (well ok, the Gorn can have high density lines, but as you point out, he can have like 3 of them at best)

Also I built SP-Bs as fast as I could. Dunno if that was stock Reptilion or our extended 6-7 turn game.

I agree with you. The Gorns are horked!

Yeah, I think playing this scenario with advanced rules is likely just asking for it to
totally fall apart--it was written in, like, 1992, and the update that is out there (IIRC) doesn't change anything to account for extra stuff (like giving the Romulans escorted AuxCVs...).

The SPBs don't appear in the actual scenario. I suspect that was something you guys added--the scenario as written has the Roms start with a single WH group, and they can convert one a turn, but other than that, no Romulan carriers (although the Romulans get fighters on BATS where the Gorns do not).

The Gorns are not completely hosed, I wouldn't say, but with any amount of prudent play on the part of the Romulans (and just using the basic rules and basic scenario), the Gorns can't actually win. Force a draw, absolutely. But win? Not in a million years.

-Peter

By ART TROTMAN (Drneuro) on Wednesday, March 19, 2008 - 09:25 pm: Edit

Thanks guys for the advice-I think that the Gorn player was allowed to use the 2nd fleet from the very beginning and did not wait until the Roms entered that area-therefore, he moved a lot of ships on his turn, to counter-attack the Roms, despite a lack of entry into that area. We have agreed to replay this scenario again. Thanks again for setting us straight about the set-up

By ART TROTMAN (Drneuro) on Wednesday, March 19, 2008 - 09:27 pm: Edit

oops-sorry for the duplicate posts!

By Mike Curtis (Nashvillen) on Wednesday, March 19, 2008 - 09:30 pm: Edit

Art, you can go back and edit your post within 30 minutes of posting it and can make your duplicate say "Duplicate Post".

No problem, we all did it here one time or another! Welcome to what I consider the best strategy game in the sci-fi catagory!

By Peter D Bakija (Bakija) on Wednesday, March 19, 2008 - 09:32 pm: Edit

Heh. Yeah, the Gorn Second Fleet isn't released (and should never get released, just like all the Romulan ships except for the North fleet and the random element of the Home Fleet). There is no need for either side to release any unreleased opposing fleets. Just pretend that all those ships don't exist, and never do anything to release them.
The SPB is available in Reptilicon Revenged, but only available to build on turn 3 (and probably has no logical target to go after, so it's only usable in the reserve fleet against the final Gorn turn).

I don't see carriers as being useful, as there's just not enough of them, and not enough time to use them. As Larry pointed out, they would be more useful if you add AuxCV's into the mix, but that really breaks the scenario, not what the original balance intended.

Hmmm... I don't think you can build more than one WH group per turn by the rules, though maybe you can build two? If you really wanted to, you could start with one, build one (or two?) each turn, and also crank out a SPB/SKB on turn 3. But again, why overbuild carriers for only the last half turn of the game? Realistically, it's 3 WH groups and a SPB or SKB at the end of the game.

And if you check the victory conditions, fighters don't add to the total ship compot, so I even wonder if building the WH's during the game is really that useful.

If you go by the rules that were in place back when the scenario was written, the Romulans only have 3 free fighter factors per turn, so that WH uses 4 BH hulls** (you start with none, you build only 3 per turn, so that means you're overbuilding one each turn for the 4 BH to 4 WH conversion), paying 4 extra ep to convert them, and then paying 4 extra ep for the fighters, in order to save 1.25 ep each time you get to use them (a possible maximum of six times, less for carriers built after turn one).

That's 8 ep plus overbuild costs to save 7.5 ep, assuming you got to use it the full six times.

Or, you could just overbuild Snipes and flood the enemy with shipcount.

**Of course, if we're using the intent of the rules from 1992, then the SN to BHE conversion really should still be available, which turns a crappy 4 pt SN into a much better BHE for only 1.5 ep conversion (as part of the 2 BH + 2 SN to 4 WH conversion for 5 ep). For that benefit alone, it's probably worth building a WH group per turn.

*~* The reason I like the scenario is that you can teach new players the tactics of F&E without overloading them with rules bloat. There's only a smattering of special
ships. It's then the classic scenario of a fleet that can win any single fight it selects, vs a fleet that can run the enemy ragged with shipcount.

I guess I'm not as good with the 'run ragged with shipcount' strategy, as I usually found the Gorns to be winning by the end of the scenario, or at least forcing the draw.

---

**Quote:**

And if you check the victory conditions, fighters don't add to the total ship compot, so I even wonder if building the WH's during the game is really that useful.

---

To reduce *cripples*

Ships are rated at their current attack factors; crippled ships use their crippled attack factors. Sacrificing a few point to reduce the damage can help in this regard, if you turn over the fighters more than once (and the SPB loses only 1 atk factor, so even in a reserve, it's a good deal)

---

**By Peter D Bakija (Bakija) on Thursday, March 20, 2008 - 03:49 pm**

Kevin wrote:

>>The SPB is available in Reptilicon Revenged, but only available to build on turn 3 >>

I dunno--I neither version of the scenario I have seen (CL10 and CO) does it list SPB as an available conversion, and it has a very specific list of available conversions. It is possible that the YIS date of the SPB is appropriate for the scenario, but I suspect that it wasn't when the scenario was written and the update neglected to notice one way or the other. But yeah, even if it available for conversion, you can make one of them on the last turn and not really have anything to hit with it other than as a reserve.

>>I don't see carriers as being useful, as there's just not enough of them, and not enough time to use them.>>

My plan was always to sub a FAL every turn and convert a WH each turn--the WH group is better than the combined ships anyway, and the free damage is always helpful. I mean, they aren't overwhelming or anything, but they are definitely a bonus for the Romulans.
If you go by the rules that were in place back when the scenario was written, the Romulans only have 3 free fighter factors per turn, so that WH uses 4 BH hulls. >>

Yeah, as you note below, the '92 version of the scenario lets you convert SNs into the escorts. Which is a plus.

Or, you could just overbuild Snipes and flood the enemy with shipcount. >>

Heh. The Gorns overbuild DDs as often, so mostly a wash.

The reason I like the scenario is that you can teach new players the tactics of F&E without overloading them with rules bloat. There's only a smattering of special ships. It's then the classic scenario of a fleet that can win any single fight it selects, vs a fleet that can run the enemy ragged with shipcount.

Agreed--it is a fun, quick, scenario. It could probably (like all the old scenarios) use a serious reformat (i.e. recalculate forces and make sure it works as intended). But is still fun for an afternoon.

I guess I'm not as good with the 'run ragged with shipcount' strategy, as I usually found the Gorns to be winning by the end of the scenario, or at least forcing the draw. >>

Yeah, the Gorns just don't have enough ships to be able to actually win the scenario--if the Romulans have more total compot on the board (which is incredibly likely, given the size of the fleets and construction schedules. And the maulers and carriers), the Gorns can at best get a draw. Which seems to be what happens most often. The likelihood of the Gorns having more total compot on the map at the end of the scenario, regardless of BATS killed by then, is so small, as to be not really worth thinking about.

-Peter

Peter-Thanks for the input, info, and advice. We are playing again this coming Wednesday, so I will get an opportunity to try out your suggestions and insights. Art

Art,

Good luck and have fun, as it is a good, quick scenario. Assuming you are playing the Romulans, here are a few pointers:

-Make a Falcon Mauler every turn and use them as often as possible. Don't worry
about self crippling them, as the Gorns will probably direct them anyway.

-Do make the WH carrier groups (you can sub a FAL for the WB and then convert a WH from 2xBH+2xSN, I'm pretty sure). Make sure to have the right ships in the right place (i.e. the capital).

-Don't fight the Gorns where they have all their good ships on your turn--pin them and send your ships to where his ships aren't (BATS, planets, whatever). If you do pin a big Gorn fleet over a base, just fight the approach and retreat. You have more ships, so you should be able to pin everything in reach and then attack multiple targets every turn--he can't reserve to all of them.

-Use cloaked movement to send snipes into provinces to contest/capture them.

-Whatever you do, *do not* release the 2nd Fleet. Just ignore them and their deployment zone. The Gorn should be doing the same thing to your unreleased fleets.

-Never self kill ships if you can possibly avoid it--you are always (barring the occasional crazy corner case situation) better off crippling another ship than self killing something.

-Peter

By Alex Aminoff (Aaminoff) on Tuesday, June 17, 2008 - 11:26 pm: Edit

Returning to F&E after a 10-year hiatus or so, capital assaults seem even nastier than I remember them. This is with F&E2k + Carrier War.

The problem is that going into a main capital planet with SB + many PDUs + a couple MBs set up, the enemy damage output (at BIR 5) is often more than my entire battle line. (yes I spent 2 command points). So either I put forward a line of DNs/BTs and cripple them all, which I can only do once, or I put forward a line of CCs/CAs and self-kill them all... Or if they roll well they might vaporize the line of DNs.

And this was without even the max of 20 PDUs yet. So I guess my question is, does this imply that you really only get to take down one capital (even assuming you had the ship count to do 2) because the second one will have fixed defenses maxed out and therefore be just plain impossible to attack?

One sliver of help I guess is I think there is a rule that you may voluntarily take damage on the free scout, so that's another 7 or 8. Does the same apply to the drone bombardment squadron? Or even carriers sending their fighters forward into the line? I'm guessing that rule only applies to the scout.

Thanks,
Alex,

ships in the support squadron (DB & CVs) can't be voluntarily crippled. The Scout is actually close enough to take battle damage.

Mostly you send in a DN, a MAULER, a few CAs and a fleet of CWs to take the first few rounds. Yes you lose lots of ships, but if you are determined to take the Capital that's what you have to do.

Or you just bypass that heavily defended capital and isolate it 😞. There have been many discussions around here about the 'mudslide' strategy to winning the game.

By Daniel G. Knipfer (Dgknipfer) on Wednesday, June 18, 2008 - 01:50 am: Edit

Alex,

Welcome back to the game. Combined Ops has a little bit of help for you in attacking a fully loaded capital. Troop ships and Special Attack Forces (SAFs). It's not a cure all to the pain you have to go through attacking a capital and the defender gets his own troop ships, but it adds a little to the mix. Also, Carrier Wars has been updated as Fighter Ops.

If you will be lucky enough to come to Origins this year stop in and join us in the F&E room. We have four games planned for this year. We even have a few slots for part time players who just want to stop in and play for a few hours.

By Paul Howard (Raven) on Wednesday, June 18, 2008 - 03:58 am: Edit

Welcome back Alex

To add to what Craig and Daniel said - Capital assaults are part of the 'hard wired' aspects built into the game to slow one side down, and give the other side a chance to recover.

The question of 'what you lose', is down to two thigs - are you happy to 'cripple' most of a good line (and so lose the ability to maintain a High compot) or do you send a weaker line in - on the basis you self kill ships. It's all down to what you have, and what you need.

The second aspect is 'luck' - even the best laid plan can go wrong - the enemies dice just come up high at the start of the assault - and there is nothing you can do stop that.
Example
You design a good line - which can take 64 damage in crippling 2 x BC and 5 x CC's...the enemy rolls a 6 doing 72 damage. Either another CC gets crippled - or two ships die.

(With 'good' attacker luck, the enemy rolls say 1 3 5 4 6 2 - with the high Compot with the low dice rolls - i.e. as you kill their PDU's - their compot drops, but damage percentage increases.

With bad luck, they could roll 6 4 5 2 3 1 - the same total dice roll, but a 6 with say 35% damage at 230 compot plus 1 of say 20% at 150 compot, is far worse than 20% at 230 and 35% at 150! i.e. - It is impossible to predict how the dice will come out - and even with average rolls over several rounds, the result could be massively different)

Other things effect the outcome too - does the enemy direct on a Mauler say - if your expecting to lose a mauler and take 40 additional damage - what happens if they say let it fall?

(All of these happened in my game with William - and I had to self kill about a dozen ships!)

About the only way to limit loses - is be lucky!

But with normal luck - you self kill afew ships (or cripple lots of BC's and DN's) - the effect of those loses (either permanent or temporary) will slow the tempo of your offensive down - therefore allowing your enemy the game time needed to recover or counter attack - it's all part of the game

---

I am assuming that they do 100-120 damage and say let it fall. If they roll well or have a full stack of 20 PDUs and are doing 140+ damage, that is when it sucks, because they cripple your entire line and then start killing ships. In these cases, the Alliance prefers to let it fall than direct on the mauler. Those 28 damage could kill 7 crippled CWs.

> but a 6 with say 35% damage at 230 compot plus 1 of say 20% at 150 compot

I'm only concerned about the first couple battle rounds with max PDUs. After a few rounds the Alliance compot goes down to more manageable levels.
I came up with a few more ideas. One is, put an unescorted tug with CV pods in the protected position. Between fighters and crippling, it can absorb 13 damage points, one better than a DN. If they direct on it at 3:1, that is a lot less damage falling.

The rest of the line might be 2x DN, mauler, 9x CW. A D6S as the scout. So that adds up to 118 damage you can absorb in crippling. If they roll low, the DNs/CV tug remain uncrippled. If they roll high and generate more than 118, you can absorb up to 154 with self-killing CWs. These numbers can increase slightly if you replace a couple CWs with D6s or CAs or CCs, which you are willing to risk dying.

A DN can absorb 12 in crippling, a CW only 11 in self-killing. So putting more DNs on the line actually reduces the amount you have to self-kill *on average*. Of course if they roll very high it increases the likelihood that some DNs will blow up. There's also the problem that I don't have an infinite number of DNs/BTs, and I would like to have some left for the phase when it is just a SB assault and I can put up a line of say 5 DNs and 7 cannon fodder and expect only the cannon fodder to get crippled.

So my mistake last Monday night was putting too many DNs on the line in the very first round and too little cannon fodder, such that in the second round I had no DNs left. Well, we'll do better next time.

The strategic implication, though, is that even if you have the superiority in ship count needed to take a second capital, you can still expect to lose dozens of CWs and maybe even larger, because PDUs will be maxed. Pin count being all-important, this makes me think twice about 2-capital strategies.

"The strategic implication, though, is that even if you have the superiority in ship count needed to take a second capital, you can still expect to lose dozens of CWs and maybe even larger, because PDUs will be maxed. Pin count being all-important, this makes me think twice about 2-capital strategies."

And I'm sure that was part of the design process. It's the choice the coalition has to make.

They can take one capital (Hydran or Kzinti), and wage war against the rest of the alliance. Or they can take two capitals down (Hydran and Kzinti), and find themselves quite weak against the Federation. Or, as pointed out, they can try the tactic of taking *NO* capitals, and just mudsliding the enemy, preventing the alliance from ever recovering (though if the alliance does recover, they still have all their capitals, and you'll be in big trouble!).

Going for the two capital strategy can work, but it's gonna be costly, and right at the time you need those ships elsewhere. More prudent to go for just one capital
(though 'more prudent' is also phrased 'less daring').

Good luck however you decide, and welcome back to the game!

Alex, what part of the country are you in? There are many F&E players around the country. You may find some nearby if you let us know where you live...

Not sure this is the right place to ask this question so bear with me please!

Just picked up F&E and almost all the mods (waiting on CO to arrive) and am wondering what is the easiest way to get started learning F&E? Just basic rules then play one or two turns of the whole campaign, or would you recommend a small scenario to start out with?

Any advice to this F&E newbie is appreciated.

Mark, I would recommend that you start with The Wind (601.00) and play only with the basic rules at first. Get a feel for how the game works before adding in any extra rules. Play more of the General War as you get comfortable with the rules.

After you've played The Wind a couple times you can add in Fighter Ops and Combined Ops and play a couple of games (any scenario). Once you've got that figured out add in Advanced Ops. You can add in Planetary Ops and Strat Ops any time after adding in Advanced Ops.

Also, check out the Seeking Opponents forum page. Drop a post in the F&E section there to see if there are any players in your area that you could join up with. And welcome to the game.

Mark, First skim through the rules, stay with the basic rulebook, then look at (606.0) which focuses on the Lyran-Kzinti border (turn 1 of the General War). [The Sequence of Play in (105.0) is your friend!]

Questions, feel free to ask...

Daniel, Stewart,

Thanks for the suggestions! Have been mulling over whether to get F&E for awhile now and took the plunge after someone sold me their collection (and have CO coming in the mail to complete it.)
Reading thru everything briefly this week I realized it is a lot of material so wanted to make sure I started off correctly. If I have any more questions I will certainly ask here--thanks again.

Mark

PS--got a copy of old Federation Space for comparison.

Way different than Fed Space. You'll find economics to be the biggest difference.

Read the rulebook for Fed Space and seems very basic; read first 20 pages of F&E2k rulebook and some of the later sections and I can see where F&E is very different. Am looking forward to trying both out.

Hey Mark,

What part of the world are you in?

Slidell, Louisiana--about 30 miles east of New Orleans. Where are you located?

Slidell? You poor guy. 😠 I used to be stationed in Alexandria many years ago. I'm in Ohio now.

It was clear from discussions over in the TAC NOTE topic that most F&E players are ignorant of the realities of late general war combat.

I'm reposting the results of two Alliance SB assaults on Alliance turns 28 & 28 from the "General War 2006" battle report topic as a starting point for discussion of late general war strategy and operations

Please carefully note the strategic situation the Klingo-Lyrans face in those two assault's aftermath:

====================

AT:28

Federation West move a huge fleet to pin the forward Klingon SB at 1809 while moving another large fleet to attack the Northern Reserve SB in 1509. The Federation South/West fleet moves another fleet pinning the Klingon Red fleet at the 2215 SB while attacking the Minor at 1916.
1509 SB: SB destroyed.

1 Federation CX sunk
1 Federation HDWs sunk.
11 Federation NCL sunk.
5 Federation DW sunk.
1 Federation DD sunk.
1 Federation DDE sunk.
1 Federation DWE sunk
1 Federation FF sunk

2 Federation CX crippled.
3 Federation NCA crippled.
2 Federation NCL crippled.
2 Federation NCD crippled.
2 Federation NVH group crippled.
1 Federation FFB crippled.

1 Klingon D5X sunk.
6 Klingon F5W sunk.
6 Klingon D5 sunk.
3 Klingon F5L sunk.
4 Klingon F5 sunk.
1 Klingon SAV sunk.
3 Lyran DW sunk.

1 Klingon DX crippled.
1 Klingon C8 crippled.
1 Klingon D7 crippled.
1 Klingon D6S crippled.
1 Klingon D7C crippled.
1 Klingon D5W crippled.
1 Klingon D5J crippled.
1 Klingon F6 crippled.
2 Klingon F5L crippled.
2 Klingon F5 crippled.
1 Lyran DW crippled.

Both sides limp away from a devastating fight which see's the Klingon Northern SB brought down.

The Feds had the advantage by far in ships & quality but the Klingons had the SB. No SIDS where forcibly scored.

X-ships continue to blow up like pop-corn.
The Kzinti main fleet moves 1 hex into the 1202 SB/minor hex to engage the Lyrans in a long awaited showdown for supremacy of Kzinti Space.

4 SAFs (2 Federation & 2 Kzinti) follow as does the a handful of Federation ships in range (12?).
Lyran reserves move here as well.

In a lopsided upset that must have put the Lyran Hierarchy in sackcloth & ashes the vaunted Lyran SB went down so fast there was little time to even launch lifeboats.

The battle saw titanic EW effort on both sides (18 points max on the Lyran side and 16 points max on the Kzinti side) to cause the SAFS to miss the target. While the Lyrans won these efforts allowing the -1 max due to EW to the SAF attempt, two rolls of 6 and one of 4 caused 5 SIDS in 3 short rounds in addition to the 3 SIDS scored normally through direct damage by the Kzinti battle line caused the SB to cripple in 3 short rounds of combat and then to be totally destroyed in the 4th. 1 Round of approach and 1 round of pursuit of the luckless Lyrans also saw a Kzinti BCX captured and then destroyed in pursuit by the vengeful Kzinti!

1202 Minor & SB: Star Base Destroyed!

36 Kzinti PFs sunk.
2 Kzinti BCX sunk.
3 SAFS used and destroyed in combat.
1 Kzinti MEC sunk.
1 Kzinti CM sunk.
1 Kzinti DWE sunk.
1 Federation NSC sunk.
2 Kzinti MPF crippled.
1 Kzinti MSC crippled.
1 Kzinti ASC carrier crippled.
1 Kzinti FFK crippled.
1 Lyran CCX sunk.
1 Lyran BC sunk.
2 Lyran CA sunk.
1 Lyran CW sunk.
2 Lyran DW sunk.
1 Lyran DN crippled.
1 Lyran BC crippled.
2 Lyran CA crippled.
1 Lyran CW crippled.
1 Lyran DW crippled.
1 Lyran DWS crippled.

The Lyran fleet retreats toward the captured minor 1001. With the sudden removal of this fortification the Lyrans will be hard pressed to stay in Kzinti space at all. In addition the Klingon frontier, lightly defended, is now open to general assault.

The Kzinti Patriarch sends high praise to his noble fleet for their stunning victory!

===================================
By John Slattery (Jslat) on Thursday, August 02, 2007 - 01:54 pm: Edit

Well seeing as War is not doing my bidding in writing down CT29 (secretaries are hard to get?) I will answer the above:

The Coalition is in a hard spot to be sure with the lopsided upset at the Lyran SB that the Lyran government put so much stock in.

Lyran fighter loses where 12 up and beyond the SB complement and where 4 PF's up nad beyond the SB complement. All the PDU's has been stripped earlier by a Kzinti strike 2 or 3 turns ago.

The Lyrans are seriously contemplating havening to upgrade their Kzinti Boarder SB to a SBX just to hold the line.

The Klingons are in a real bind now. With zero fleets defending the northern boarder it is wide upon to Kzinti raid or invasion.

If the Lyran fleets actually retreat all the way back to thier BATs/SB defenses the Klingons are in a world of hurt. So the Lyrans can not do this and expect the Klingons to survive. They must fight it out in Kzinti space being a continuous threat to the undefended (fixed defense) Kzinti homeworld. But when the Kzinti's put themselves into a position so as to be within 6 hex range of the Lyran boarder BATs and still between the Lyrans and the Kzinti Homeworld and also within easy range of Klingon space the Lyrans will have to decide what to do? Let the Kzinti's flatten the BATs and cut supply without much of a defense or retreat and allow the Kzinti's an open door to the Klingon northern frontier?

The Klingon council is not amused by the Lyran inability to even defend its own starbase much less now its ability to defend the Klingon Northern Marches. All the
while the Federation is threatening the entire Klingon Eastern frontier and the Hydrans are threatening the Klingon occupation of the Hydran Homeworld.

The Lyrans have already lost the Southern Fronts BATs on the Hydran boarder, what next?

The Federation front is a very different animal these days. All the targets in range of the 2 antagonists are Klingon and that puts them on the defensive, and those targets are getting crushed one turn at a time. There is nothing really for the Klingon fleets to strike at within range in the Federation except the LTF which is very closely guarded indeed.

The Romulans have reached a parity of sorts with the Alliance fleets, but the buildup of SAFs on that boarder is frightening. Within 2 more turns the Alliance will have some 5+ SAFS within range of Remus. The Romulans are trapped with very few options but are still striking out at their antagonists. If they go for the Minor that the Alliance fleets sit on it would be an all out brawl. Its removal would remove the Alliance supply point that allows attacks on the Romulan Capitals. But it is heavily defended as the alliance can pin out the whole of the Romulan Fleet.

It's not a pretty picture.

By Trent Telenko (Ttelenko) on Thursday, August 02, 2007 - 04:29 pm: Edit

The Kzinti Theater is now in a mobile operation phase and the Coalition problem boils down to poor position. The Kzinti have interior lines of communication. The Coalition has too many now-weak fixed fortifications to cover and not enough ships to defend them.

If the Lyrans defend too far forward to cover the Klingons, the Kzinti can take an off-map fleet to hit the Lyran Frontier BATs line behind the Lyran fleet’s left/rear flank.

If the Lyrans place their fleet to protect their BATs line and border SB from that threat, it cannot protect the Klingon frontier.

The "Tigermen" can threaten both the Klingon and Lyran frontiers with one fleet and the Coalition need two or three fleets to defend. No matter what the Coalition does now, it will be losing 2-3 BATS or minor planets per turn, plus how ever many province holding frigate it cares to place in Kzinti territory for Kzinti fleets to swallow.

The Kzinti’s huge pool of free replacement fighters, +1 fast drone BIR shift and drone bombardment platforms mean they will be inflicting as much damage as pure Lyran forces and taking less permanent damage in open space.
The Coalition defense priority must now be its SB and using its BATS to inflict as much permanent damage on the Kzinti fleet as it can.

First, after reading the above, you need to be aware of what wide spread use of PF Flotillas mean for a General War fleet.

The role of the PF Flotilla in the late general war is not well understood by most F&E players. Most think of them as another form of attrition unit in the mold of fighters.

They are not.

PFs are like combat potential (COMPOT) cocaine. They make your fleets feel great in the short run by supercharging your offensives with free production PF flotillas (See rule (502.615) F&E2K). They let you inflict more damage to the enemy and take more damage from them, but they destroy your long term economic health in a few turns via replacement costs after combat destroys those free deployment flotillas.

Not using PF Flotillas to win means you lose your territory and your economy to the enemy.

Using PFs to win bankrupts your economy and shrinks the size of your battle fleets, as you desperately trade low COMPOT battle group ships to try to maintain fleet combat density with replacement PF flotillas.

How do you sink a ship in space? Where does it sink to?

It sinks to the bottom line where you write

Salvage 2.125ep

---

Quote:

PFs are like combat potential (COMPOT) cocaine. They make your fleets feel great in the short run by supercharging your offensives with free production PF flotillas (See rule (502.615) F&E2K).
Well of COURSE the dealers going to give you the first hit free to make sure you get addicted. After that, well....... 😝

Trent,

As was noted in the Tac note topic there are three problems with your Zin battle example.

1 The SAFs scored higher than normal damage, so the result does not accurately portray the relative strength of a Zin vs Lyran battle.

2 The Lyran player admitted to bad planning, by having no backup plan for the SB and not upgrading it to an XSB.

3 Lastly, you commented on a the Tacnote side that this lead to a psychological(?) problem for the Lyran player.

You are taking an extreme example and making it the rule.

Now I do agree with you about the Feds they are nasty but it is their economy that makes them so not there X-Ships which are average or below. Think of the US in WWII the Sherman tank was average at best but won because there were 5 for every one of the enemy.

Also if you look at the battle with the Feds the damage inflicted is a much better representation of the type of combat in the later turns.

It is the Feds not the Zin that will win the war. As I had said over on the Tacnot site the CO need to win by T20 or T25 at the latest otherwise it is a slow grind back to the original borders.

Let's look at these points:

>1 The SAFs scored higher than normal damage, so the result does not accurately portray the relative strength of a Zin vs Lyran battle.

Hot dice happens.

This point is irrelevant as the Kzinti has sufficient forces to take the 1202 SB whatever the Lyran player did. When I killed the Klingon 1107 SB in the AO play
test, both times I had a single SAF and only one of those two assaults did I score a SIDS with a SAF. In this Kzinti attack, there were four Alliance SAFs and the Kzinti player had only used _three_.

The biggest and most important point of a SAF attack is that it denies the defender the ability to do a directed damage attack on anything other than the SAF and lets the attacker stack the highest COMPOT units he has available to make the assault. Note that X-ships and PFs give the Alliance more COMPOT in the late war than the Coalition had in the beginning.

The additional cost in terms of damage done to the Kzinti from the 28 additional COMPOT from an SBX compared to a SB would amount to one dead DW/DWE per combat round where the SBX is present (AKA three dead DW/DWE).

It was only a matter of the price the Alliance/Kzinti player would pay to win and he had the necessary forces to win in the example.

>2 The Lyran player admitted to bad planning, by having > no backup plan for the SB and not upgrading it to an >XSB.

A SB->SBX upgrade costs 24 economic points of which 12 must be XTP. Even with a corps of engineers (COE), this cost would have been 12 XTP and seven EP. IOW, to upgrade the SBX the Lyran player would give up a CCX and 14 PFs and expose the COE to Kzinti attack.

In addition you missed the Lyran strategic situation. The Lyrans had the entire Kzinti fleet adjacent to the 1202 SB upgrade, which had just inflicted 40 PFs (+) worth of damage to the Lyran fleet the previous round.

The Kzinti could have launched an interception free carrier raid from the adjacent hex using a SCS group with a “raid” CPF and a mega fighter marker, generated 30 COMPOT and rolled adjustments on a base eight battle intensity rating table.

Remember carrier raids don’t enter the target hex. They are only in the adjacent hex. Had you “reaction moved” a force out to intercept a Kzinti Carrier Raiding force, they would have to fight the entire Kzinti fleet. Given that threat, the Lyran player would not have risked a COE on the SB upgrade. Thus, they would have given up a CCX and 24 PFs to upgrade the SBX.

The lack of PFs at 1202 due to the cost of the SBX upgrade would have more than compensated for the 28 additional COMPOT of an SBX in the Lyran battle force. The Lyrans would have to kill and crippled far more in the way of ships to keep the PF’s COMPOT.
Look back at the Lyran losses posted above. The Lyran player didn’t give up _any PFs_ in the fighting over the 1202 SB. He had enough empty PFTs to make of with the SB’s PF flotillas.

>3 Lastly, you commented on a the Tacnote side that
> this lead to a psychological problem for the Lyran player.

Watching a SB or SBX go down fast has that effect. So does watching BC and DN vaporize in command ship formation with enough other damage to cripple ships past your attrition units.

By replacing the SB with an SBX in the above example, you would have seen the fourth combat round be another SAF assault rather than a fight over a crippled SB. The Kzinti could and would have given up fighter and lower COMPOT ships to take damage in that fourth SAF round.

Assuming that the Kzinti took 76 damage points from ~220 Coalition COMPOT, I expect a SAF, 12 fighters/PF, two dead CW and two dead DW worth of additional Kzinti damage.

Given that the alliance player had hot dice, he likely would have gotten at least one additional SIDS to the X-ship directed damage SIDS the Kzinti would inflict (AKA 10 SIDS). But even if not, at that point, the SBX would have 9 SIDS out of 12 needed to cripple it.

The next two rounds the Alliance can and would have come in with marines to generate additional SIDS per round. The cost of that SBX, and the threat of additional SIDS from the marines, would have forced the Coalition player to engage and cripple/destroy marine ships.

The Kzinti at this point in the war have enough commando ships for one marine battle group attack round and one escorted Marine tug plus marine major general (MMG) round. This will get the Alliance player two more SIDS from X-ship directed damage without X-ship losses and he would have taken attrition unit damage plus eight to nine dead or crippled marine/marine escort ships (including one dead tug). Call it a total of 12-18 additional attrition units, two dead CW, five dead DW/DWEs and eight directed damage killed or crippled marine/marine escort ships (including that dead tug).

Assuming that the Lyran player prevented any marine SIDS, the Kzinti will have only one more round to cripple the SBX and would have sufficient forces left to do so.

When I went after the Klingon 1107 SB I had 10 PF Flotillas, including several
CPFs. In the example, only 36 Kzinti PFs (six flotillas) had been used.

In the mean time, the Lyrans are taking between 25 and 40 points of damage per round after the Kzinti directed damage attack. So there are between 50 and 80 damage points of crippled or dead Lyrans from those two rounds. Since 20 damage points resolves out to a dead CW plus a dead DW. You are looking at five to eight dead Lyran battle group ships or double that number of cripples.

>Now I do agree with you about the Feds they are nasty
>but it is their economy that makes them so not there
>X-Ships which are average or below. Think of the US in
>WWII the Sherman tank was average at best but won
>because there were 5 for every one of the enemy.

Federation X-ships are good enough, and more importantly, numerous enough, to get the job done -- X-mauling Coalition ships and bases.

No, the issue with the Feds is the same with the Kzinti. There are too many Klingon and Romulan targets with too few forces to protect them.

The Federation OTOH has a single, mobile LTF strong point it can protect because it has ship superiority to pin out the Klingons and can strat-move it, if it has to, when it does not (AKA after a SB assault).

This is what the Coalition player said about that in the example:

> If the Lyran fleets actually retreat all the way
>back to thier BATs/SB defenses the Klingons
>are in a world of hurt. So the Lyrans can not
>do this and expect the Klingons to survive. They
>must fight it out in Kzinti space being a
>continuous threat to the undefended (fixed
>defense) Kzinti homeworld. But when the
>Kzinti’s put themselves into a position so as
>to be within 6 hex range of the Lyran boarder
>BATS and still between the Lyrans and the
>Kzinti Homeworld and also within easy range
>of Klingon space the Lyrans will have to decide
>what to do? Let the Kzinti’s flatten the BATs
>and cut supply without much of a defense or
>retreat and allow the Kzinti's an open door
>to the Klingon northern frontier?
>
>The Lyrans have already lost the Southern Fronts
>BATs on the Hydran boarder, what next?
The Federation front is a very different animal these days. All the targets in range of the 2 antagonists are Klingon and that puts them on the defensive, and those targets are getting crushed one turn at a time. There is nothing really for the Klingon fleets to strike at within range in the Federation except the LTF which is very closely guarded indeed.

The Romulans have reached a parity of sorts with the Alliance fleets, but the buildup of SAFs on that boarder is frightening. Within 2 more turns the Alliance will have some 5+ SAFS within range of Remus. The Romulans are trapped with very few options but are still striking out at thier antagonists. If they go for the Minor that the Alliance fleets sit on it would be an all out brawl. Its removal would remove the Alliance supply point that allows attacks on the Romulan Capitals. But it is heavily heavily defended as the alliance can pin out the whole of the Romulan Fleet.

The short story of the late war is that the Alliance has the advantage of interior lines compared to the Coalition and they have a lot of targets available to attack.

Alliance ship superiority in the late war, PF/3rd Way COMPOT and the availability of X-ship directed damage mean that those Coalition static defenses go down much faster and at less cost than the Alliance defenses did at the beginning of the war.

The new found ability of the Alliance to treat Coalition battle lines the way the early war Coalition mauler lines treats a Hydran cruiser line has a similar effect on the Coalition that maulers do on Hydrans.

However you miss the point in most games the Lyrans don't just have one Supply Point. So it is not a matter of being out of supply. That is bad planning.

In the case of the SB you had the fleet to take it out. Great but hot dice do make the losses that were taken look out of proportion. Also in many if not most games the Lyrans still have superiority in density and ship count on the Zin border from T22 when CPFs are available to T28 the Lyrans should be at a huge advantage. There fleet will be denser than yours. The Zin doesn't get PFTs until T 26 and CPFs until T27 and it takes a few turns for the Zin to build up unlike the Lyrans (That early PF Coke is good).

Also in the most campaigns the Hydrans are going for their homeworlds during
these turns so there is really no garrison down south. The Lyrans are fighting a one front war with a larger econ. Lyrans econ should be around 80 Zin maybe 55-60 if they are doing great. You say the Zin are using FFF for PF to offset this econ disadvantage so no more carrier groups are showing up (The CV had kept you in the war.)

Lastly, even if everything went the way you say the best the Zin can hope for is to get back to the original border. T30 you have to fight the Lyran fleet in open space (from the note above) T31 you hit the BATS now the Zin have a supply problem to go any farther, 1105 will have been a long term capture.

So as I say it is NOT the Zin who will win the war, but the Feds.

The Federation front is a very different animal these days. All the targets in range of the 2 antagonists are Klingon and that puts them on the defensive, and those targets are getting crushed one turn at a time. There is nothing really for the Klingon fleets to strike at within range in the Federation except the LTF which is very closely guarded indeed.

Everyone understands that the CO is on the defensive and the increase in COMPOT means that defenses go down faster, but this player made a mistake of not fortifying a few positions. Forgetting about the SR SB and NR SB for example until late in the war and they are toast. Two SBs at one postition make a tough not to crack even with only one getting it's full COMPOT. But the CO must choose what to defend.

Your not telling us anything we did not know.

> However you miss the point in most games the Lyrans don't just have one Supply Point. So it is not a matter of being out of supply. That is bad planning.

It does not matter how many supply points the Lyrans have. The Kzinti fleet can and does destroy them because -- at this point in the war -- the Lyrans cannot pin the Kzinti out from all those positions.

The Lyrans have to be strong somewhere and weak somewhere else. Where they are not strong is where the Kzinti destroy supply points.

Those Lyran supply points within three hexes of the Kzinti capitol hex, or the off map areas, are going to be visited by the Kzinti Siege train of Aux ships and SAFs and will go down fast. Once they are gone, the Lyrans cannot protect the Klingon bases and the Lyran bases at the same time nor can the Klingons spare enough
ships from the Federation to protect themselves.

When the Kzinti get their three hex Capitol/off-map cordon, the Lyrans get reamed.

Trying to position Lyran fleet units forward to cover the Klingon BATS line leaves the Lyrans horribly out of position to defend their BATS line near the Kzinti off-map area.

The Kzinti fleet in a central position three hexes in front of the capitol hex is in a position to strike both. Then can CEDS relocate back to the central position, or the capitol hex, after the assaults.

> In the case of the SB you had the fleet to take it out.
> Great but hot dice do make the losses that were taken look out of proportion.

The issue with high late war Alliance COMPOT and X-mauling is that the attackers only need one good dice roll in a long series of engagements to flip a SB. After that, the deeper Alliance fighter pool -- with adequate PF support -- is enough to push the Coalition back.

> Also in many if not most games the Lyrans still have superiority in density and ship count on the Zin border from T22 when CPFs are available to T28 the Lyrans should be at a huge advantage. There fleet will be denser than yours.

You are missing several points. The first is that the Kzinti get a +1 BIR shift for fast drones. This bucks up the Kzinti effective density and is felt most when their COMPOT gets higher.

Second, the Kzinti like other DB using races get a 50% COMPOT bonus. This means their 12 points of DB is now 18.

Third, the Kzinti get mass Heavy Fighter deployment in this period. Their COMPOT and attrition unit burn rate is going up in this period as well.

A Kzinti battle line with an Adm, 4CVA(H), a 4CVD, a DNH (form), 3xCW, plus 18DB COMPOT is 129 with 26 fighters to give up and a +1 BIR to give it an effective COMPOT of ~136. Mega fighter markers can buck up this number by up to five COMPOT. [Admittedly, most Kzinti players don't bother with more than their free production mega-marker and maybe one Mega-HF marker for a single CVA(H)]
A pure Lyran force of that period will be between 5 and 15 more COMPOT than the above Kzinti line without DB.

The Kzinti can and do bleed the Lyrans of PFs in that period with heavy fighters and fast drone upgrades. So when the Kzinti get PF flotillas en-mass from base deployment, they kick the Lyrans across the map.

> The Zin doesn't get PFTs until T 26 and CPFs until T27
> and it takes a few turns for the Zin to build up unlike
> the Lyrans (That early PF Coke is good).

The Kzinti are less looking for total numbers of PFTs than they are _deployable PF flotillas_ in a combat hex.

They need a minimum of six PF flotillas in a heavily contested non-capitol combat hex to hold a position against the Lyran fleet, given their deep fighter pool, or to get into and destroy a Coalition BATS, minor planet, or other non-SB strong point.

The tug PF resupply pods are a higher build priority than HDW-HOGs, for example, because the Kzinti are building/convertng SCS, DCS and BCS while using an escorted non-control ship PFT in the support echelon to send a PF flotilla forward.

Resupplying those carrier groups with more flotillas is of more use to the Kzinti than the extra cost & pin count of a full up PFT. Especially since they are single weight pods that LTT's can use, freeing tugs for higher priority missions.

And recall as well that the Kzinti are also getting three free production Aux-PFT for that three hex siege train.

On the third turn of PF deployment the Kzinti can show up to any one hex with a SCS, a BCS, a DCS, a PFT, a Small Aux-PFT, a large Aux-PFT, a Aux-SCS, a PFT pod and a PFT resupply pod.

The SCS and the DCS/NCS are conversions and the BCS and PFT are new hull production. The pods are also new production.

That is enough Kzinti PF flotillas to cave in any Coalition defensive position within three hexes of the Kzinti capitol hex/off-map area.

> Also in the most campaigns the Hydrans are going for
> their homeworlds during these turns so there is really
no garrison down south. The Lyrans are fighting a one
front war with a larger econ. Lyrans econ should be
around 80 Zin maybe 55-60 if they are doing great.

The issue with the Kzinti in those campaigns is that the Feds can and do add 20
econ to the Kzinti. So the Lyran economy is actually smaller, when you add in the
economic value of the larger annual Kzinti fighter production (12 eps).

You say the Zin are using FFF for PF to offset this
econ disadvantage so no more carrier groups are
showing up (The CV had kept you in the war.)

Lastly, even if everything went the way you say the
best the Zin can hope for is to get back to the original
border. T30 you have to fight the Lyran fleet in open
space (from the note above) T31 you hit the BATS now
the Zin have a supply problem to go any farther, 1105
will have been a long term capture.

The Kzinti are using FFF *AND* 18 base PF flotillas (54 EP).

Lyran "PF Coke" used yesterday cannot stop a huge PF Coke shipment to the
Kzinti today.

That is how the Kzinti not only regain their whole territory. It is how they cleanse
the original Coalition border defenses from the map.

As I said you get the border BATS not much else. This is nothing new, but it is the
Feds that make it happen not the Zin.

Trent,
I'm really not clear on what your point has been, with teh tac notes and all this.
Yes, PFs and X-ships have a profound effect on the war, esp. when one side has it
and the other doesn't. It seems that you've spent pages upon pages to prove
something that we all know.

Is there some advice in all this? I'm not sure I've seen any (beyond, get PFs and
X-ships of one's own).
Ed,

> As I said you get the border BATS not much else. This
> is nothing new, but it is the Feds that make it happen
> not the Zin.

BATS count towards victory points.

So do Star bases.

In both AO play tests I ran, I destroyed every Klingon & Lyran border BATS, two Lyran SB and one Klingon SB.

I did this with zero Federation cash, a partial (2/3 size) Gorn Operation Remus expeditionary fleet per the historical (617.F3) AO set up -- at turns three and four respectively -- in the two sector B scenarios I played.

In a free play campaign the exchange of 20 Fed EPs per turn for the Gorn units would have made my forces much stronger much faster in that time frame. As would not having the historical Operation Remus ship count fleet in Sector F in the first place.

That Kzinti Operation Remus fleet arrived at turn four of both play test scenarios.

Joe,

> Is there some advice in all this? I'm not sure I've seen
> any (beyond, get PFs and X-ships of one's own).

My first objective here is education on the strategic background upon which late war tactics are based.

For players, particularly Coalition players, to understand late General War tactics, they have to understand the strategic situation they face.

They just don't.

The Coalition faces a block obsolescence in their force structure in the face of the X-mauler threat.

For the Alliance, it is maulers plus more of the same with control ships displacing carriers.

Alliance or Coalition players who have never played late General War really don't get what PF or X-ship deployment does to reduce the size of their respective
fleets.

Coalition players, and particularly the Lyran just don't understand what they are facing in terms of facing two major fighter using races getting PFs.

The Lyran are the closest race to 108 EP (36 PF Flotillas) of Hydran & Kzinti base PFs and a further 16 free fighter factor (FFF) purchased PF flotillas per year.

The Lyran, OTOH, are going to get only six free PF flotillas a year with no more than five of them in a turn.

The Klingons, thanks to 1) Federation LTF, 2) The pressure of Federation X-cruisers and 3) The "switched on in a turn" Federation 3rd Way, are not in a position to effectively blunt more than a small percentage of that Hydro-Kzinti PF flotilla avalanche that hits the Lyran.

Both the Alliance's and the Coalition's tactics have got to take into account that built in late war spread sheet first. And tactics and strategies appropriate to the late war make no sense without that context.

"Both the Alliance's and the Coalition's tactics have got to take into account that built in late war spread sheet first. And tactics and strategies appropriate to the late war make no sense without that context."

That's fine, but you've posted reams and reams of background, and I've not yet seen any strategies or tactics. You even posted 2 Tacnotes with no suggestions. I don't disagree with your conclusions, but I think you've more than demonstrated the point, and at this point, it just looks like harping or complaining (and I don't think that is your intention). I'd really like to see what strategies you suggest to deal with the situation.

I agree with Joe, you have said how it is. I also do not disagree with your conclusions, but you really aren't telling us A)How to stop it or B)How to make it even more devastating.

Perhaps it is necessary for the Coalition to start thinking about the defensive earlier than they have been doing? Fortifying certain positions well ahead of the coming onslaught, rather than continuing on the offensive, may be the better way to go long term.

However, I personally cannot offer any practical advice, having never gotten to this stage of the game.
A yes on the defenses.

Also, it is imperative for the Roms to build as many fighters as possible to cut down on the damage... I'm planning on doing a follow up to my earlier "Romulans love a good fight(er)" to incorporate all the changes that have happened since I wrote it.

I'd think that building as many decent carriers as possible for the Coalition from the get-go would be very useful. 1 less D7 a turn, convert to a D6U/D7V or some such. Convert to heavy fighter carrier as fast as possible.

Fortifying up, I don't know about.

"1 less D7 a turn, convert to a D6U/D7V or some such"

All those D6Vs can become D6Us, and you don't even have to lose a cruiser hull 😊

All the more reason to build D6Vs instead of FVs the first turns until the D5V comes out.

The carriers are nice, when the tide turns for the CO they usually know. They get at least 6-8 turns to start fortifying their positions, so it is not like they can't get there defenses in place. That said if you are planning to defend a certain hard point without a planet setting up FDUs there early will help. When the tide turns you need to select your front line hard points and your fall back positions. With a little planning you can cause an awful lot of damage to the Alliance ala the early Zin and Hydran capital assaults.

I don't understand the word "instead" in that sentence.

in lieu of?

Larry,

I've seen a tacnote that says "don't build D6Vs, build FVs". I disagree with that. Or at least, build both (if you want to reduce the number of fighters you pay for), at least until the D5Vs come out
I agree with Joe on that. D6V may not be a great carrier but it is a carrier. You can never build too many carriers as the Coalition. Even before D6U was added to the game I would build as many as I could afford.

I don't understand INSTEAD.

I build both. I build as many fighters as I can. Maybe it's cause I'm an AWC, maybe because I think you should play a long game instead of leaping on your enemies pike, but I like fighters.

Joe,

Realistically, do the Klingons have to chose between building D6Vs or FVs? They aren't usually that strapped for cash in the early game unless their repair backlog is huge or they need to fortify a captured capital.

I like the FV. With flexible carrier groups it provides a ready source of light escorts and gives you a viable use for the E4. Before FCRs the FVs were the source of fighters on rounds 2+ and even now they provide lots of fighters to feed forward or use for pinning. Didn't someone do a TACNOTE on the pinning power of a D6 and 3FV groups to stop reserve movement?

I'm at work so I can't reference my rules. However, it would be cool if there was a heavy fighter version (FVH?) or MEGA counters for the fighter groups on FVs.

As a side note D6Y has no production limits. Not the ideal way of adding fighters to the fleet, but a with escorts relatively safe in battleline.

"Realistically, do the Klingons have to chose between building D6Vs or FVs?"

I find that during the first few turns there are so many demands on Klingon money that building more than the free fighters is difficult, until the Lyrans start sending cash and you conquer some territory.

I looked back at my econ for Still Sleeping Giants with Peter D., and I only paid for 2 fighters beyond the free ones, and I had very little spare cash. Yes, I could have purchased a couple FVs, but only 2 or so. I decided that foregoing the FVs will allow me to build 2 D7V/D5V carriers a couple turns later; I forecast my econ, and building them would have been very difficult otherwise. And as you mentioned FCRS, I find them more economical than the FVs. If (assuming we get the game going again) I find some spare cash in a couple turns, I may build
some.... but then they are an adjunct to D5Vs, not D6Vs.

there have been so many toys added to the game that it really eats up cash....

you know I had to save enough money for convoys!! 😊

"Didn't someone do a TACNOTE on the pinning power of a D6 and 3FV groups to stop reserve movement? "

That assumes my opponent is silly enough to put them where I can pin them. I play Peter D. He doesn't do stuff like that (nor do I).

One of the real reasons (IMO) for not building D6V's is the fact that the Klingons have so many better things for which to use their cruiser hull capacity.

For the first few years of the war, they get 9 cruiser hulls per year (1xD7C, 3xD7, 1xD6 built; 4xD6 from mothballs). Sounds like a lot until you subtract out the things the Klingons pretty much _need_ to build each year:

1xD7A, 2xD6M, 1xD6S, 2xD6D, TG

You're now down to 2 hulls left, and I would much rather have them as more D6M's or D6D's that I can use now, instead of a truly lousy carriers that I can turn into something good at a later date. When that time comes, you can convert the existing D6V's you're stuck with at start and CDR existing D6's that you're repairing anyway.

Until the D5V shows up, I think the Klingons are much better off spending their free fighters on F5V's. You get the same compot density, more attrition factors per EP spent, and, when paired with a F5S, a pretty mean little group for ESSC.

Cheers,
Jason

Joe,
The Klingons also have 21 D6s already in service. They are prime conversion targets.

I convert 4 D6s to D6Vs prior to the intro of the D5V.

Those 4, plus the 3 at start D6Vs, will become D6Us in my navy.

Joe:
Absolutely true that you could use existing D6 hulls. Quite frankly though, I would rather have the D6's until the D6U becomes available and spend my FFF on the FV's, which are far more flexible and useful carriers. Until AD5's become available, the D6V has absolutely _no_ advantage, other than command rating, over the FV. Again, I would rather spend the money and FFF on something I can use now instead of something that will be useful later, but is deadweight now. Once the D6U becomes available, then convert the D6's directly. Don't waste the hull in a wretched intermediate status for the intervening turns.

Gee, can you tell that I don't like D6V's? :-)

Cheers,
Jason

---

By Trent Telenko (Ttelenko) on Tuesday, November 11, 2008 - 11:13 pm:

> That's fine, but you've posted reams and reams of background, and I've not yet seen any strategies or tactics. You even posted 2 Tacnotes with no suggestions. I don't disagree with your conclusions, but I think you've more than demonstrated the point, and at this point, it just looks like harping or complaining (and I don't think that is your intention). I'd really like to see what stratagems you suggest to deal with the situation.

Joe,

How many people in F&E demonstrate real understanding of the importance of the late general war game strategy I mentioned here:

_The one thing hammered home as the Kzinti player is that the most important point PF flotillas is MASS! What counts is being able to throw a large number of PF flotillas, on many PFTs, CPF, Tug pods, etc in one hex to benefit from the presence of PF flotillas._

Paul Bonfanti in his CL #34 "THE TRUTH ABOUT PF's" tac note told F&E players that the Hydrans and Kzinti should not really use PF's because
1) They already have fighters and
2) They can't afford replacement PFs.

When, between them the Hydras and Kzinti,
a) Are getting 108 EP (36 PF flotillas) of free PFs to attack the Coalition with, (because the Coalition destroyed all the base they would have been deployed on), plus
b) another 48 EP (16 PF Flotillas) per year in the form of free fighter factors.
In F&E game terms, for the Hydrans and Kzinti, that advice is INSANE.

Especially when their main opponent holding most of their territories, the Lyrans, are getting 18 EP (six PF flotillas) worth of free PF flotilla production a year and have burned up it's allotment of 54 EP of base deployment PF flotillas in offensives before the Hydrans and Kzinti get the majority of their PFs.

Those two races should take every base deployment and free fighter factor purchased PF flotilla and hammer flat every Coalition strong point in their territory or capable of projecting power into their territory.

Paul Bonfanti's tac note also gives a lot of other tactical and strategy suggestions for the various PF using races that show no real understanding of the following:

1) The need for Massing PF flotillas,
2) The PF deployment spread sheet built into the game,
3) The Fighter factor versus PF purchase payback curve, and
4) X-ship Directed Damage's effects on PFTs,

and are just as wrong.

Joe S said:

> Also, it is imperative for the Roms to build as many fighters as possible to cut down on the damage... I'm planning on doing a follow up to my earlier "Romulans love a good fight(er)" to incorporate all the changes that have happened since I wrote it.

So Joe, your Romulan answer to the Federation 3rd way and X-ships threat is to preemptively build an "Alliance-style" Romulan carrier fleet?

How is that any different from my saying this:

*The directed damage capability of Alliance X-ships forced the Coalition to switch over to the Alliance’s carrier group plus rule (315.0) battle group based lines after spending 25(+) turns building a heavy battle cruiser/Mauler/battle group combatant based fleet. This radically lowered the Coalition battle line COMPOT until large numbers of (315.0) battle group capable X-ships arrived.*

The only difference I see is I was describing the game as it is really played and you are moving the Romulan response to that reality up 20 turns because as a F&E player you can see it coming and prepare.
Trent,

Because Joe is saying the Roms should be building lots of fighters from the beginning not because the X-ships are coming 10 years down the road. The Roms with a carrier fleet can take out the Gorns thus you never reach a turn that you have to deal with X-ships. The alliance can lose the war by T20.

Also no one here has ever said as far have read not to build carriers, even today over on the general discussion they were debating D6V vs FV production. The CO uses carriers and lots of them, so as far as I can see your argument is flawed. Yes if it goes to the late round the Alliance will kick the CO back on to the defensive. And X-ships and PFs work the way they do but you are not telling us anything that is not in the rulebook.

Joe Stevenson (Ikv_Sabre)

"the FV's, which are far more flexible and useful carriers"

I have to disagree completely. For one, I can resolve 8 pts on the D6V to cripple, and it has higher compot. I CAN put it on the line without fear of it getting blown away, except at a capital, even with crappy E4s as escorts. And the FV group is never going to get much better. The D6V will, and will grow up to become a D6U. That sounds a lot more flexible to me.

Trent,

"How many people in F&E demonstrate real understanding of the importance of the late general war game strategy"

Everyone who's played the late war scenarios (or been in the room) at Origins. Not all of them post here much anymore, but they still play.

"In F&E game terms, for the Hydrans and Kzinti, that advice is INSANE."

Agreed. Sadly, not all tac notes printed are good ones.

"So Joe, your Romulan answer to the Federation 3rd way and X-ships threat is to preemptively build an "Alliance-style" Romulan carrier fleet?"

No, as Ed points out, I'm saying start that from day 1. I even give up frigate builds to do it (although the diplomats reduce the need to give up as many ship builds). The Roms can build more fighters than anyone except the Feds, and can
spare some frigate builds to save themselves a ton of cripples they can't afford to repair.

"How is that any different from my saying this:"

It was hard to see that in 15 pages of rant. There was so much exposition, it was very difficult to see what you were getting at (if anything)

"The CO uses carriers and lots of them, so as far as I can see your argument is flawed"

That's kind of my take as well. And it is ONLY an issue for the Roms, because the L and K GET PFs before the others. So they already dole out the "compot shock".

Joe puts this right on point the L and K know about "compot shock", you are saying because they lose a SB or a Group in one turn they are completely demoralized? I just don't see how you get there. The CO loses tons of ships attacking capitals so losing groups and fixed fortifications should not rattle them into complete submission as you suggest.

Not to mention they have plenty of time to turn BATS into STBs (using COEs) to make it a little harder on the Alliance, and make it easier to upgrade to SBs.

I agree Ed. This idea that losing one SB is going to kill the Coalition is just not supportable. It happens on occasion now; it just gets a bit easier for the Alliance later. But when it does, the Coalition defending compot, with five PFs sqns at SB battles (3 with the fleet, two on the base) is going to make the Alliance pay dearly... except when they sweep away the poor Roms.

Which makes me think the WoF scenario needs to be updated to include the new FO and CL stuff. That would give them a little boost.
I would also have to agree with Joe and Ed. In East Wind, the Coalition has lost 4 or 5 SB's and they are still going strong. The Kziniti still need to keep a sizable force to protect my capital each turn.

> I agree Ed. This idea that losing one SB is going to kill the Coalition is just not supportable. It happens on occasion now; it just gets a bit easier for the Alliance later. But when it does, the Coalition defending compot, with five PFs sqns at SB battles (3 with the fleet, two on the base) is going to make the Alliance pay dearly... except when they sweep away the poor Roms.

Joe,

I did not kill one SB.

I killed three SB and added another 10 Coalition BATS to the killed counter pile as well.

STB's don't add O-COMPOT. They add defensive staying power against non-mauler or non-X ship fleets. Against mauling of any kind they are still speed bumps for late war fleets. (They also let you repair DN's at the front lines and slightly reduce the cost from an SB upgrade from a BATS, but it is the former capability that is more important here.)

As for three plus two SB PF flotillas, I would exchange one of the PF flotillas for a CVD oversized fighter squadron to better manage absorbing damage, most especially the additiona attrition unit damage from X-ships.

Also, when you are down to using CPFs. It is often useful to replace them in the line with Heavy megafighters because they are one less O-compot for eight more non-permanent damage.

You left out where I said to use them as a root to cheaper SBs.

Trent, 3 SB's and 10 BatS killed. Was that on one turn or spread over many turns?
Joe,

You are trading game time (ask me for anything but time) for 10 EP of COE work going BATS->STB->SB plus the risk of exposure of the COE to raids and fleet attacks.

For example, this gives the Alliance two chances to score an espionage/sabotage raid on the base that will delay upgrade completion of either upgrade a full turn.

This is in addition to other special raids that target the COE.

The opportunity costs of that are not worth the risk to the COE, IMO, until all my off-map minor ship yards are built.

Russell,

It was over the course of six turns in the Winds of Fire "Sector B" scenario in Advanced Operations.

"You are trading game time (ask me for anything but time) for 10 EP of COE work going BATS->STB->SB plus the risk of exposure of the COE to raids and fleet attacks."

There is plenty of game time to get it done.

"The opportunity costs of that are not worth the risk to the COE"

What else are you going to do with them at that point? They should already have built any shipyards they can build

"It was over the course of six turns"

That's a pretty long time.

I have to agree that 6 turns is a lot of time. In East Wind we have taken down a total of 5 Coalition SB's as well as over 1/2 the BatS that start on the map and the Coalition is still punching.

I think I see what might be causing a flaw in your reasoning. You seem to be basing your article on experience playing the early game (turns 1-9) and seeing the Coalition romp. Then playing the Winds of Fire Scenario which starts on Turn
26 and being surprised by the Alliance ability to actually do damage. You are extrapolating the concept of Compot shock based on these two experiences.

However, if you play the Campaign from Turn 1 through Turn 26 and beyond, the Alliance's ability to field increasingly large compot battle lines and deal actual damage does not come as a shock. The reason is because they are incremental increases. You see it building over time so that the first time an SB falls the Coalition player knew it was going to happen a turn or two before it actual did.

For example, in East Wind, the tide changed gradually. As is typical in the game, the Coalition was romping all over the Alliance through most of the game. However, by about turn 20ish, the Coalition player realized he wasn't going to be able to maintain the initiative any more. That meant that when the Alliance started to put up the larger Compot battle lines and dealing serious damage the Coalition Player was prepared for it.

By Edward Kroeten (Ekroeten) on Thursday, November 13, 2008 - 11:42 pm: Edit

I agree with Russell that is it in the nutshell, the Coalition has to win by the early 20s turns or it is slowly getting pushed back. There is no shock in this development.

By Paul Bonfanti (Bonfanti) on Tuesday, November 18, 2008 - 11:04 am: Edit

Trent,

To go back to your post a few days ago, that's not a true depiction of what I said in the "Truth about PFs." You are correct--I should have talked more about using free fighters as PFs or the left over base PFs--it was a long article already, but more could be said about it.

However, I still stick to the opinion I offered in that (which you're misrepresenting some)--that the Kzinti should not fall in love with PFs.

First of all, as for the free base PFs--those will disappear pretty quickly if you follow the strategy you espouse. I think someone likened them to a drug--you get hooked on them, but there gone in a couple of turns. As for free fighters, it is more efficient to use free fighters for PFs than for the original use, but it's not free. There's an opportunity cost there. The Kzinti may want to use some of those fighters for an SCS, or converting a CVS to a CVH or to build HDWs. Those are valid options even in late war in my mind.

The other part of the cost equation is the PFTs themselves. By the time they get to build PFTs, the Kzinti is in 50% exhaustion. Those 5 extra EP to build a PFT can get hard to bear.

In terms of density, a MPF with escorts has one compot more than a CVS group;
one less than a CVH group. Meanwhile, you're giving up free damage for damage that costs money. If you don't escort the MPF, it's dead.

OK, you say, put three up and get super density. The issue there is one of force dynamics. For 25+ turns, the Kzinti have been building up their fleet around CVS and CVA. They may not have any single ship CR10 other than Battle Tugs, which can't use Admirals. And they can't build CCXs until T30. They also probably don't have a lot of high density single ships like CCs left. What fills out the line?

As per your "combat shock" idea--let's go with a good strong Kzinti line with 3 PFTs on the line and an X-mauler against my Lyran line with a DNP in protected, an SCS on the line and a mauler available. You get 44 damage and kill my DNP. Fine. Assuming I can base the PFTs somewhere else, I've lost a ship that costs me 15 EP after salvage. If our lines are close to equal strength, which is reasonable considering my DNP and SCS start me off with 74 compot on 5 ships, I will probably score about 41 damage (considering the Kzinti +1). Ok, I pop your on-the-line PFT for 13, and you still have to take 28 points of PFTs. Total economic impact to you: 15.75 EP. But if you don't get enough to bag the DNP, I'm still killing your PFT. I think a good coalition player won't mind those odds or exchange.

For the Kzinti, I still think it's better to go easy on the PF strategy and focus on getting even better with fighters.

As for the Hydrans, my reservation there is all about the cost of PFTs. The Hyran econ will be wrecked, and they have a lot of things they want to buy. For the Hydrans, their free fighter factors are just like money since almost all of their shipbuilds will use them to reduce the cost of their hybrids, so using them for PF replacements is just like spending the EPs. But I do say in the tacnote that the Hydrans should use PFs, just judiciously.

I will just point out that the Hydrans can easily muster giant lines in late war with 50+ fighters to take damage on having nothing bigger than a DW exposed to shoot at--without using a single PF.

---

By Joe Stevenson (Ikv_Sabre) on Tuesday, November 18, 2008 - 11:18 am

Paul,

PFs are no worse than repairs. And the fact of the matter is, when PFs and X-ships are out, the most economical (AND density efficient) thing to do is destroy old, small ships (Hydrans excepted). Salvage is not affected by eco exhaustion. We've seen it before, the fleet contraction that happens, because killing off PFs (as you point out) kills one's density once you run out. That said, I'd not kill the ships until I'd run down my supply of PFs some, and used up what fighters I could get on the line (better to use up 6 ftrs, than a 5-pt frigate, of course)
"I will just point out that the Hydrans can easily muster giant lines in late war with 50+ fighters to take damage on having nothing bigger than a DW exposed to shoot at--without using a single PF."

I'll point out that they can go 40+ fighters PLUS PFs.

That line beats your line.

And it will not kill their econ. They build the PFs, take damage on fighters. Win-win.

Joe,

I agree on killing small ships--it's a necessity in late war.

But PFs can actually be worse than repairs. An odd compot ship repairs more efficiently than PFs. Also, for fighter heavy races, putting those PFs on the line probably means you have 6 fighters less on the line, so in some cases by using PFs you're giving up free damage absorption possibilities.

On the Hydrans, yes, you are correct that they can go 40 fighters plus PFs. They often should. But Trent was advocating maximizing PFs on the line, and my point was the Hydrans don't necessarily need to.

The other drawback to the Hydrans going with PFs on the line is that they will give the Coalition something to shoot at. Consider a line with a REG in protected, a fully escorted IC group, a fully escorted SD group keeping its regular fighters in the bay, and DWs filling out the other spots. If the Hydrans only have one target in a turn, this is a line they could muster easily. I'm not sure if you can get a PF tender in there and make it better compot without exposing something.

"An odd compot ship repairs more efficiently than PFs"

A little, but you also need to count in the extra damage scored (eco damage) against the enemy as well.

"Also, for fighter heavy races, putting those PFs on the line probably means you have 6 fighters less on the line, so in some cases by using PFs you're giving up free damage absorption possibilities."

Some. But again, going with all heavy fighters is not going to beat PFs.
"and my point was the Hydrans don't necessarily need to."

Not much reason not to, though. They can still soak up the bulk of their damage on fighters, and that being the case, the enemy will most likely direct every round...... so max PFs are definitely the way to go, unless one is putting up the carrier line to protect cruisers.

"The other drawback to the Hydrans going with PFs on the line is that they will give the Coalition something to shoot at."

They are probably going to, anyway.

You can't fight a way worrying "if I use my units, they might die". The simple fact of the matter is force must be met with force in the late war.

I agree with you that resolving too much damage on them is a bad idea, but to not make full use of them is a losing prospect

By Joe Stevenson (Ikv_Sabre) On Tuesday, November 18, 2008 - 12:40 pm: Edit

Paul,

Where in PA do you live?

By Trent Telenko (Ttelenko) On Tuesday, November 18, 2008 - 01:13 pm: Edit

Paul,

>First of all, as for the free base PFs--those
>will disappear pretty quickly if you follow the
>strategy you espouse. I think someone likened
>them to a drug--you get hooked on them, but
>there gone in a couple of turns.

I am the person who wrote that.

I also said if you don't use them, you will be in the position of losing both your territory and your fleet.

>As for free fighters, it is more efficient to
>use free fighters for PFs than for the original
>use, but it's not free. There's an opportunity
>cost there. The Kzinti may want to use some of
>those fighters for an SCS, or converting a CVS
>to a CVH or to build HDWs. Those are valid
>options even in late war in my mind.
It boils down to your payback function.

You have to use a fighter factor eight times to get the cost/benefit of four PFs that you can buy with that free fighter factor.

Plus, you have to factor in the additional future permanent ship losses you will take in those eight payback rounds versus the four PFs.

Those calculations push you hard to using free fighter factors as PFs for anything produced after turn 28-to-30, even leaving aside the pressing need to get the Kzinti into the same league as the Coalition in terms of combat loaded PFTs.

> The other part of the cost equation is the PFTs themselves. By the time they get to build PFTs, the Kzinti is in 50% exhaustion. Those 5 extra EP to build a PFT can get hard to bear.

Not every PFT conversion cost 5 EP, nor are PFT conversions hard to bear if you are adding hull COMPOT to the line as well as PFT ability.

My favorite Kzinti build/conversion combination was to do the following:

CVA->SCS (six surplus fighters available for use)

New Kzinti BCS cost 13 EP (10 for hull three for PFT ability), 3 x fighters from SCS for the BCS fighter factors, three SCS fighter factors at two to one for six PFs on the BCS.

Alternately, there is the SCS conversion plus DCS/NCS build that uses all the excess SCS fighters in a new hull.

Or third, I can use the three excess SCS fighter factors from a SCS conversion/BCS build for CV tug pod production, SCS pod production, CVE production, FCR production, or HDW fighter factor production.

> In terms of density, a MPF with escorts has one compot more than a CVS group; one less than a CVH group. Meanwhile, you're giving up free damage for damage that costs money. If you don't escort the MPF, it's dead.

The only time I put naked PFT's on the line -- when the other side has maulers or X-ships -- is behind a SAF during a SB assault.
If you pop my PFT during a SB assault, you are going to lose a lot more in terms of SB SIDS or PDUs than it cost me to build the PFT.

Note as well that the Kzinti Fi-Con counter is also useful in a crippled-glutted pursuit *if* it is constructed with two MPFT's. That is because it is effectively a 15/8 counter because of the scout directed damage bonus and is hard to kill with mauler directed damage in that case. It also gets CEDS retrograde as a carrier thanks to the fighters it carries.

>Ok, I pop your on-the-line PFT for 13, and you
>still have to take 28 points of PFs.

You always escort your PFTs sending PF flotillas forward with two escorts, if it is a pure PFT, or simply use a off the line BCS, DCS or SCS to deliver the PF flotilla. This radically changes the ability to pop off the line PFT's.

The key thing here is to understand the capabilities of the various PFTs. The following is from an article draft I am working on:

<i>"There are several types of tenders and tender like units that carry PF flotillas. These include:

1) Heavy PF Tenders – these are class 2 hulled DN and Class 3 heavy battle cruisers that have battleship class combat densities of 24 and 23.

These PFTs are the priority targets for X-ship battle group directed damage attacks. The best of the class are the Lyran BCP’s due to their ability to raid and conduct PFT special raids.

2) Combat PF Tenders – These are HDW-POG and Size class 3 ships with offensive combat density of four or more in addition to the PF flotilla.

Other than the Lyran BCP, these PFTs are the toughest raiders because they and their PFs have combat densities larger than Heavy Dreadnoughts and are capable of single combat outside the small ship combat table.

3) Combat support PF Tenders – These are size class three and four PF tenders that have to use the small ship combat tables in duels due to low innate combat density. The Kzinti MPFT, Kzinti PFT, Gorn PFT, Tholian PFT, Lyran PFT and any light PFTs are examples of this class of tender.

These PFTs cannot be risked in direct combat, even with escorts, due to mauler or X-ship attacks. Nor can they send PF flotillas forward to the battle line combat without escorts, since most have small hulls that are vulnerable to 3-to-1 directed damage attacks in the support echelon."
4) Control Ship PF Tenders – These come in three flavors;
(a) DN hulled SCS with a full fighter squadron and PF flotilla,
(b) The BCS with a half squadron of fighters and a full PF flotilla and
(c) The DCS/NCS heavy cruiser hull which trades all its offensive combat density for special sensors, a fighter squadron and a PF flotilla.

These classes trade total battle line combat density for the protection of escorts. They are the only PFT type that can survive direct combat versus X-battle groups.

5) Tugs & LTT with PF pods – These are tugs with PF pods and can mimic combat or combat support PFTs depending on the race, the ship and the pod sets available. Some tug PF pods are pure resupply types with no PF flotilla combat capability at all.

Large raiders and X-battle groups will target these ships whenever they appear.

6) Casual PFT – These units trade combat density (10 vs. 12) for being an “invulnerable distributed PFT” in the face of mauler and X-ship directed damage attacks because as long as a single crippled ship escapes from a CPF equipped battle force, the CPF will survive.

Note that only one CPF can be used per battle force for all races save the Lyrans. The Lyrans, or combined Klingo-Lyran battle lines, can use two CPF.

7) Auxiliary PFT – They are a slow and more vulnerable form of combat support PFT.

Treat Auxiliary PFT as large auxiliary scouts that you can escort because they carry either a PF flotilla or a fighter squadron and a PF flotilla. Never leave an Auxiliary PFT without an escort or they will die from enemy raids."

>As for the Hydrans, my reservation there is all
>about the cost of PFTs. The Hydran econ will be
>wrecked, and they have a lot of things they
>want to buy. For the Hydrans, their free
>fighter factors are just like money since
>almost all of their shipbuilds will use them to
>reduce the cost of their hybrids, so using them
>for PF replacements is just like spending the
>EPs. But I do say in the tacnote that the
>Hydrans should use PFs, just judiciously.

The Hydrans get free Pegusus PFT production above the production limits, a cheap DD-PFT conversions above the production limit, further cheap DDS->DD-
PFT conversions within the PFT production limits and a BCS with a full fighter squadron.

The Hydran's ability to convert a CVA->SCS and build a BCS using all six of the left over SCS fighters is unmatched.

They also get a tug PF resupply pod that carries two PF flotillas gives them the ability to move a lot of back up PF flotillas at strategic ranges from the off-map area.

The Hydrans have always had high density fleets with great attrition capability. They lacked maulers and fleet depth to their high COMPOT units to deal with the Coalition Mauler/SFG/Penal ship threat.

For the "Mean Green," free PFT's, combined with carrier groups, add high COMPOT depth while X-ships add lots of anti-ship maulers.

A Hydran line with a IC+NCE+NCE+DWE+FFE group (with holding six ftr factors), plus NSV+NCE+DWE+FFE group, plus PF Flotilla, plus KNX, plus SCX is simply sick to fight.

There are eight HF factors, 12 PF factors and 28 normal fighter factors to deal with and very little other than the X-ship that are worth shooting at.

Alternately, you could use SCS+NCE+NCE+DWE+FFE (with holding six ftr factors or having used them earlier), plus CV+NCE+DWE+FFE group, plus PF Flotilla, plus KNX, plus SCX for 24 PFT factors & 25 fighter factors with the same vulnerabilities, less EWPs and the same attrition unit sickness as above.

As long as the Hydran free PF flotillas and Hunter escorts last, they are going to be eating Coalition fleets in open space and dropping anything below SB size in stride.

At Coalition SB's, they will have enough PF flotillas and fighter factors to absorb low BIR assault rounds with little permanent hull damage aside from the directed to death hulls.

Paul B,

The Hydrans absolutely need to use the 54 EPs of free PF flotillas, combined with their fighters, to crack Coalition fixed defenses in their territory and especially at
their capital.

If only to have a fleet afterwards.

A Late war SB assault can inflict several hundred points of damage on the assaulting fleet.

For example, the AT:29 Lyran SB assault in General War 2006 that went down "quickly" in five rounds inflicted a minimum of 279 damage points to the Kzinti fleet, leaving apart unreported number of fighters killed.

The Hydrans need enough control ship PFT's and replacement PF flotillas in their fleet trains to absorb the shock of that kind of SB assault.

Think in terms of at least 10 PF flotillas in addition to 200 of so fighters of various kinds.

By Paul Bonfanti (Bonfanti) on Tuesday, November 18, 2008 - 03:21 pm: Edit

Joe,

I agree that being afraid to lose units is a Very Bad Thing. However, I've also seen how frustrating it can be for a coalition player to face a Hydran line with 140 compot but nothing to shoot at except maybe the scout. Those lines are often predicated on facing two CVA groups. Naturally, an SCS can fit in as one of those CVAs, and for the Hydran it makes a lot of sense because you have plenty of free damage.

Oh, and I live in Bryn Mawr, outside of Philly

By Paul Bonfanti (Bonfanti) on Tuesday, November 18, 2008 - 03:28 pm: Edit

Trent,

I was interpreting your use of the term PFT to mean what you're calling Combat or Combat support PFTs. In the tac note which you called insane I did advocate building a few of those and also an SCS or two for each race.

I also completely agree with the need to use all resources to their fullest, including the free base PFs

However, I think you're overstating the power of PFs. If you're not advocating putting PFTs loose on the line, the Kzintis don't gain that much by using PFs--maybe 4 Compot per squadron. In a long, protracted battle where you're going after a starbase, you'll need all the compot you can get and all the damage absorption you can get. But if you're fighting an open space battle or a bats battle or such, you may be better off leaving the PFs at home.

By Larry E. Ramey (Hydrajak) on Tuesday, November 18, 2008 - 04:32 pm: Edit
And when you attack the Lyran SB with a SAF and put 3 PFTs in the line.......  

Tell me again what the Lyran shoots at?  

Paul,  

Facing the Hydrans always hurts. It's just part of the game.  

And if you live in Bryn Mawr, we should play FtF. I've been talking to Rob Padilla about playing a game at my house. It would be great if you could join us.  

Larry,  

you have it surrounded 😊  

Joe,  

Would love to play you FTF, but unfortunately, I'm a grad student right now, so most of my nights are taken. I think the only F+E my wife can handle is the neverending East Wind game. ..But maybe in two years when I'm done school.  

Paul,  

What about weekends?  

Joe Stevenson (Ikv_Sabre) On Tuesday, November 18, 2008 - 06:22 pm: Edit  
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> I was interpreting your use of the term PFT to  
> mean what you're calling Combat or Combat Support PFTs. In the tac note which you called  
> insane I did advocate building a few of those  
> and also an SCS or two for each race.  

Paul, your tac note told F&E players that the Hydrans and Kzinti should not really use PF's because:  
1) They already have fighters and  
2) They can't afford replacement PFs.  

Given that between them the Kzinti and Hydrans are;  
1) Getting 36 free PF flotillas they can use anywhere they can transport them and,  
2) Another 16 PF flotillas a year versus _SIX_ for the Lyrans (Of which they can get no more than five PF Flotillas in a turn),
I am going to call your tactical advice nuts.

You cannot effectively use those free PF flotillas without _a lot_ of PFTs.

Further, control ships can CEDS retrograde and CEDS repair on the opposing player's turn while PFTs and their escorts cannot. This makes control ships logistically and strategically superior to non-fighter equipped PFTs.

This also makes converting control ships the number one Alliance priority due to the mauler directed damage threat leaving them with huge carrier fleets to start with.

>However, I think you're overstating the power
>of PFs.

Nope, you are underestimating the PF flotillas used in real mass.

Showing up with 10 free production PF flotillas in a SB assault is like having the damage absorbing power of a Klingon Swarm to use, with better COMPOT besides.

>If you're not advocating putting PFTs loose on
>the line, the Kzintis don't gain that much by
>using PFs--maybe 4 Compot per squadron.

Using the 24th Fi-Con behind a SAF is hardly 'avoiding the use of unescorted PFTs.' When the risk-benefit justifies it, you do so.

The difference is that I have a much different appreciation of the power of mauling plus high COMPOT than you do.

You won't nail one of my PFT's unescorted in the support echelon because I escort those that are sending PF flotillas forward while every one of my unescorted PFTs is going to be feeding the escorted PFT's PF flotillas.

Nor will you nail my pure PFT while being escorted on the battle line because control ships are superior in the direct combat role.

>the Kzintis don't gain that much by using
>PFs--maybe 4 Compot per squadron.

You are missing the implications of X-ships.

The presence of large number of X-ships increases the attrition unit burn rate by up to six damage points per round.
The Kzinti -- and everyone else for that matter -- are driven to use lines with at least six free replacement fighter factors to take that extra damage for zero replacement cost. The X-ship attrition rule says you can't take that attrition bonus damage on low COMPOT ships, if attrition units are present.

Three PF flotillas on the line without fighters mean as a minimum there are three dead PFs in addition to your other casualties. That X-attrition bonus causes both permanent economic damage and reduces fleet COMPOT in the engagement.

Now sometimes using three PF Flotillas in a battle line is required, but in a long SB assault, the ability to take more non-permanent damage counts for more.

That is why I keep saying in my COMPOT shock article that More Fighters plus PFs beats Less Fighters plus PFs when I spoke of the Lyrans versus Kzinti.

>But if you're fighting an open space battle or
>a bats battle or such, you may be better off
>leaving the PFs at home.

You need PF's to break into a BATS versus a PF equipped defending fleet.

You use PF flotillas in open space when they provide enough COMPOT to make a difference or to avoid a pursuit by absorbing damage that would have created cripples.

When everyone has burned up their respective free production PF flotilla cache, the damage assignement priority is to burn fighters and low COMPOT ships rather than PFs (sometimes) or X-ships (always).
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Paul,

Carriers and fighters cannot stand up to PFs/control ships/etc.

The Feds are an exception, because the 3rd way gives them the EFFECT of PFs, with a boatload of fighters at their disposal.
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Trent,

It seems to me like you're attributing arguments to me that I've never made, while asserting that you understand the game better than I do. I have no interest in getting into a fight about who knows how to play more.

But at no point in my tacnote or in the last few posts have I said that the Hydrans
and Kzintis should not use PFs. What I have been arguing is that players need to understand that overreliance on PFs can get everyone, but particularly those two empires, into financial trouble. I believe you've been saying the same thing.

Yes, I agree, building and using SCS is a good thing. I said so in my tac note. Yes, if you can assault a position with a lot of PFs and have free replacements, it's great. You can't do that too often though, because you'll run through those base PFs pretty quickly.

And absolutely, the presence of X ships and their ability to destroy attrition units requires you to put some fighters on the line... which is one of the reasons why I say the Kzintis shouldn't overdo it on the PFs.

Perhaps I misunderstood what you've been saying. I took "Mass" to mean three squadrons of PFs on the line. I see now that you meant one or two squadrons on the line with a lot of backup. Sorry if I caused any confusion by that.

But, I still stand by my position that overreliance on PFs will not help the Hydrans or the Kzintis. If you'd like to debate that, I'm happy to.