Pablomatic,

Why would you build the VLV instead of the SUB? In every particular the SUB is better. You cannot start mucking about with Romulan production till T10 so both are available. You begin Turn 10 with 3xSPB and 2xVUL with another 2 VUL and a VLV in mothball.

SPB=>SUB is 5+8
VUL=>VLV is 4+20

You end up taking a war cruiser hull and making it a BC Hull with excellent compot when you build the SUB. Or you can take an already pretty decent ship and make it a crappy CVA. The VLV has less compot and less fighters than the SUB and until Y175 its got two squadrons (6+4) whereas the SUB is (6+6).

You cannot build the CNV till Y175, your Y173 and 174 CVA builds should be a pair of SUB's and given the state of the Romulan EP situation the conversion from SPB is most likely.

In Y175 you start pumping out the CNV's. At this point the ONE VLV you activated (which costs 4+20 btw grrrr) becomes oversized and you can mate it with a CNV group for a really nice battleforce.

If you build VLV's instead of SUB's your not getting any real good use out of them as their one saving grace is that you can in Y175 pair it with *drumroll* either a CNV group or a SUB as an oversized squadron. Well your mothball act. is fated to mate with your first CNV in Y175. I suppose if you build an additional VLV instead of one of the SUB's you could have two such groups in Y175. But for your heavy CV OOB would you rather have.

Y173 SUB VLV
Y174 SUB
Y175 CNV
Total CNV 2xSUB VLV

or

Y174 SUB VLV
Y174 VLV
Y175 CNV SUB 2xVLV

If you go with the second option you basically using both VLV's for backwater operations until you can get some use out of them as oversized in Y175. Whereas with the first you get two legitimate VERY effective CVA's. Also you would be loosing a VUL in the second OOB and that is a useful command ship. How you do this ep wise can be a big difference also. If you decide to use FH's to make SUB's then your paying 5+24 compared to 4+20 for the VLV, but its well worth it. I would think though you would cash in on the SPB to SUB and use the savings to build a FAK here and there.

Building a SUB + FAK by Conversion of SPB and Substitution of FH costs 15+20. Building a VLV to compare apples to apples would be Building an FH and conversion of VUL to VLV costs 12+20.

Which would you rather have for your critical Turn 10-12 attacks.. a SUB+FAK of VLV+FH?

Edit I should say instead
VUL + SUB + FAK 28(18) vrs FH + VLV + SPB 21(18)

Quote:

Next question. Turn 15 and I'm building a 2nd SB on Romulus. I want to build a 2nd SB on Remus as well. I certainly won't try to build any SBs outside of the capitals for the Romulans. Any comments?
I disagree, personally. I like to convert BATS 4010 to a SB right on turn 10, and you have the SEs to absolutely prevent the Feds from disrupting the upgrade. As a result you can much better shore up the NW quadrant against the Gorn/Fed assault and threaten them for longer. Later, upon Gorn entry, I'll upgrade BATS 4510 or one of its ilk for support against the Gorn invasion and to threaten them longer. I build one PDU per turn at Romulus itself to shore up the shipyard hex for later assault in the game.

Other than that, I build ships and carriers. Pincount is very important, and the Roms can play the same funny carrier games that the Alliance can (useful against the Gorns anyway).

Two starbases are of limited usefulness in the same hex, given the rules that limit 2+ SB combat potentials, especially over a planet. If you do build 2*SB in the capital, do so over the minor planets in the same system as the capital planet and then build up the PDUs at the minor planet as well. That way the Alliance has to face major pain twice to take the hex.

However, as I said, I just don't see it as being worth it. I'd rather have the ships.

By Paul Edwards (Pablomatic) on Wednesday, December 29, 2010 - 11:41 am: Edit

Good stuff William, Michael,

At the very least, this conversation has reminded me that the Roms can build 2CV, CVE, and SUP/trn. I knew that on turn 10, but seem to have forgotten on turns 11, 12, and 13. Here's what I actually built:
Trn 10: SUP, FAB, SPB
Trn 11: SPB
Trn 12: SUP, SPB, SKB
Trn 13: FAK, SPB, SKB, converted sublight VLV to warp power.

Looking over my build schedule I'm embarrassed that I haven't maximized my best carriers, and it's no wonder I'm hurting in this game. Similarly, I overlooked that the Klingons can build a D6S/trn after Y171 (thought it was still 1/yr) and screwed that up too.
I haven't found that the Romulans are short of CR 10 ships, or rather they don't seem to need more than three or four full lines each turn, so I'm not sure that argument is valid.

Nevertheless, I don't expect to convert more VULs this game thanks to y'all.

BTW, I don't have the money for the starbases. The Lyrans and Klingons have both been sending 10 ep/trn, but this hasn't given the Romulans any eps to spare for SB.

Do other Coalition players NOT build extra SBs in Romulus and Remus? Every game that goes long enough on the forums seems to show the fall of the Romulan capitals. Doesn't it make sense to prepare for this when I can, rather than spend those eps repairing ships from an offensive that will inevitably get rolled back?

By Paul Edwards (Pablomatic) on Wednesday, December 29, 2010 - 12:34 pm: Edit

Michael,

Doesn't converting SPBs to SUBs use up the Romulan's 1 CVA build per year? If not, I'll convert them, otherwise I can't see giving up a CNV build to convert.

By Thomas Mathews (Turtle) on Wednesday, December 29, 2010 - 12:42 pm: Edit

PE, SPB to SUB counts as the 1/Yr CVA build. This is listed in the Order of Battle for the Romulans.

By Michael Parker (Protagoras) on Wednesday, December 29, 2010 - 01:14 pm: Edit

Pablomatic,

I mean do that Y173 abd Y174 before the CNV is available. Once the CNV is available... build that every year for sure!

By Ted Fay (Catwhoeatsphoto) on Wednesday, December 29, 2010 - 02:04 pm: Edit
Paul Edwards, see my post above about Rom SBs.

Ted,

I'm not sure I agree with your SB strategy, though that doesn't make it "wrong" of course.

Since it's unlikely I can string the Klingon/Lyran supply network all the way to the Gorn border in this case, it doesn't look like I'm going for a 3 capital win. In this case, I can't justify building SB to support an attack I don't intend to make. Also, I suspect the Romulans will have trouble defending those SB. In my experience, if the enemy can threaten two of your hardpoints from one of his, you're at a disadvantage since you'll have to divide your forces to defend both while he only defends one. If I was the Alliance and I saw your SB builds, when the time came for the Alliance offensive, I'd move my fleet to a position to threaten two or more of your SB, let you split your fleet, then attack one of them with my whole fleet.

For these reasons, I can't justify building Romulan SB outside of the Homeworld. Though I would like one on 4112 to close the gab between North and West SB, I can't do that AND build them in the Capital. In a few turns I may re-visit my thinking on this. No money for SB, I'm just setting up my MBs in Romulus and Remus for now (third is in the offmap with an FRD).

In the homeworld I'll have to disagree as well. Two SB over the homeworld give you an additional half compot for the second SB while the enemy takes out the PDUs. Then when he comes for the SB, you again have 1 and 1/2 SB compots while he takes it down--THEN he can go for your final capital SB to take the hex. The higher compot over the homeworld means a better chance to bag CV groups, and forces the enemy to face higher compot for a longer time--which makes me happy.

Furthermore, the Romulans only have 3 major planets, so I'd rather
defend them and ignore the minors.

Essentially, I advocate concentrating firepower to better punch through Alliance free damage absorption. Consider this: If you do slightly more damage in several places, the Alliance will take the excess damage on Ftrs (this fact makes maulers all but pointless except for against PDUs as you and I have agreed previously IIRC). If you concentrate so you can do scary damage each round in one location, you may be able to direct plus the enemy loses all his fighters on the line plus he has to cripple ships! (This ought to cause the Alliance to fret, and you can tell him "welcome to MY world!)

The name of the Coalition game is to try to minimize the damage the Alliance takes for free. Spreading out only plays to the Alliance ftr. advantage. This may not hold true in vanilla F&E, since you could conceivably run the Alliance out of Ftrs if he doesn't have FCRs, but in the full game, the Alliance doesn't run out of Ftrs, and if he does, he'll retreat and come in with full ftrs again next turn.

Everything I do as the Coalition is geared toward overcoming all those Alliance ftrs enough to actually score some damage. This is why I'm skeptical about the value of PFs. Sure if you score enough to kill a better ship that's good, but simply scoring a few more points of damage each round is pointless, and that's what will happen 9 rounds out of 10 (12 more compot on the line will get you a better DD ship once in a Blue Moon I suspect).

This is also why BGs are not an alliance "advantage." With BGs, you get a few more compot on the line, which means the enemy takes 1 or 2 more fighter casualties each round. BGs are better than nothing is about all I can say for them. Without them the Coalition couldn't even compete with Alliance compot in their lines unless you risked heavy ships. That's the value of BGs--to keep the Coalition from being humiliated even in the compot category when the enemy only shows you frigates and ftrs to kill.

As a side note, I now wish I would have built the Klingon base in southern Fed space in 2915 instead of 2916--both to threaten two planets, and to better ignore the Tholians when they stab me in the
back. Not sure why I made the wrong choice, but it's too late now for this game.

By Robert Padilla (Zargan) on Monday, January 03, 2011 - 02:55 pm: Edit

As an Alliance player, I *love* seeing the Romulans building Starbases from T10 onwards. Maybe I'm just sadistic, but I'll sit over a Romulan SB with a combined Fed/Gorn fleet and grind all day if you'll let me.

And the reason, because the Fed/Gorn alliance can repair most of those ships next turn, while the Roms are so hard up for cash that taking a large pile of cripples means they have that much less to defend the next SB or planet, and it just becomes a domino effect. You cannot play the Roms like the red-colored Klingons, or you'll be loosing Romulus before T20 guaranteed.

By Ted Fay (Catwhoeatsphoto) on Monday, January 03, 2011 - 03:25 pm: Edit

I can attest to that. Rob went 20 battle rounds with me over a Rom SB I upgraded in 4010. The damage he took was insane, but it was gruelling for the Roms to repair their own damage. And he was back in force in about three turns.

By Timothy Mervyn Linden (Timlinden) on Wednesday, January 05, 2011 - 04:14 pm: Edit

Paul E

If you want to beef up the Romulan capital, try setting up a Klingon starbase there instead. That way it doesn't cost the Roms anything, they get a better SB (because you will add the SFG's to it, and if you last long enough can make it a SBX long before the Roms could, and possibly before any X ships can attack it.)

Historically I haven't double SB'd Romulus, and likely never would do so over Remus. Mainly as the Coalition pretty well much always won my old games. But playing all the expansions, I likely would try the above most of the time. If you do get a klingon SBXaa over
Romulus, the alliance is rather likely not taking Romulus period. (They'll just take everything else, but hey, what can you do?)

By Paul Edwards (Pablomatic) on Wednesday, January 05, 2011 - 07:46 pm: Edit

Timothy,

I have considered putting a Klingon SB in Romulus, although I hadn't thought of upgrading to SBX. A Klingon SB at Romulus would always be in supply itself by 410.54. If it was cut off from Klingon space it would lose the ability to do repairs and supply anyone but itself I think, since it will be in a partial grid that generates no eps. Not sure I want to pay for an SBX where it can't repair X-ships. On the other hand, if an SBX meant the difference between the Alliance capturing Romulus or not, almost any cost is worth it for me.

I can certainly send the Romulans money to do their own SB, which was my idea. I would never reduce Romulan builds in order to build a SB. Also, I have abandoned the idea of putting a 2nd in Remus as well.

"...they'll take everything else...[in Romulan Space except the homeworld]..."

My intention exactly. It's the best I can hope to do.

By Robert Padilla (Zargan) on Thursday, January 06, 2011 - 08:41 am: Edit

Tim,

No, the double SB is barely going to be a speed bump to the Fed/Gorn juggernaut once it gets rolling. The problem is the Roms just don't have the income to conduct a protracted fight over their capitals. Sure the Alliance will get hurt the first time, but every time they go back the Romulan fleet will be smaller and weaker until you reach a point where you'll be self killing Romulan ships because you can't repair them anymore.
If anything buy PDUs, lots of em. Sure they die fast, but while they are dying the Roms are taking no damage in return.

By Michael Parker (Protagoras) on Thursday, January 06, 2011 - 03:20 pm: Edit

A Second SB costs 61ep to build from scratch and contributes 18 compot and some EW and sucks up 66 damage (granted SIDS allow you to take damage without compot loss)

56ep buys 8 PDU's that contribute 72 compot and gives you 2 turns extra of +4EW. They will end up sucking up alot of damage as they go down, alot more than the second SB. Plus the effect of PDU's is geometric, the more PDU's you have the better the next one performs (because it lasts longer while your opponent burns through the others). Your fleet is also able to score damage while the enemy burns through your PDU's.

Now if you're already at 20 PDU's and the Romulans have eps burning a hole in their pocket (how did you manage that?) then yeah work on a second SB..

Oh and lastly 😊 8 PDU's are 5ep cheaper than a SB!

By Timothy Mervyn Linden (Timlinden) on Thursday, January 06, 2011 - 04:06 pm: Edit

Robert,

Yep, the main thing is a ever shrinking Romulan fleet not being able to exploit the fortifications. But, it does take awhile for the counterstroke to hit, especially if the Roms get support (expeditionary fleets/etc.)

And for that first while, tackling about 430 compot (SBXaa, 1/2 2nd SB, 20 PDU, elite Rom units, a few rounds worth of DB from leftover D6D's) hurts bad - That can fairly easily just direct kill a stuffed SCS group, even presuming none of that group is stasised.

The Romulans should have a pretty big fleet to chew through still, especially as it won't have been gutted against the fed or gorn
capitals. (or they were attrited in devastating those, which delays
the counterattack more). It isn't really a matter of if the Alliance can
take such uber defenses on Romulus, just if they will have to spend
so much time and ships that they don't really get anywhere else by
game end.

By all means buy the PDU's first. But, buy the SBaa (using Klingon
money after all), and do the SBXaa conversion too, if at all possible.
(And my first impression is that won't be hard.)

I will note that I have yet to face such a full rules late Alliance fleet.
Old rules they just weren't able to do that until it was far too late.
They did sometimes wreck the Rom shipyard in the games they
didn't outright lose, but they could never keep it.

Tim.

By Robert Padilla (Zargan) on Thursday, January 06, 2011 - 07:51 pm: Edit

Tim, I'm not even talking late war fleets yet. A combined Fed/Gorn
fleet smashing into your defenses will get the job done quite nicely,
if the Roms do not get Klingon support. But the thing is, even if
they do get that support, it has to come from somewhere which
menas somewhere else is weaker. And as we've been discussing
keeping the supply lines open to the Romulans is ripe with danger
and is hard to do. Worth it IMO, but hard.

And personally I would not be worried about a SBAA over Romulus.
As the attacker I simply focus on the planet and ignore it's SFGs
until I destoy all PDUs and the Romulan SB, then I'll worry about it
(and go low BIR so you never get to use them).

By Paul Edwards (Pablomatic) on Thursday, January 06, 2011 - 08:01 pm: Edit

It is my understanding that in the full game with expansions, if the
Coalition doesn't win, Romulus will fall. I have no personal
experience in this area.

Since I am fast approaching the point where I will find this out first
hand...

Besides building out the homeworld PDU's, and the dubious value of a second SB, what are some ways to prepare?

Should I build off-map minor/medium shipyards with engineer? Seems such a waste, since the Roms don't have money for their existing schedule + repairs as it is. Also, I don't even have a colony offmap yet, so this could take some time.

Better yet, how can I hold Romulus for good?

By Robert Padilla (Zargan) on Thursday, January 06, 2011 - 09:15 pm: Edit

Paul, I don't think you *can* build minor shipyards offmap for the Roms, since they can't build bases there either.

The bottom line is you can't keep Romulus once the Alliance gets into full swing against them. That's like asking how can you hold the Hydran capital and never loose it. Bottom line is eventually the Alliance is just going to have too many ships for the Romulans to be able to handle, just like in the early game where the Coalition has too much for the Alliance to handle.

The best bet to *try* and hold it is to buy enough time for the Romulans to get PFs. Maybe get a Lyran or Klingon base there early that can build PFs to help out, but that will be dicey at best. And in the early game don't even bother trying to build your full schedule, max out carrier production instead. You don't need those small crappy hulls, as 2/3rds of the Romulan navy *is* just small crappy ships already.

By Michael Parker (Protagoras) on Friday, January 07, 2011 - 09:26 am: Edit

The Roms have no planets nor are they allowed to build bases offmap (still scratching my head on why that is disallowed) so no offmap MSY. But they have some hinterlands (5318) where MSY's are pretty safe.
I would build SP shipyards.. what is the COE going to do anyway. The SP is a cheap versatile ship that you will want as many as you can get. And they eventually become FHM's to escort your CV's and small maulers!

Minor quibble: 506.31 allows the Romulans to deploy a single MB in their off-map area. It cannot be upgraded though, so you still don't get off-map MSYs.

The SP is arguably the most important Romulan hull in their navy. It does pretty much *everything* the Romulans need out of a ship, including becoming the heavier variants later on. But that is also a bit of a weakness, as if you do not manage your SP hulls well, it's going to hurt you a lot.

I am finding all this out about those SP hulls. They are also great for trading to the Klingons for D5s to get a KDR out of it for free.

Perhaps I will consider building SP shipyard(s) in 5318 but expect if I did the Alliance would make a point of coming to kill them there. What you all are telling me is that the Romulans will die with nowhere to go and/or repair?

I have apparently *not* been maxing Romulan carrier builds because I haven't been building the WE carriers. Do other people build those as well?

Currently, I am considering *override* converting a VUL to VLV in addition to my CNV build so I can do two CVA for the Romulans instead of building the CVE and WE carriers. Any thoughts?
I could be missing something but the KDR is no great shakes. You get two of them by fiat, I wouldn't covet any more of them and would only trade more if the Klingon player really needed the SP hulls for some reason.

Your SP is more versatile overall.. and the KDR is a Kestral hull meaning once your out of spares repair costs are doubled!

You got plenty of high compot hulls, I wouldn't trade the SP for a KDR at any time.

This is why I really need to play a full game with all the rules. (I haven't used the bizarrely effective special raids or the extra EP toys yet) My previous games have always been either the Coalition takes three capitals, or more often, they don't, but are parked all over Alliance space until around turn 27-28, when the alliance starts to push them out slowly. I don't recall losing Romulus earlier than turn 29, and never totally (i.e. the Alliance chose not to lose all the extra ships needed to wipe out the Romulan fleet).

My last game the Alliance didn't get SE parity until after the T17 loss of the Gorn shipyard and one other capital, and they obviously didn't keep it. Without those ruinous losses (about 80+SEs), I doubt the alliance gets to parity until around turn 22 or so, depending on how clear they can keep their space. Then it is still more than a few turns before the Alliance can really start pushing back deeply, let alone start attacking Coalition space.

Given the Romulans are the weak end, I cannot imagine NOT giving them serious support.

But, I really have to try it and see - this may be the same as my World in Flames experience. In that game, the Axis kept cutting off lend-lease, until one game the Allies said no, we are keeping it open whatever the cost. Normal Axis wins became an allied romp - it was very shocking to see how fast the Russians were able to roll up the Axis. While it doesn't look the same to me here, it may be!
Tim.

By Paul Edwards (Pablomatic) on Friday, January 07, 2011 - 07:18 pm: Edit

Michael,

Well SP is much more versatile and doesn't have KR supply problems, but KDR gains one compot. Both KDRs and RKLs will only ever be used as BG ships with others of the same kind (for the leader bonus--they are war cruisers). Granted, I'm not basing my strategy around this, but I've exchanged about 10 or so so far. Also, I don't plan to let the Romulans run out of KR parts ever--currently stockpiling like crazy.

By Robert Padilla (Zargan) on Monday, January 10, 2011 - 09:21 am: Edit

You're required to swap at least 3 SPs for D5s ot face a very heafty penalty. Dumb, but them's the rules.

Paul, you can only get a turn of KR parts per turn max. And the Roms will use up at least I set the moment they enter the war, unless the Klingons have a base setup close enough to establish a strategic movement route. So six turns of extra is their absolute max.

By William Stec (Billstec2) on Monday, January 10, 2011 - 11:29 am: Edit

Robert,

Where are you seeing in the rules that 6 turns of spare parts is the absolute max?

Also, I see no limitation to sending several tugs a turn to the Klingons to pick up spare parts.

Here's a excerpt of Nick's ruling from June 19 2005...

John Colacito:
(442.82) Does the TG have to complete the transfer in one turn? I’m assuming not otherwise blockade running (320.512) would not work.

ANSWER: You have to start at the Klingon capital and end at the Romulan capital, this could take multiple turns as far as I can tell. Each time you finish such a trip the Roms are credited with the noted supplies.

Can the transfer occur if the Klingons are at peacetime or limited war? Such a situation would be valid in certain scenarios like East Wind.

ANSWER: I think you would be subject to the normal rules. I.e. if the roms are at war, but the Klingons have not entered yet, the roms can't enter Klingon space (future belligerant) and the Klingons can't leave (all fleets inactive). The limited war situation is more complicated, but would depend on those rules as normal.

Can 2-3 tugs travel back and forth in the same turn thus picking up several turn’s worth of spare parts?

ANSWER: Don't see why not.

By Robert Padilla (Zargan) on Monday, January 10, 2011 - 12:32 pm: Edit

William,

I thought the rules said it out clear, but they do not. But, careful reading of the rule (442.82), gives us "Each turn that a SPH or KRT or 3FE or Klingon or Lyran tug can complete a trip from the Klingon Capital to the Romulan Capital, one turn of "KR spare parts" is credited to the Romulans." That reads very singular in nature, and it does not say "each turn that one or more of the following completes the trip".

Also refer to 442.84 where the Roms can buy exactly one extra spare turn of KR supplies from the Orions for 10 EPs, and only in
the Spring. Why have such a limit if they can run 10 LTTs (Romulan LTT = tug for this transaction) back and forth for a basically unlimited supply of parts (do this twice and you can't run out by wars end)?

Being on the playtest team for AO, I know the intent of the rule was for the Roms to only be able to get one extra turn each turn, with the ability to buy a "bonus" turn from the Orions, which odds are the Roms can never afford, but it was an option.

Anyways, I get that they have a 6 turn max from the fact that you use one every turn, and if you can only get one each turn, you never go above six unless you smuggle the parts from the Orions. Ask Mike, odds are he'll rule the opposite way I think it works, and then we'll all be clear 😊

By William Stec (Billstec2) on Monday, January 10, 2011 - 01:18 pm: Edit

I see what you mean about 442.82 implying only a single tug could make the trip, but it does seem ambiguous all in all. It says that every turn a tug CAN make the trip, not DOES make the trip. For all we know, it could mean that somehow by means unseen to us, as long as there is a valid strategic movement path, it gets taken care of by those hard working staff officers. 😊

I frankly wouldn't object to the idea that each turn of spare parts costs the Romulans 1ep (credited to the Klingon economy). If the Feds manage to cut off the strat move link, well there's always the Orion smuggling option. 😊

I'm going to use Nick's ruling in my personal games until Mike rules otherwise. 😊

By Paul Edwards (Pablomatic) on Monday, January 10, 2011 - 02:35 pm: Edit

Nuts. That screws the Romulans even more than normal if they can't build up a bunch of spare KR parts. If I would have known that I would have self-killed tons of KR ships from turn 10 on, and certainly not exchanged more than the minimum 3D5 for 3SP.
I will also play using the most recent ruling for now, until it's ruled otherwise.

By Michael Parker (Protagoras) on Monday, January 10, 2011 - 05:09 pm: Edit

I would point out that in no way does the KR maint. rule preclude deliveries of spare parts before the Romulans enter the war.

The Romulans begin Y168 with 6 turns of KR parts they use a turn of KR parts every turn actually at war with someone (not just on wartime economy). So turns 2-7 the Klingons and Lyrans can go hog wild with any unused APT/PTR's sending 1/10 of a turn per unused transport. I would say since Klingon ships cannot leave home space and no Lyran ships can enter Klingon space turn 1 that no spare parts can be shipped turn 1, but its not unreasonable to assume you can find on average 5 free Klingon/Lyran small transports a turn 2-7 which will give the Romulans 9 turns of spare parts starting turn 10. That should get them up to turn 20 assuming no wartime shipments can be made.

By Paul Edwards (Pablomatic) on Monday, January 10, 2011 - 07:27 pm: Edit

Michael,

I'm all for it, but I suspect that the rules about ships entering territory of future belligerents (considered "neutral territory" until at war (503.11) would cause internment of Klingon or Lyran ships that move to Romulan territory pre-Romulan entry.

By Robert Padilla (Zargan) on Monday, January 10, 2011 - 07:40 pm: Edit

Those ships also could not use the Federation strategic movement network, so would get interned in Fed space. Probably not a good idea.

By Michael Parker (Protagoras) on Tuesday, January 11, 2011 - 08:46 am: Edit
Well there is that whole business about internment isn't there?!

Odd that the Klingons can Deliver Kestral hulls including a C9 on turn 5(6?) but cannot deliver spare parts.

edit: I suppose the Klingons could setup a MB in 2718 and blockade run spare parts to 3317?! But that precludes the use of APT's unless you really wanna setup a MB for 1/10 of a spare part a turn!

Michael,

The C9 and other KR deliveries is just something that historically happened, and one could presume that it took a very long time, and it maybe that those ships were little more than floating husks at the time and therefore deemed not a threat to Federation interests? I dunno, but flavor text answers all!

You might ask ADB how they did it...

Oh I am aware its historic... but it bugs me a little when such things then do not have an enabling rule to make them possible within the framework of the game.

actually there is something on deliveries. Most of it regards the last E4s delivered to the Romulans and could affect the delivery of the C9.

That event is the Romulans going to war early. While unlikely that they would, it is a possibility.
Oh is that in one of the balance options?

What, in your opinion, would be the best way to take down Tholia, assuming you decide to do so in the General War campaign, playing with rules from all modules (but no optional rules)?

What turn?

Use how many ships from which empires? (And which key ships?)

Expect how many losses?

The best way is to ask your opponent to set up the Tholians the turn before you attack then:

1. Set up the chairs so the sun is in your opponents eyes

2. Rinse your mouth thoroughly with Vodka, and pace around the table muttering phrases in Russian while breathing on him

3. Distract him with a pan of brownies and while he isn't looking ransack his fleet setup boxes and replace all his big ships with PC's

4. Replace the 20xPDU's on Tholia with 20xPTR and claim it was a typo that was recently errata'd

I see Tholia starts with 12 PDUs, thanks for pointing that out.

I thought Tholia started with 4 brigades(16 PDUs).
sorry only 16 pdus

By William Stec (Billstec2) on Wednesday, January 12, 2011 - 07:31 am: Edit

Paul,

Have a couple shots of your favorite hard liquor first, then you won't mind it so much.

I've seen the number 60+ ship losses expected. Apparently it's tough to take out the Tholians behind that web. You have a hard time pulling cripples out of the web, so basically any ship that goes into the web dies.

And if you lose, the Tholians get ALL the salvage. 😂

By Ted Fay (Catwhoeatsphoto) on Wednesday, January 12, 2011 - 10:47 am: Edit

You must invade in force with enough SE to destroy tholia and both SB in a single blow. Depends on when you invade, but you are looking at 150 to 200 SE. You must bring lots of heavy hitters and expect to loose many.

I ran a full simulation as of C11, where the Tholians have some good PWC, but not a lot. I lost 69SE, many of them good.

Tips for attacking: first, bring SAFs, lots of them. They are the only things that can hit those PDUs until you burn through his ships and he has no choice but to self kill them in the final rounds.

Second, use maulers to direct on the PDU fighters, 10 every round. Do not use directed damage otherwise. Killing fighters will soon reduce his compot. Also, he just doesn't have that much stuff and will soon run out of ships - so any other use of DD will only prolong your pain. However, there is an exception: you must kill his AWTs in the first two rounds.

By Ted Fay (Catwhoeatsphoto) on Wednesday, January 12, 2011 - 10:50 am: Edit
One other thing. Hit them sooner rather than later. Not only do you get more benefit for the captured planets, but they have less PWC so your pain is less. With the new ruling, if you want Tholia, then consider having the Klinks take them on turn 7 and delay hitting the Fed a turn or two.

What Ted said. I have done it in a scenario at Origins. I lost over 50 ships, but my salvage was enough to build a SB at the Dyson Sphere over the next three turns!

hehehe leave it to Mike C to find a Silver lining in loosing 50 ships!

Say that with a smile boy.

Absolutely wonderful information Ted and Mike. I know this subject has been talked about a lot, but I'm hungry for more insight.

Salvage, plus I count 22 EPs per turn for Tholian space since if captured it becomes Klingon home territory, is the economic payoff. Seems a no-brainer to couple that with the D5, then maybe F5W shipyards, to make up some pincount of good ships with that money.

I'll figure 70 ships, average cost of 5 lost just as a rough number. That's 350 eps of ships. If you capture Tholia on turn 7, you break even (very roughly speaking) in 20 turns if you factor in exhaustion, around turn 27. That part doesn't sound so good.

Also, you won't attack the Feds until turn 9 or 10. That's bad.

If you use the salvage from losses to build a SB on Tholia, you
shorten the ComCon route by 1/2. Unfortunately for the ComCon, Tholia is one hex too far to be ideal, but I'd still build the SB there. Anyway, this will net you another 50 eps over 18 turns above what you would have earned. Maybe you break even on turn 25.

Less ships, but more money after turn 7.

Having control of Tholian space pre-Romulan entry is another consideration. This will allow the Klingons and Lyrans an easier route for the base network into Romulan space. With a couple of supply points, you're in-supply to Romulus from Klingon territory! This aids a multi-cultural attack on the Gorns, albeit with less ships.

Looks like killing the Tholians does potentially pay for itself in the long term--in pure economic terms. So if the Coalition go for it, their strategy needs to be long-term.

A little more Coalition muscle in the 20+ turn range might help. Maybe you could defend Romulus if you couldn't get the Gorn homeworlds. You will get at least some VPs for Tholian econ. Surely a SB built at Tholia should count for VPs, but the rules seem to suggest otherwise. Actually, I don't think it would be totally out of line to expect a small VP bonus if the Klingons re-capture Tholian space and hold it, but the rules don't give one that I know of.

With the extra money, you can build more bases in captured territory (count for VPs). Theoretically, you could end the game with more ships=more VPs than you would have otherwise had.

Of course the Tholians are a back-stabbing pain if left alone. They blast a Klingon major planet and a bunch of BATS, and they push the Romulan supply route into a tiny, vulnerable corridor.

Into the victory calculations I suppose you should throw in that you likely keep that Klingon planet and all those BATS pristine for VP purposes.

All of this flies in the face of conventional Coalition thinking, including my own, as everyone is well aware.
But...

Maybe Tholia is the Coalition's VP route to victory after all if done correctly?

By Adam Hickey (Ahickey) on Wednesday, January 12, 2011 - 08:50 pm: Edit

Plus Tholia counts as a capital for VP purposes, just not sudden death victory purposes.

By Mike Curtis (Nashvillen) on Wednesday, January 12, 2011 - 11:25 pm: Edit

I had done my attack on Tholia in a scenario with my friend Scott Hofner's assistance with plan ideas and some of his Lyran ships. This was around turn 15, so the ship count was larger than it would be on, say turn 7. A simulation of what it would take is not too hard. There is little the Tholians can do to prevent what you want to do. You just have to "stay on target" as my friend Scott kept reminding me as I was killing 3xD5 and 3xF5 a turn for the first 6 or so turns.

By Paul Edwards (Pablomatic) on Thursday, January 13, 2011 - 12:02 am: Edit

651.2 says the Tholian capital certainly does not count for sudden death purposes.

However, I think you are correct about Tholia counting for VP purposes. As soon as the Coalition destroys 1 Tholian base they join the Alliance, and the VP rules (603.3) say "...Tholians do not count toward victory conditions unless they have joined one side or the other."

If you could hold Tholia and Hydrax until game end, and not lose Romulus maybe a VP win would be possible. You can also threaten the Gorn early with this strategy, although not necessarily better than by the conventional method.

By Adam Hickey (Ahickey) on Thursday, January 13, 2011 - 02:43 am: Edit
For a turn 7 Tholian assault, very very careful movement can assure that you only face the Home Fleet and the 3rd fleet over Tholia itself (and the 6 PWC ships). There will be no reserves to worry about, so that's it. Of course on T7 you cannot have any SAFs available to hit Tholia, but I think you can use them to drop the border SB, just to help keep the losses down a bit.

So, facing 25 ships over the capital is not going to be that bad, especially since most of them suck (4 compot or less). I can agree that you'll be killing BG ships left and right, but that should be the extent of the pain for the most part. The Tholian fleet simply does not have any legs, and every point of damage they take is going to hurt them. And nothing stops you from mauling Tholian ships, and you should starting with the MONs and DN (if on the line). Otherwise take 10 fighters a turn and let the Tholians eat the rest. And try to get a *lot* of fighters there. You don't need the escorts for the CVs. Send forward as many 6 factor groups as you can, and if the Tholian player directs your unescorted CVs that are outside the web, that's a bucket of damage less you just avoided. Sure you may lose some CVs and CV tugs to it, but it will save a few ships each round that would have died anyway.

I'd also note that you can designate things like Drone Bomnardment ships and the Free scout to help pull ships out of the web, if necessary, since they do not need to be in the web to function. I'd say 50 dead ships on T7 is a good estimate of the losses the Klingons will take, but the extra income combined with building some extra minor shipyards can replace those losses mostly.
SAFS to kill PDU's will be invaluable to you I would think. This is the one case where I think SAF's are worth their weight in gold.. you can brazenly park them within striking distance to a neutral target then unleash them in a vicious strike!

Don't forget the pinwheels they Tholians will have a pair of Pinwheels with DD class ships.. those can suck up damage well.

Robert, you need to re-read some of the web rules. Some of your advice won't work as well as other strategies, and some isn't right, and some is better than you think.

For instance, CVs sending fighters forward into the web *cannot* be targeted by directed damage by the Tholians. Which makes that strategy quite brilliant.

Drone bombardment ships might not be considered "in the battle force" and thus might not be useful for pulling ships out. However, for sure the free scout can so it should be a D6S.

Use multiple heavy scouts on the line to force a shift on the Tholians. It's easier than you think. These scouts get designated as "pull ships." They already had low compot to begin with, so you don't loose that much more, and now you have a very high EW and the ability to pull some crippled combat ships out of the web. So, you force the Tholian to do less damage *and* you can save more cripples.

Don't direct on the DNs. Tempting, but no. Not efficient. Monitors are good targets, as it takes 9 damage to kill them with a mauler and the Tholians lose 10 compot. However, it is MUCH better to...

1) Target the two AWTs first two rounds. You must do this otherwise he is reducing your damage by 4 throughout the 10-12 combat rounds needed, and that is significant.

2) Target fighters, fighters, fighters. For a while anyway he can
replace a MON with a PC (worst case), meaning net compot loss to the Tholian of 6. However, very quickly he runs out of fighters if you target 10 every round. Thus, each time you do that, his compot goes down by 10.

To minimize the damage he does to you, you have to bring your damage up (kill AWTs) and bring his compot down as rapidly as possible - and the best way by far to do that is to kill fighters. Only after the fighters or other ships are gone do you target the MONs.

The major strategic problem with hitting Tholia is NOT long term. Long term, it's good (especially if you are going for a VP victory). It is short term. The loss of 50-60 SEs is very, very significant in terms of your ability to quickly bring the Fed war machine under control.

My overall assessment is that attacking the Tholians should NOT be done if you are going for a knock-out victory. You will most likely fail as a result of early massive SE losses.

However, if you think a VP victory is viable - then you MUST take out the Tholians and take them out early. This decision should be made by turn 12 at the latest, and depends on how you think you've done in the first 11 turns in terms of going for your original victory plan (knockout, taking out the Feds, mudslide, whatever). If you're not where you want to be, then the Tholians might actually help you with the ultimate VP victory.

However, I'm not even convinced of that. 😊

---

By Paul Edwards (Pablomatic) on Thursday, January 13, 2011 - 08:02 pm: Edit

Ted,

Spoken like someone who has studied the problem closely. I agree with all of it, and thanks for the pointers.
Tholia would of course be the perfect target for the Swarm--historical I think. The problem of course is that you will get the swarm just a few turns too late. If you get wildly lucky and complete the swarm on turn 12, you can take the Tholians for a song I suspect. Coalition players should at least be aware of this potential.

Speaking of which. Who has used a Swarm, and how would you recommend employing them?

By Ted Fay (Catwhoeatsphoto) on Friday, January 14, 2011 - 10:09 am: Edit

Never gotten a swarm at all. Will have to report when I do. 😊

BTW, I'm thinking about the AWTs. It's true he's reducing your damage by 4 per turn, but if you kill them that's 2 turns you're not killing fighters and so his compot is up by 10 and then 20 for longer. You likely will take more damage as a result. That's somewhere around 3-9 points of extra damage taken per turn for somewhere around 10 turns. Let's call it 60 extra damage he does as a result, as a rough guess.

The AWTs will cost you 4*10=40 damage to him over 10 rounds (you'll kill them after the fighters and the MONs). That's roughly 1.25 battle rounds of damage, or 1.25 rounds that he will live longer than he would have had you not targeted the AWTs. 1 battle round if you're lucky (remember your compot is lower as a result of using scouts as pull ships and high EW). Let's say that a battle round of damage at about moderate compot (let's say 180 compot) will be roughly extra 60 damage you'll take because you didn't kill the AWTs first. Multiply by 1.25. Rough guess of 75 extra damage to you because you didn't hurt him as much as time went on.

Although it's a small amount over a long time, and you're comparing apples and oranges (more damage he does to you versus less damage you do to him), it's probably a reasonable guess to subtract the two numbers. 75-60 = 15 more damage to you by not killing the AWTs first.
These numbers are very rough, and entirely dice dependent. However, my math is saying you're better off killing the AWTs right away. But not by much. The numbers are close enough you could probably gamble by taking fighters first.

Mike, you're a pretty good math guy, would you agree? Anyone have a better suggestion?

Ted, I had never even looked at the AWT rules before. Nice little toy they get there. That does beg the question do two (or more AWTs) stack in effect? Of course if you hit them T7 2 (or more) AWTs are not a problem, since they can only have one at that point.

So if they only have 1 sucking 4 damage, it seems like a no brainer to drop it for 6 damage. At best the Tholians have 8 backup fighters, so every turn they drop damage it's either crippling Tholian ships or killing fighters (or SIDS on the SB). They simply have no other options.

Michael,

You cannot put anything in 2718 or 2618 on Turn 7, which is why I am saying you can't hit Tholia with SAFs that turn. Sure you could wait a turn, but then you'll have to deal with the Fed 7th Fleet as well. Pinwheels I'd not be worried about either, as it does not increase their ability to take damage, and the ships in said pinwheel are not juicy DD targets anyway.

Ted you are right on the DB ships. Under 309.0 it specifically says they are not part of the battle force.

Now as far as directing his ships go, he's only got a handful of them and every one lost is on less that can take damage once you eat through your 7 SIDS on the SB. And of course you want the biggest ship possible. And while the DN would cost you 20 to kill, that's 10 compot he's not getting back. Same with the MONs, except that they only cost 9 to kill. And if the Tholian pinwheeled up all of his
DDs and PCs, you want to blast the mobile ships ASAP, as then you get to pick his BIR for him! Not a big deal as they'll drop a pinwheel to stop that, but it's still something to consider, espically if they used a CV in the pinwheel.

I agree targetting the fighters is good, but hitting the ships is just as good, as they're limited and the more you kill the less get adopted by the Feds. Again it's not going to take long for the Tholian to start crippling ships, as they can only absorb 31 damage for "free" before every damage point reduces their ability to fight.

And just as a point of reference, the best line the Tholians can put up T7 is:
SB, 16xPDU, 3xDN, 2xMON, 2xCA, DD, {BW-PCE}, {DDV-PCE}, PTR, DDS for 291 Compot and 7 EW. Adding in the AWT drops it to 287/7. Dialing the SB at all drops it even further. Not that bad of a capital grind really when you consider the best replacement ship is a DD, and after that 11 PCs and then he comes up empty. The Tholians can also only absorb a max of 346 damage to cripple everything and kill all PDUs and fighters. Realistically they'd not take damage on PDUs until the end, and the SB would only take 7 SIDS, so in reality the Tholian fleet can take 258 damage, and that's assuming they self kill every ship they have in the hex and take 7 SIDS on the SB. If the Klingons average 30 damage a turn (and waste none) the Tholian fleet is dead in 9 rounds. Assuming directing 10 fighters a turn (they have 108 max, I assumed their CV fighters in the above damage number), the fleet lasts a bit longer, until round 13. Good damage rolls for the Coalition can take the Tholians out earlier, if they can average 40 damage a turn (not very likley). And of course poor rolls can make it take longer.

i have a suggestion, "better" i dunno.

since you have to have enough units to make major inroads into the federation, in order to attack the tholians, why not make major inroads into the federation?
straight up, 2915 is a more valuable hex than 2919. 2915 can be attacked by anything that can reach 2919, and the actual expense is incomparably lower. if you have a yen to burn the equivalent of the eastern fleet, do it over 1401.

By Paul Edwards (Pablomatic) on Friday, January 14, 2011 - 11:58 am: Edit

How would attacking the Tholians work if you don't also declare on the Flatheads? Everything that enters the Eastern Fleet zone (which now includes the Tholian Border Area) will become "unreleased" won't it?

By William Stec (Billstec2) on Friday, January 14, 2011 - 12:22 pm: Edit

Robert,

You might check 322.32, where it says that the pinwheel gets a 50% bonus to it's defense factors, AND it's an unbreakable group.

So that group of 3 DD that normally take 18 damage to cripple, now in a pinwheel they absorb 27 pts of damage to cripple.

And 3xCW which normally requires 21 now takes 31 damage to cripple.

I did some quick checking around and could not find a rule enabling it, nor disallowing it, that would allow a battlegroup to contain 2 pinwheels - 1 of 3 CW, 1 of 3DD. Such a battlegroup would have a combat potential of 40 attack and 58 defense.

3 x 7 (3 CW hulls) plus leader bonus =22
3 x 6 (3 DD hulls) = 18
Defense bonus of 50% makes those 3 CWs = 22-31
Defense Bonus of 50% makes those 3 DDs = 18-27

Just to cripple them - 58 damage absorbed instead of the normal 39. 😊

By Ted Fay (Catwhoeatsphoto) on Friday, January 14, 2011 - 01:08 pm: Edit
I agree targetting the fighters is good, but hitting the ships is just as good, as they're limited and the more you kill the less get adopted by the Feds. Again it's not going to take long for the Tholian to start crippling ships, as they can only absorb 31 damage for "free" before every damage point reduces their ability to fight.

There is merit to preventing the nice 10 point DN's from being absorbed by the Feds. That might be worth some extra damage.

since you have to have enough units to make major inroads into the federation, in order to attack the tholians, why not make major inroads into the federation?

That is the real source of the debate. As for why go Tholian...

1) A mostly unbreakable network between Klinks and Roms. If you don't take them out, the Tholians get too strong and you have a very narrow, easily attackable supply chain between Klinks and Roms. After turn 24 you are NOT attacking Tholia b/c the Feds are strong and the Tholians get the 312th (shudder).

2) Tholians WILL take a Klingon major planet, 4 border BATS (2 Rom, 2 Klink) and occupy 4 provinces after turn 20. That's ugly.

3) The extra econ points from taking Tholia early are nice. If you take them on turn 7, then turn 9+ you're getting like 21 EP/turn extra. (Tholia is 10, 3 minors for +9 (19) and a province +2 (21)). Less after exhaustion, of course, but still nice.

4) You're getting extra planets that will be hard to take. That's more XTPs for the Klingons when X ships come along. Sweet!
Then again, you could have used those ships to attack the Feds.

I think whether you attack the Tholians depends on your strategy. It remains to be seen whether it works in the long term, and whether it's better to attack on turn 7 with a plan for knockout victory, or on turn 11-15 once you think you can't achieve knockout and you're going to try for VP instead.

"Sure you could wait a turn, but then you'll have to deal with the Fed 7th Fleet as well."

Where can I find the rule that permits the Federation 7th Fleet to protect the Tholians and under what conditions? thx

Also, remember, with the Tholians, the attacker has to select a BIR of 3 or 4 each round.

Surely pinwheels can't be in battlegroups. They're immobile, and the BG description describes "...screen[ing] the flanks, close[ing] the gaps, [and]...slip[ping] in at the last second to deliver the coup de grace..."

Also 322.52 says each ship in a pinwheel counts for command purposes with no discount.

Until I hear otherwise, no pinwheels in BGs.

Pinwheels definitely add another disadvantageous twist to the calculation. Bloody Rocks.

Based on what I hear here, and my own thinking, I think there may be a way to take Tholia to advantage in the full game. The Rocks'
fleet *looks* so vulnerable on turn 7. I suspect the advantages could be well worth the effort if handled correctly.

Losing 50 ships to take Tholia makes the calculations much more attractive. Losing 50 ships to take Tholia (if possible), assuming average 5ep ships, is 250 eps cost. Subtract estimated salvage: (maybe 30eps?) leaves 220. Tholia + the ComCon advantage can recoup that in 8 turns. These are a critical 8 turns, but assuming you build minor shipyards pre-Tholia, 50 ships less doesn't have to mean you can't still kill the Fed SBs and push him back to the capital if you attack ASAP after Tholia. Then, you slowly make up ground in the pincount losses. If you can build, say 20 extra ships from your extra shipyards in 8 turns, that mitigates the problem by a lot, and as Ted points out holding Tholia means more XTPs and more money in general throughout the game. About turn 15 you should be stronger than you would have been (other than additional losses caused by less, pin-count, obviously).

I'd like to throw out two Tholian plan variants as well.

#1 You attack the Feds turn 7 as normal, saving 7th SB for last, move 200 ships there to take it, while leaving parity on all other fronts, then take Tholia turn 9. Set up shop, and you're ready to slide over to Gorn territory as soon as the Romulans enter the war.

#2 Use the 603.5 and 603.6 rules. Klingons take Tholia turn 7 and then don't attack the Feds. Turn 10 the Romulans don't attack at all. They're still at a wartime economy. They can set up to threaten attack, and keep increasing the threat. I suppose the Gorns can send 2nd fleet to join Fed 4th fleet to help the Kzintai on turn 10, but with the Romulans sitting there, will they? If the Feds attack Romulans or Klingons, (other than Fed Limited War), the Gorns won't enter the war at all. Ultimately, the Feds will have to enter the war, or your next target is Kzintai. And as soon as the Feds do attack, then the Romulans can join and the Gorns still stay out! This won't necessarily make for a fun game, but it's something I've been considering.

Any thoughts?
You might check 322.32, where it says that the pinwheel gets a 50% bonus to its defense factors, AND it's an unbreakable group.

I did. Check out 322.32: "The owner has the option to cripple one or more of the ships during damage resolution (without the 50% bonus), but destroying one or more of the ships dissolves the Pinwheel." So go ahead and pinwheel, your 3 PCs can still only absorb 12 damage crippled and another 6 destroyed. Also pinwheels count as a base, and I am pretty sure bases are not allowed in battle groups.

Where can I find the rule that permits the Federation 7th Fleet to protect the Tholians and under what conditions?

You know what, this was a change between the 2000 scenarios and 2010. In 2K, 602.48 states: "If the Coalition invades the Tholians without going to war with the Federation, then the above Limited War rules also apply to the Federation and Tholians. The Federation may send the 7th Fleet into Tholian territory along with elements of the 2nd Fleet and any new construction."

2010 says: "If the Romulans go to war with the Federation, the Federation may, at its option, go to war with the Klingons. If the Romulans do not attack the Federation, the Federation has the option, but not a
requirement, to declare war on the Klingons at the start of any Federation Player Turn starting with Turn #10."

BIG difference. So my strategy of hitting the Tholians T7 looks like it may be OBE, unless this was an unintended change?

---

**Quote:**

Also, remember, with the Tholians, the attacker has to select a BIR of 3 or 4 each round.

---

Actually you must pick a 4 (512.5)

---

**Quote:**

Pinwheels definitely add another disadvantageous twist to the calculation. Bloody Rocks.

---

No they don't see above.

---

**Quote:**

#1 You attack the Feds turn 7 as normal, saving 7th SB for last, move 200 ships there to take it, while leaving parity on all other fronts, then take Tholia turn 9. Set up shop, and you're ready to slide over to Gorn territory as soon as the Romulans enter the war.
This works even better if you do not get within two hexes of the 7th Fleet area on T7, and if you do *not* drop a Fed SB on T7, since then the 7th is not released until turn 8 then. And if you hit the Tholians then, the 7th cannot help at all since you're at war with the Feds. Of course that's assuming you *can* hit the rocks on T7, which it looks like was changed in the scenario rules.

By William Stec (Billstec2) on Friday, January 14, 2011 - 03:47 pm: Edit

Robert,

quote:

I did. Check out 322.32: "The owner has the option to cripple one or more of the ships during damage resolution (without the 50% bonus), but destroying one or more of the ships dissolves the Pinwheel." So go ahead and pinwheel, your 3 PCs can still only absorb 12 damage crippled and another 6 destroyed. Also pinwheels count as a base, and I am pretty sure bases are not allowed in battle groups.

unquote

I interpret that rule as saying that if you cripple the entire group, it resolves 50% more damage than if you had individually crippled the ships. Ie 3 DD absorb 18 if you cripple them individually, or 27 if you cripple the whole group of 3.

I missed the pinwheels are treated as bases; therefore they'd be unlikely to be allowed in battlegroups. Thanks for pointing that out.

So you could still do 3xCW and 3xDD in pinwheels, just not in a battlegroup.

By Robert Padilla (Zargan) on Friday, January 14, 2011 - 04:06 pm: Edit

William, I think that interpretation is a stretch. The combined group is really no tougher than it's individual parts, it's just harder to direct damage on a pinwheel. So sure if I wanted to maul it it would
get the 50% bonus, but if you self cripple it you can only take
damage on it equal to it's parts. Much like how a SB SIDS costs 9 if
I maul it, but if you take it willingly it only resolves 4.5 damage.
Also remember that unbreakable group do not exist in 2010.

And if the Coalition is gonna hit the Tholians, they'll not make it to
CWs and will be lucky to have 3 DDs in one place.

If he cripples the group, or destroys the group, that's not crippling
or destroying individual ships, and the group's defense applies. I'm
not sure how else you can read this.

We've got plenty of rules where a unit has a different defense
against directed damage, and they all SPECIFY that it's directed
damage that this applies to. You're assuming that this is the case
here based on what? That the rule ALSO provides the defender with
an OPTION to take damage on individual units rather than the
group, and that that OPTION uses the individual defense factors of
the ships rather than the defense of the group?

I don't see it.

Taking damage on a group is NOT the same as damaging individual
members of the group. And the group gets a defense bonus.

I reread the rule several times, and I may be in error after all. It
makes more sense to me now that the only thing the pinwheel does
is provide more protection against directed damage attacks.

So that group of 3PC or 3DD is harder to kill if directed upon, but if
self crippled takes the same damage, without the 50% bonus.
The F&E Staff will review our notes on the Fed 7th Fleet support to the Tholians -- my thinking is that we mistakenly omitted the enabling rule when we revised to rulebook last year as I don't recall having that provision removed (but I could be wrong/misinformed and ADB may have decided otherwise.)

By Robert Padilla (Zargan) on Friday, January 14, 2011 - 07:58 pm: Edit

Thanks Chuck, as that rule also enables the Klingons to be able to attack the Tholians on Turn 7.

Douglas,

You need to remember that you do not damage groups of ships at a time. You rather damage ships one at a time. See 302.61:

"The owning player selects which of his units will be crippled or destroyed to satisfy the Damage Points scored by his opponent. He may select these units in any order, but selects them one at a time."

Otherwise you could cripple a pinwheel of 3 PCs with say 4 damage, and generate a mass number of minus points (12) since you crippled the whole thing with that 4 damage. But actually you'd choose one of the PCs to cripple, since you select individual ships to resolve your damage, and once you picked one, you're out of damage points so the process is complete.

By Thomas Mathews (Turtle) on Friday, January 14, 2011 - 08:43 pm: Edit

Rob wrote:

Quote:

Otherwise you could cripple a pinwheel of 3 PCs with say 4 damage, and generate a mass number of minus points (12) since you crippled the whole thing with that 4 damage.
While you could to that you can only carry over 3 of the minus points. The other 9 are lost in the 2010 Rules.

By Ted Fay (Catwhoeatsphoto) on Saturday, January 15, 2011 - 10:47 am: Edit

only on pursuit, IIRC

By Robert Padilla (Zargan) on Saturday, January 15, 2011 - 11:35 am: Edit

Thomas,

My point is you cannot do that, because the pinwheel is not one big block of defensive compot for damage, it's three individual ships. Same deal with carrier groups. You can't cripple a whole carrier group to resolve a single point of damage, you just cripple a ship in said group.

By Michael Parker (Protagoras) on Saturday, January 15, 2011 - 03:58 pm: Edit

Quote:

Michael,

You cannot put anything in 2718 or 2618 on Turn 7, which is why I am saying you can't hit Tholia with SAFs that turn. Sure you could wait a turn, but then you'll have to deal with the Fed 7th Fleet as well. Pinwheels I'd not be worried about either, as it does not increase their ability to take damage, and the ships in said pinwheel are not juicy DD targets anyway.

Yes you can the Klingons can occupy 2619 2618 and 2718 turn 2. They can then put whatever they want in those hexes including SAF's. Unless I am missing some other rule.

By Robert Padilla (Zargan) on Saturday, January 15, 2011 - 04:15 pm: Edit
Michael, which rule says the Klingons can occupy those hexes? That's news to me if they can do that. As far as I know all of those hexes are under the caveat of being next to a future beligerant and therefore cannot be entered without accepting internment.

By Ted Fay (Catwhoeatsphoto) on Saturday, January 15, 2011 - 04:23 pm: Edit

Yeah, news to me. If you can occupy those on turn 2 I've been losing a WHOLE lot of EPs in all of my games.

By Michael Parker (Protagoras) on Saturday, January 15, 2011 - 06:06 pm: Edit

I do not have the rules with me. But its the same rule that says you CANNOT 2617. Maybe its the section on the Tholians. But its something I reminded you of Ted in one of our games.

By William Stec (Billstec2) on Saturday, January 15, 2011 - 06:17 pm: Edit

Michael,

See rule 503.624. The Klingons cannot enter 2617.

By Michael Parker (Protagoras) on Saturday, January 15, 2011 - 06:37 pm: Edit

Bill,

I knew that.. but they can enter 2619 2618 band 2718 right? Is that in the same rule?

By Chuck Strong (Raider) on Saturday, January 15, 2011 - 07:24 pm: Edit

See (503.64) for neutral zone hexes that may be occupied adjacent to Tholian territory; note restriction in (503.624).

SAFs can enter these zones as part of a pre-invasion of Tholia -- just saying -- because I've done it.

By Michael Parker (Protagoras) on Saturday, January 15, 2011 - 09:23 pm: Edit

I really need to get a 2nd set of rulebooks!
Ah, I see 600.30 allows released ships to pass through an unreleased fleet's zone. So I guess you move your Tholia invasion force through East Fleet territory (if they stop in the East Fleet zone they become unreleased don't they?), to set up in the NZ in preparation for the attack.

Paul:

I can find nothing in the rules that gives the impression that active units are effectively "interned" by an inactive fleet if active units stop within the area of an inactive fleet. It is even a common tactic for the Kzinti to set up a released reserve fleet within the inactive Marquis Fleet area to tempt the Klingons to enter and activate the Marquis and bring the Federation 4th Fleet into the game.

General Scenario rules have almost always defined new construction as released with the exception of designated PWC as part of unreleased fleets. Note even Limited War (654.0) overrides designated Pre War Construction limitations.

Thus a new frigate could be built at an unreleased fleet's starbase and moved (operationally or strategically) closer to the front lines of an invading empire. The Federation 7th Fleet Starbase comes to mind first and foremost.

Chuck, Thomas,

Thanks for the clarification. I don't know where I got that idea since I'm very familiar with the Kzinti hiding a released reserve in the Marquis zone.
Good, then the attack on Tholia can proceed from the bases down south.

By Paul Howard (Raven) on Sunday, January 16, 2011 - 02:13 pm: Edit

It is possible to convert a released item into an unreleased item - but only for Reserve Fleet designation counters (507.43).

I did think released ships added to an unreleased fleet reserve marker also become unreleased - but I can't find a rule on this!

By Chuck Strong (Raider) on Sunday, January 16, 2011 - 02:52 pm: Edit

PH:

I think you're reading (507.43) incorrectly:

(507.43) INACTIVE FLEETS may be assigned reserve markers not part of their original order of battle, but a (INACTIVE) reserve marker assigned to an inactive fleet cannot be reassigned to an active fleet until the inactive fleet becomes active.

BOLD is my emphasis.

By Paul Howard (Raven) on Sunday, January 16, 2011 - 03:31 pm: Edit

Chuck - that doesn't sound right - unless I am reading it wrong.

You can't assign an Inactive Reserve Fleet Marker from X to Inactive Fleet Y - as it's part of Fleet X's order of battle.

Therefore, you can only assign a Reserve Fleet Marker from an active fleet, to an inactive fleet.

i.e. You can assign an Active Fleet marker to an inactive Fleet - but upon doing so, the Reserve Fleet Marker becomes part of the inactive fleet.

Correct?
Not Correct.

One can:

A. Assign an activated reserve marker filling it with inactivated fleet ships within the inactive fleet set up area but it cannot be moved unless that fleet is activated.

B. Assign an inactivated reserve marker filling it with activated fleet ships within the set up area of the inactive fleet but it cannot be moved unless the inactive fleet is activated (IOW the marker must be activated).

Example - Given: Klingons activated the Fed 4th Fleet by entering the Marquis earlier in a game; it is now Turn #7. Under condition A, the Feds use the 4th Fleet's reserve marker to place elements of the Fed 7th Fleet (inactive) on standby but the Klingons don't invade this turn which might have allowed the 7th Fleet to activate. The marker is NOT interned with the still inactive 7th fleet and can be reassigned on the next turn.

Thanks Chuck!

Have we found an enabling rule that allows the Klingons to enter the Tholian NZ hexes on turn 2? I'd like to know if I've been missing out all these years!

Entry into Neutral Zones

503.1. Not allowed to enter NZ hexes which are adjacent to future belligerents until War or an alliance exists.
Based on that the NZ hex they could enter is 2617 since it is not adjacent to either the Federation or the Tholians.

Ted,

503.64 according to other folks in here.. my rules are at work. But basically anyone at war can occupy hexes adjacent to Tholian territory. 2617 (and its mirror image on the Rommie side) are specifically disallowed with some flavour text saying the Federation would not like that.

I have occupied those NZ hexes in every game I have played the Coalition (only twice lately) and in at least two of our games with you as Coalition I have reminded you about those hexes when I have noticed you not going after them.

Ryan,

2617 is specifically disallowed in a rule somewhere...

Shoot, you're correct. 2617 and 3217 are considered to be part of the Fed-K or R NZ per 503.624

Also note that although you cannot capture 2617, one can move through it to capture a hex behind it (like 2718).

As I said earlier, read (503.64) for neutral zone hexes that may be occupied adjacent to Tholian territory; note restriction in
Unless at war with the Federation, hexes 2617 and 3217 CANNOT be moved into or captured or by the Klingons or Romulans respectively without being interned by the Federation.

In a General War Scenario:

Klingons can occupy and capture 2619, 2618, and 2718 as early as Turn #2.

Romluans can occupy and capture 3219, 3218, and 3118 as early as Turn #10.

According to SVC's ruling that the Klingons can't attaack the Tholians until turn 7. It stands to reason they can't capture the neutral zone hexes until turn 7.

See 503.64, which _explicitly_ permits permits empires at wartime status to capture neutral zone hexes adjacent to the Tholians, LDR, and WYN. There is no requirement to be at war with the bordering power. The Klingons do not ever need to declare war on the Tholians in order to take 2619, any more than they need to declare war on the LDR to take 0912.

(I was not aware of this provision until someone brought it up above: not sure if it was something that changed in 2010, or if I have been regularly denying the poor Klingons 0.6 EP a turn!)

TM: Please read (503.64)....Jason is correct...
The rule has been like that since I think F&E2K at least. I was surprised when it was used against me once, but it is legal.

By *Ted Fay (Catwhoeatsphoto)* on Monday, January 17, 2011 - 11:28 am: Edit

Heh. Now I remember Mike Parker reminding me about that. Twice in two different games. And I still forgot! 😊

Meh. Memory like a steel sieve, I guess! 😊

By *Michael Parker (Protagoras)* on Monday, January 17, 2011 - 02:07 pm: Edit

Well its easy to forget! And I don't often notice it as the Alliance player as its kinda off the beaten track to be looking at till about turn 6 or so.

By *Ted Fay (Catwhoeatsphoto)* on Monday, January 17, 2011 - 03:37 pm: Edit

Hey Mike, don't you owe me something in our game.... 😊

By *Michael Parker (Protagoras)* on Monday, January 17, 2011 - 04:27 pm: Edit

I am not at work today and all our game stuff is at work.. so I will be getting you stuff tomorrow!

By *Ted Fay (Catwhoeatsphoto)* on Monday, January 17, 2011 - 05:04 pm: Edit

LOL, np, just being a nit. 😊

By *Thomas Mathews (Turtle)* on Monday, January 17, 2011 - 05:35 pm: Edit

Back in the Archive for Jan 12 someone asked about Klingon Delivery of KestraLs and early war. I believe it was specifically related to the K9R but would also apply to the Klingon E4s delivered to the Romulans.

The answer is in (652.4). Found while checking on something else related to (652.0)

See the Order of Battle for delivery schedule.
REVISED RULING ON THOLIAN NEUTRAL ZONE HEXES

Okay – after spending a good part of the afternoon reading the rules I found the ‘missing’ rule that restricts the Klingons from occupying the neutral zone hexes adjacent to the Tholians. The ruling was incorporated in the last line of a scenario note in (601.11):

“The Klingons cannot occupy Neutral Zone hexes adjacent to the Tholians until they are at war with the Federation.”

So here is my revised ruling:

FEDS RULING:

Rule (503.64) is a general rule. Rule (601.11) is a specific rule that only applies to a historical General War scenario such as “The Wind” (601.0). As always, a specific rule overrides a general rule.

Please accept my apologies for my mistake and for not catching this earlier – I was wrong.

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

This ruling was also posted in the Q&A section.

Dale, have you ever done a colony placement strategy for the ISC? If so could you post it here? Thanks in advance.
Has anyone posted a post-CEDS early alliance clinic? I just got my new large print F&E2010, and I wanted to try it out. I found out in short order the tactics I was used to didn't work well without CEDS. I never realized how much the early Kzinti game relied on it until I didn't have it any more.

Thanks in advance!

By Ted Fay (Catwhoeatsphoto) on Tuesday, February 01, 2011 - 04:39 pm: Edit

CEDS and GEDS are actually fairly similar. The biggest difference is no out-of-phase retrograde for carrier groups. The actual use of carrier groups in combat is about the same in the two systems. However, there are probably subtle differences that others can chime in about.

By Michael Parker (Protagoras) on Tuesday, February 01, 2011 - 06:51 pm: Edit

Ray,

The two biggest problems for the early Kzinti without CEDS are:

1. You cannot afford to cripple escorts
2. You cannot afford to cripple escorts

While I realize this is technically only one problem, its such a large one I thought it deserved mentioning twice!

If you plan on doing much offensively on your turn you will need to preserve your escorts. So the typical Kzinti tactic of 18 fighters and cripple an EFF and CLE don't work as well. Crippled EFF's are not tragic as you don't lose much by replacing them with ad-hoc FF's on your turn, but its still a strain.

Build some extra light escorts if you can afford it, and as always be prepared to build every CM on your schedule as an MEC until about turn 7.

Unless your opponent is directing on you (quite possible) you will
find damage absorption to be a problem. Sure some EFF's can be crippled but you will find a typical 3xCVS group line frequently crippling whatever off ships you have in order to maintain escorts. For me I have taken to putting DD's and CL's on the line (and BC's and CC's even) taking them as cripples then throwing them into the Depot for free repairs. The odd crippled BC can even be CDR'd into a survey hull for the one ep discount, or made into CC's.

Loss of CEDS is not nearly as bad as I thought it would be, but you will need to come up with some creative ways to take damage, or else you will find yourself unable to field credible CV groups on your offensive half turns!

I have been playing a solo vanilla game under 2010 rules and am up to Alliance turn 7. The Kzinti are still doing fine, but they do have many of the smaller carriers without escorts. Some CVEs have CLE escorts as their original FFE were moved up to the big carriers (coalition has been DDing FFEs). MECs are replacing CLEs in the big groups, and the CLEs are going to the CVEs. It helps to have spare escorts in advance, but I haven't been keeping up with this as well as I might have.

Many of the smaller carriers don't go on the battle line regularly anyway, not like the strike cruisers do, so if they go without escorts it is often not a problem, they can just transfer fighters to the big boys, or forward deploy fighters, or just bulk out pinning numbers for the Kzin fleet.

It is an interesting difference to playing with out of sequence repairs, but I don't think the Kzinti are doing particularly badly at all. I am not a great coalition player however, and they have been concentrating on the Hydrans first. Hydran capital was razed (except for the cap planet/starbase) on turn 5, and taken on turn 6. The first batch of coalition repairs are now appearing back on the kzin/fed area, so we will see how the kzinti fare under more attention from the coalition fleets. I did not invade the Feds on turn 7 (too many klingon cripples), but am considering it for turn 8.
hhhhmmmmm small carries.......we got "Jeeps" in the game now

Nick,

My experience so far in my solitaire game has been similar as far as escorts/carrier usage so far. The Kzin haven't had a big issue keeping some escorts available for emergency usage. The issue has been keeping enough FKE escorts around...but that's not a 2010 rule problem. 😊

Nick and Bill, you never have enough FKEs around. lol

Heck, you never have enough FFEs, let alone FKEs. That's not a change.

there are situations where loss of CEDS may matter, but i don't see how the zin in turns 1-6 are in one of them.

first, the zin are flush with cash (by "virtue" of their anemic build schedules) in the first couple turns. produce a few extra EFFs, then each turn replace your losses. it's not hard to do.

second, escort and light carriers are for all intents and purposes (bad) FCRs. the escorts they begin with are pretty much completely spares to be used by the medium and heavy carriers.

third, the zin can live entirely without EFFs, and it may actually be advantageous to do so. ad hoc FF saves you an EP, at the cost of
taking four more falling damage (which is at least occasionally fighters) when an escort is directed, and dealing one less damage done per round of combat. obviously the fleet is better with EFFs than FFs, but the upgrade isn't particularly cost-effective.

when DWEs become generally available, and especially for the gorn and lyrans with their awesome outer escorts, CEDs can matter, but i just can't see it having any effect on the early zin.

Chris,

Flexible Conversion rules make it easy to have plenty of small escorts. You can easily convert 6 to 12 plus build most of your small ships as escorts if you have a really bad turn in the early war. Later on, you should have enough spares with the newer DW escorts coming on line that you can fill in with older FF class escorts where needed. The real limit is how many FF and DW hulls you have. Not how may you have converted to escorts. You just have to plan for it.

Chris,

The old Kzinti tactic was lines like.

DN (form) [CVS MEC EFF][CVS CLE EFF][CVS CLE EFF] FF FF SF(FS).

The coalition could direct a FF or an EFF or let the damage fall. Assuming the coalition let the damage fall the Kzinti would happily burn 18 fighters cripple CLE EFF for 28 total and slide in a fresh CVS group next round rinse repeat till out of fighters. If the coalition directed then almost as good, an EFF got burned for 14 you still have 18 fighters and you cripple a CLE or MEC and you again slide a brand spanking new CVS group in next round.
So at the end of a battle you typically end up with tonnes of CV groups that have crippled escorts with possibly some missing outer escorts.. you happily CEDS retrograde, throw patches on the cripples, build EFF's with CEDS and voila' your fleet is now ready to attack on your turn.

Now however without CEDS you have to be VERY careful how you take damage, you see more lines with CA/CL/DD instead of FF's for damage absorption. You see less willingness to cripple lots of escorts.. because you cannot repair them for your offensive turn.. heck you cannot even repair them for your next defensive turn unless your sitting atop a repair point or are willing to do field repairs.

So in the CEDS days an EFF crippled C2 defending count's SB was repaired and ready for action A2. Withough CEDS assuming count's SB went down, you most certainly do not have the ability to repair this ship for use on A2, and if you want it available for C3 you will need to field repair it. This same ship is ready ostensibily on A3 a full turn later than before. Rapid Combat Repair can shorten this just like field repair but at a premium the Kzin usually find hard to pay.

That is the difference as I see it.

Now with that said.. it sounds bleak.. but it really isn't. You have to scale back the tempo of your offensive operations, and you have to be very stingy with ep's. Build out your FKE MEC's and ad-hoc FF's to make up the difference. Depot repair DD's CL's and even the occasional BC as your using them as line ships more than in the past, and crippling them to absorb damage.

As a primarily Alliance player I was really of the opinion that the loss of CEDS would be crippling to the Kzinti... then I played the darn game! Actually Ted Fay and I played two games with no CEDS before 2k10 came out and I will say I adapted fairly quickly.. and it isn't bad.
Thank you all.

It sound like careful management of smaller hulls (The Kzinti never have enough small hulls.) should enable me to have a reasonable offensive every turn.

Has anyone noticed Hydran tactics changing appreciably? I usually get hammered by CT6 regardless what rules set we use, and I have to hope the Klingon player has bad rolls.

By Thomas Mathews (Turtle) on Wednesday, February 02, 2011 - 10:15 pm: Edit

Ray, that's about normal as most Coalition players tend to adopt a Hydran first strategy and try to kick them off the map as fast as possible.

By Daniel G. Knipfer (Dgknipfer) on Thursday, February 03, 2011 - 12:22 am: Edit

Ray,

No, the Hydrans don't see much of a change. The Hydrans have no starting carriers and I know several players that just ad hock CRs as the outer escort for their carriers till their opponent conveniently blows them up for you trying to drive the odd CV or TG-V off the line.

By Robert Padilla (Zargan) on Thursday, February 03, 2011 - 04:44 pm: Edit

Quote:

Now with that said.. it sounds bleak.. but it really isn't. You have to scale back the tempo of your offensive operations, and you have to be very stingy with ep's.

Well, depends on how you look at it. Yes without CEDS the Kzinti have to attack less, as they cannot afford the damage they will take, but this is war, and not attacking your enemy is not a good
thing for the long run. I've basically seen the game shift from the Kzinti being able to drop almost every Klingon/Lyran border BATS in the first 6 turns of the game, to the Kzinti being able to maybe do half of that in the same timeframe. Sure, in the pre 2010 days the Kzinti had to pay the butcher's bill, but the thing is, if they were willing to pay the cost, they could outlast most Coalition defenses, take out a key target, and then retrograde back for repairs. They can still do all of that, except for the repair part, which is the *huge* differece IMO. Now with 2010 the Kzinti cannot launch those attacks at close to even odds, they now have to have a significant advantage in order to minimize their damage taken. It *really* makes a difference in the early game, as the Kzinti are forced to play much more conservatively than before. This allows the Coalition to control the tempo of the early game even more than they did before. Later on, once the Feds come into the game, it affects them too, as they would use a very similiar tactic to attack Coalition hardpoints and still be able to put up a good defense on the next turn.

And none of that needed out of phase retrogrades, it needed the special repair phase that carriers got on the player turn. Had CEDS been altered to only take away the out of phase retrogrades and left in the extra repair step (for the phasing player only), I doubt either side would have missed CEDS at all. But instead we have the reduced ability for the Kzinti and Federation to attack in the early game, and the Coalition really isn't affected in the slightest since in the early game you don't want those CV groups on the line anyway, and once you get the "good" escorts, you just pair up a CV with a BG for all the damage absorption you need.

Is this bad? I don't know to be honest. What I do know is that the game plays differently now for the Alliance than it did before. That may or may not be a bad thing, as it seems the consensus is that the Alliance basically can't loose anyway, they just ned to hang in there. Just my 2 cents.

By Michael Parker (Protagoras) on Thursday, February 03, 2011 - 05:42 pm: Edit

Robert,
I agree with you 100% I attack as the alliance a little less, as to me killing coalition border bats isn't a big deal early.. those Bats will fall eventually in any case.. and when the Coalition has to spread out its resv markers to cover fed space is the time for me.

By Paul Edwards (Pablomatic) on Monday, February 07, 2011 - 07:05 pm: Edit

Has anyone used PGVs and FLGs to any benefit?

By Ted Fay (Catwhoeatsphoto) on Monday, February 07, 2011 - 07:19 pm: Edit

I use them. They are pincount, especially when establishing FRD parks in your own territory, and help with picket rings. FLGs are useful to allow a stack of POLs serving in picket rings to use extended reaction and get to the hex that's being defended before approaching enemy forces enter that hex and make it impossible to get in (with POL restrictions.

By Paul Edwards (Pablomatic) on Monday, February 07, 2011 - 09:45 pm: Edit

Thanks Ted, it's you who I saw building them. I suppose theoretically a FLG is useful for what you say, and theoretically, PVs are more fighters.

By Daniel G. Knipfer (Dgknipfer) on Monday, February 07, 2011 - 09:58 pm: Edit

I've used them some for FRD park defense. A FLG, PV, POL is a bit more resistant to raids than just stacking three POLs together while being more expendable that actual Naval warships. Especially if the POL is a free call up. You can take 3 casualties in small scale combat before you actually loose anything. The only reason I don't build them more often is I'm usually short on cash for the things I have to have.

Ted, I'd be interested to know if you're giving something up to call up those FLG and PV hulls or finding a nickle I haven't been able to squeeze out of my econ.

By Ted Fay (Catwhoeatsphoto) on Monday, February 07, 2011 - 11:54 pm: Edit
Dan, I build all hulls, but sometimes have to give up a specialty ship.

By Paul Edwards (Pablomatic) on Friday, February 11, 2011 - 02:28 pm: Edit

I have found a reason to build VLVs for the Romulans when you can. VLV squadrons are oversized in Y175. That's incidentally when you can start building CNVs. The Roms only have two carrier designs with oversized squadrons: the VLV and the KRU. The VLV has less fighters, but is available earlier, and has more compot overall. Every race needs oversized squadrons to put with heavy carriers on the line if possible in order to get more than 18 ftrs on the line.

The Romulan problem is that their carriers with 8 ftrs (SPB, etc.) aren't oversized squadrons, and thus if you pair them with a CVA that has two regular sized squadrons, you must leave 2 ftrs in the hangar and can only put 18 max on the line. These carriers do work well with the VLV however, because together they at least do reach the maximum of 18 ftrs on the line.

We're now on turn 16 in Charlie Mike, and I am feeling the shortage of Romulan oversized squadrons (only 1 VLV) acutely. I will convert a KRU this turn, since a VLV is a heavy carrier and you can only build so many of those. I now regret not building more VLVs instead of an FAB (which only adds to the Romulan ftr problem). Next game I will build VLVs early, as I wanted to do this game.

How do other players pair up the Romulan carrier types?

By Daniel G. Knipfer (Dgknipfer) on Sunday, February 13, 2011 - 11:39 am: Edit

Ted,

Do you have to down sub occasionally to find the EPs required or just forgo a few specialty ships?

By Ted Fay (Catwhoeatsphoto) on Sunday, February 13, 2011 - 02:54 pm: Edit

Dan, yes I down sub occasionally. Sometimes a mix. I'm not set on any particular thing - depends on my needs at the time. My most common one for the Klingons is building a Tug-B in place of D7C in
fall turns - 6 EPs instead of 3 and I get the tug in addition to the two D7/D6 builds which can be subbed for other things.

By Chris Upson (Misanthropope) on Sunday, February 13, 2011 - 03:47 pm: Edit

TGB is THE STUFF. a dedicated mission W platform alone is well worth the purchase price, and oh yeah it does a zillion other great things.

don't believe i'd often downsub a D7C though. after you sub your one D6M, there is no particularly cost effective use of a CA hull. 1 EP for an extra point of free damage soaking and 1/3 point of damage dealt each turn- times utilization, which is generally pretty high for the klingons? a pretty good ROE, i think.

By Ted Fay (Catwhoeatsphoto) on Sunday, February 13, 2011 - 04:58 pm: Edit

Chris, there's nothing wrong with a D7C; great ship. However, I'm often wanting to sub my D7/D6 slipways with two of the following: TG-*, D6M, D6D, D6G, D6S, D7V. I try hard to build a D6G every turn, as that is my limit, and I also make a priority of having 2*D6M per turn. Combine those requirements, and the further need for more tugs, I end up having to downsub the D7C to get all the specialty ships I want. (And I have other D7Cs *AND* crippled D7s can be cheaply turned into D7Cs using CDR.)

Some people think it's nuts to build D6Gs like that. However, I have established quite a reputation of being both lucky and skillful with G ships and have quite a bit of success using them on planetary and starbase assaults.

Just my play style and strategy, really - there's no magik potion here and no reason why some other strategy won't work either. 😊

By Paul Edwards (Pablomatic) on Sunday, February 13, 2011 - 07:16 pm: Edit

I'm not knocking you Ted, but a D5G+TPod is cheaper than a D6G and frees up a slot. Plus, you can leave the TPod off most of the
time and only put it on when you're attacking fixed defenses. D6Gs have other advantages though.

Four D5Gs is really the limit there since I think they take up LTT slots. And I definitely want to learn what you're doing to succeed with G ships.

Dan, you are correct. D5Gs take up the LTT build slot.

Dan, Ted has no magic trick to using G ships, he's just darn lucky with them! I used to discredit them almost entirely, until I had Ted come into one of my SBs and score a hit with G ships 6 TIMES IN A ROW! And not all of those were with a VBIR of +2, and at least one was into a negative shift.

Ted hits G attacks about 80% of the time, give or take. That's why I call him the G-MAN!!!!

Rob, remember your limited to the number of ships you can sell to the WYN. 4 in a 20 turn period. Usually the Kzinti DD, as it gives you the best bang for the buck. At the same time you can accumulate trade rights. So even giving up 1 turn of delivering 6 EPs you can send 10 on the next carrying 2 forward. While it is frustrating to not have all the money you need on one turn you might be better off having it available later. especially when exhaustion starts to take hold.
Ted hits G attacks about 80% of the time, give or take. That's why I call him the G-MAN!!!!

Yeah, I like to hit the "G-spot." ;)

More seriously, though, I find that by putting several G ships on the line the opponent has to either kill them (saving my more valuable units) or suffer defender casualties (shortening the battle and my pain). I make this strategy more effective by killing enemy G units when I can. Normally the alliance doesn't bother to replace them and the effect over time can be telling.

As for D5G v. D6G - yes, D5G or D5H+T-pod is very nice. However, you are limited in numbers, as indicated by Thomas. Also, this unit does not have *TWO* G units and one on the crippled side. More G units = more G attacks and more ability to sustain G assaults longer. Also, they take more damage to kill, which is one of the functions of G ships in my mind.

By Kevin Howard (Jarawara) on Monday, February 14, 2011 - 10:00 am: Edit

The D5G plus T-pod does have two G units, and one on the crippled side. However, There's only four of them available at a time (only four pods).

I try to have all four in operation all the time, and then I supplement that with a few D6G. The D5GT takes first priority in battle, since they are replaceable without losing a heavy cruiser hull. I keep additional D5G handy, both because they can haul stuff around for me, but also so I can buy replacement T-pods and instantly have double-G troopships in forward positions.

Hmmm... I never checked - is there Lyran T-pods available. If so, lend them to the Klingons to put on more D5G's, thus increasing the total number in service.

By Robert Padilla (Zargan) on Monday, February 14, 2011 - 10:46 am: Edit
Thomas, I remember about the limit. It just seems (or me at least) that I always want to sell a ship AND pull EPs from the WYN on the same turn, to setup a next turn's purchase at some point in the first seven turns. Being able to Blockade Run a ship to sell (to the WYN) and at the same time being able to Blockade Run a tug I conveniently left in the cluster back to 1401 is perfect.

And I would note that the restriction on going to the same hex does not limit this at all, since my one way Blockade run sent a ship to the WYN (trip used to that hex), and if I can use a tug already in the cluster, it can Blockade run to 1401 (trip used) and then by the letter of the rule return to the cluster where it started to send EPs back (round trip run bringing it back "home").

Sounds too good to be true to me.

---

**Quote:**

The D5G plus T-pod does have two G units, and one on the crippled side. However, There's only four of them available at a time (only four pods).

---

Kewl! I learned something new.... now I have a reason to build D5Gs!

---

Ted, and convert them to DWGs later. 😊

Rob, I see what your getting at. Sort of like the round trip Strategic Movement for Tugs between Capitals for the transfer of EPs from one Empire to the other.
Yeah Ted, the Klingons of course have 4 T-pods and the Lyran can loan them both of the KTPs they have giving you SIX commando raiders without using a D6 hull.

By Daniel G. Knipfer (Dgknipfer) on Monday, February 14, 2011 - 08:37 pm: Edit

Yeah Ted, the Lyrans have 2 KTP and 1 A-Pallet to start. You could easily lend the KTP to the Klingons or just have them in the area to lend their G to your other G ships. I've taken to sticking them with a SR+KSP, a relatively safe and still useful unit, to have them available when I need the G to replace losses.

Of course my opponents scored 39 points of damage over the Marquis SB weekend before last and popped an SR+KSP+KTP out of the free scout position. It was annoying, but that was 27 points of damage my Klingon partner didn't have to spread around after fighters. There are now only 5 Alliance SB on the map outside of a Capital. Four Fed and one Gorn.

By Andrew Bruno (Admeeral) on Monday, February 14, 2011 - 09:59 pm: Edit

Gee. Where's that after action report?

By Paul Howard (Raven) on Friday, February 18, 2011 - 08:12 am: Edit

As with anything - luck can turn one players 'wasted hull' into another person's wonder weapon!

And Ted with his G's are very lucky - and then it gets self perpetuating!

You know if your DON'T direct - it will do a succesful G attack - so you have to waste damage - and so Ted's luck doesn't come into play!!!

I have seen other players never hit a SB Barn door with G attacks - and so they don't get directed on - and don't do any damage - and so don't get built!
Those G hulls already in existence are worse than normal ships (due to lower compot!)

PDU's and Capital strategies.

Okay, I just did a quick analysis recently, and wondered what others thought. What is the 'best' strategy to take a capital? Defend it?

e.g. Coalition vs Hydran capital t9. More than enough DN's, and likely enough maulers too, 4 SAF vs 20 PDU, 2PAL,2LGE, 9 LB, 6 Rangers, other stuff. Presuming BIR 8 each round - I believe (from a earlier check) that BIR 5 marginally increases the differentials

So, from some quick calcs of expected damage to coalition: (I ignored the SB below, as it will be a constant)

Direct 4 PDU, SAF 1 PDU/turn, Alliance disrupting SAFs - 590 damage over 8 rounds (last 3 just fleet)

Directing 4 PDU, SAF 3 PDU turn (alliance ignores SAFs) - 606 damage over 8 rounds (4 rounds just fleet)

Ignore PDU, direct on fleet, SAF's ignored by alliance - 694 damage over 8 rounds (but 3 of 4 PAL/LGE lost, last round only fleet)

Ignore PDU until SAF's gone, alliance disrupts SAFs - 772 damage over 8 rounds

Don't build any PDU on 617 - 465 damage over 8 rounds (but get 84 EP worth of extra Hydran ships).

So it looks like in general the alliance should just ignore SAF's and direct on choice Coalition units, UNLESS the Coalition does the same. (Have to look up who directs first and how SAF disruption works in that timing.)
Now, interestingly enough it looks like (from this not necessarily accurate analysis) that PDU's may not necessarily be worth it - Sure the alliance deals 140 extra damage or so, but if that is 14 dead CW/DW, and 84 EP builds the alliance another 17+ships, am I actually ahead? I suppose yes, as the coalition may get away with crippling a lot of that 140 damage, thus not lose the SE's, plus a bit of extra benefit in taking some less damage in the post PDU battle rounds from the early hits crippling any big stuff, but that is still a bit minor.

Anyone done a more full analysis? I'm interested in what I should do this time around on the upcoming capital battles. Obviously this is a general case, and would depend on the specific circumstances, but an interesting exercise nonetheless

---

By Michael Parker (Protagoras) on Tuesday, April 19, 2011 - 05:09 pm: Edit

Timothy,

Nice analysis... One thing to consider however is that if the Hyrdans build no PDU's then they don't have a chance to do some of the truly disgusting things that are possible. Its not impossible to have the Hydrans put up 390 Compot with their first line. That is 117 damage@30% assuming the Coalition player wants to assure a Mauler and SAF attack they are choosing BIR=4 you can acheive much higher than that. If you see them bring a SAF and you assume they are not going to put a SAF up and choose BIR=1 then you can choose BIR=4 as the Defender and be looking at 35% on average which is 137 damage. If you tell the attacker to drop 137 he will self kill alot of items. And imagine if you hit the 6-6 jackpot (I have done that before) and score 190+ damage and have them drop that.

Also consider if you don't build PDU's you might see an attack on 617 earlier than you otherwise would. PDU's are grow geometrically.. if your not building them then your opponent might want to come in to knock the 8 off your capital world to keep them from growing into 20 later.
Timothy

To add to what Michael said - it's all swings and roundabouts!

With say 17 extra ships - could the Hydrans delay an attack on 617 for 1 turn?

With 20 PDU's - will the Coalition decide the pain far outweighs the gain?

(If you get a good roll, the Coalition might kill an entire line and STILL owe 20+ damage for the next round - and if the Coalition only kill say 4 PDU's and Hydrans are owed 24 points - would the Coalition fight another round).

My 2p though - I would go with the PDU's!

Chris Upson (Misanthropope) on Wednesday, April 20, 2011 - 04:15 pm

Tim:

the extra 12 PDUs absorb three rounds of damage, during which time the coalition take ~330 damage and spend 33 EPs on drone bombardment and SAFs. damage in big clumps is more expensive than the same damage spread out, so it looks like the coalition are paying about half again the cost of the PDUs, to kill them. not a spectacular gain for the alliance, but probably better than you get buying the inferior ships that you would normally skip due to lack of funds.

add to that two possibilities: delay the capital assault for an extra turn, which defrays whatever, 13 EPs of the cost of the PDUs, or the PDUs might actually make the assault *fail*, which is a game-changing swing, and entirely possible. your projections generally seem to posit the coalition has infinite resources available and the alliance fleet is inexplicably absent, which doesn't seem to be quite be the general experience presented in the game reports.
It all depends on what the coalition is doing. If they don't want the Hydrans to get to 20 PDUs on Hydrax, they have the ability to commit the ships early enough to prevent such a thing from happening.

My analysis above was based just on the first 8 rounds of the assault, as by then any method had stripped the PDU's. After that it would generally be the same, but not entirely, as really the total number of rounds after the PDU's are gone is fixed (i.e. you will fight till your tolerance and leave). So my initial analysis above of 465 damage without any extra PDU's vs. the 606 with 20 PDU isn't really a differential of 141 - it is really 377 damage vs. 160 damage. Differential 217. That is a bit better. Thought something was being missed - I was pretty sure the switch to 5 points to kill made the PDU's worth building, but it looked strange. I really only did this to see whether it was better to disrupt the SAF's or not, as I haven't used SAF's before. And I wanted to pop Lyran DN's this game, not blow up already dying freighters....

The coalition line on round one would likely be BG, mauler, 2 BC, 4 DN, DB Tug-A in form. Can pop the BG, BC's, and cripple all the rest to absorb 160 damage, and only a 6/6 sort of result will hit that. And I will be picking 4, to use the SAF's and maulers. Also - that sort of loss on my side sucks, but it takeable - I'll have reserve DN's and maulers. (Lyrans will have 18 DN/DNL's ready for a T9 assault, though some are still up in Kzinti space) Also - a BIR 10 gives me likely a 1/3 chance of direct crippling the SB - which if I can I will. Doing so will save me 20+ ship casualties presuming the Hydrans are willing to fight many rounds without any defenses. Even more otherwise. It isn't a good chance, but could happen.

EP's on drones isn't that big a deal - I've got oodles of EP's. Plus the SAF's all cost less, as I used up the useless (okay almost useless) FTL/FTS's building them.
Even with the correction, I think if I was going to play possum as the Alliance, I'd skip the PDU's and build 34 frigates. Doesn't matter that they are just pincount - I'll have the quality ships doing the fighting when I finally do come out to play. It should still mean getting SE superiority turns faster, and once the Coalition loses SE superiority things start going downhill faster and faster.

I've never had a problem taking 617 - it is just how costly is it. And only once did the Hydrans get to briefly retake it. But getting a turns delay would make the extra PDU's even more worth it.

I really don't see why there ever would be a problem - the starting coalition fleets outnumber the Kzinti and Hydran fleets easily. Add the 40+ builds/activations the coalition gets each turn (vs. a lot less on the alliance side) and I don't see how you have a problem. I lose 50+ ships taking out each of 1401 and 0617 and still grind the feds down while holding both the Kzinti and Hydrans from doing anything of note. I do not have any massive superiority against the feds - it usually is a fairly marginal one to start with. (I only really care about popping the 7th fleet SB on the first turn of invasion) But given the IWR, and with no kzinti shipyard and the starved hydran one going down soon, the coalition still is outbuilding the alliance by a fair margin. More than enough to drive towards Earth while you wait for the Romulans to enter. Especially given how terrible the Fed fleet is early - I've out compotted fleets on BATS, and sometimes even over SB's.

The coalition doesn't have infinite resources, but it has a lot more than the alliance. The alliance chooses how much of their stuff they will trade for the coalition stuff, but I don't care if it is Coalition 300 ships vs 140 alliance or Coalition 150 ships vs 40 alliance/whatever - I'm still fine.

I wish I could play like 100 ships didn't matter - wow.
Tim is right though, you can take both of the Zin and Hydran capitals early (before T8 or 9) without too much of a problem. The problems really come after T15 when the CO hits exhaustion, so prior to that the CO should be on the march.

Heh, define 'too much problem.'

I know Mike took Kzintai on turn 4 in our game 'Beautiful new map, ugly old war'. We're on turn 7 and capturing the Hydran capital is not looking too likely anytime soon.

I suppose if he had held off attacking the Feds, then he could do it, but that DEFINITELY would have lead him to problems, starting with turn 7.

Richard, if he took the Kzintis on T4 what did he do with the repairs from the Zin Cap on T6? I would have to suspect he made the choice of not taking the Hydran Cap to make a heavy push on the Feds.

He took most of the cripples to the Hydran front after repair.

Crippled ships on the Hydran front on turns 5 and 6 generally went to the Fed border after repair.

PS. Pick a scenario yet?

I am thinking the Tholian one, I have never really played with them. In campaigns most players have left them alone.
It isn't that the 100 ships do not matter, just that spending them wisely to take out the Kzinti and Hydran homeworlds pays off enough to let you try to stay on top of the EP/SE totals in the long term. That won't always work with the current full rules, but can.

E.g. if you take out the Kzinti capital T5 and hold it vs. devastating all the planets save the actual capital, then the 50 odd ships you lost cost the Kzinti 16EP per turn, up to 30 turns. 480EP buys a lot of ships. Plus the coalition gains the 13 odd EP per turn over the same timeframe. (which will help pay for keeping the Kzinti down) AND the Kzinti build a lot less ships while rebuilding the shipyard (offsetting the SE loss while it is relevant) - those 90 EP could have bought more ships too. All in all, losing 50 ships T5 when the Coalition has the significant early SE advantage is a bargain for the 100 odd never built Kzinti ships over the rest of the game. Same with the Hydran capital.

So, it is an investment, one that can pay big dividends. Done well, you can win the game by doing so. Of course, done poorly it may cost you the game too.

In my experience it is very hard to hold 1401, and would be even harder less 50 ships. Also in my experience the Coalition is building out their schedule already, so extra EPs do not equate to more ships (unless you want to overbuild frigates).

Let me put it a different way - if you do not deny the Kzinti/Hydran income, you lose. If you do not reduce the Kz/Hy builds, you lose. If you do prosecute the war in a way that shrinks your fleet relative to the Alliance, you lose. Advocating a strategy that hemorrhages ships like Obama giving out IOUs is not a war-winning strategy, in my opinion.

Of course, this assumes competent (as in active) Alliance play. With a passive Alliance, all things are possible.
Why is 1401 so hard to hold? Once you kick them off they don't get extra ships or money. The Kzinti's will have a big repair bill (so will the CO but they can afford theirs) and have to rebuild their shipyards that is a 6 turns of not much building the CO should certainly be able to hold the Kzintis out. The Feds will be hard pressed in their own space. Invest in building defenses at 1401 (use TT to drop PGBs) and bleed the Kzintis. The bulk of the CO fleet in Kzinti space should be at 1401, the CO should have more SE's and good quality ships as the Lyrans can't go into Fed space en masse until T10.

Ed,

You have assumed the Zin will have a big repair bill. A good Zin player will exact his pound of flesh in exchange for 1401 and then will leave when he starts taking serious damage on his ships. A Zin player who focuses on preserving his navy will have a large and angry navy offmap that cannot be pinned out of the capital hex.

Under these circumstances the Coalition must commit a large number of ships, many of them good solid units, in order to be assured of being able to hold the hex. Worse, the Zin will come in every turn and exchange fighters and cheap FFs for doing lots of damage to the Coalition that will have to be paid for to be repaired. Setting up MBs and PGBs is hard as he can direct them easily.

Contrast with the Hydrans. You can use a couple of SBs that he *cannot* stop you from constructing, and then one or two good lines of ships and a lot of crap ships can maintain the pincount advantage to prevent any shinnanigans in Lyran space.

I'm not saying that keeping and holding Zin space is impossible. I am saying that you will desperately want that pincount and good ships against the Feds.
As Ted says its not so easy holding 1401.

Use TT's to place PGB's well that is the rub isn't it. How are you going to stop the Kzinti from coming in and blowing up your TT's? You can't put them all in form, and killing just one rather spoils the whole bunch.

If the Kzinti plays into the Coalitions hand and wrecks his Navy yes its hard for him to make things hot for you at 1401, but if he plays it smart, he has a very potent, numerous, and dare I say mad like a drenched cat fleet sitting offmap making your life miserable and very very often untenable.

With 617 you can get bases and indigenous repair into the hex, with 1401 you are very unlikely to get either.

I cannot recall the Kzinti ever retaking their capital. I attack them with a fleet that will utterly destroy theirs over the SB and still have some ships left. After you leave, pretty well much regardless when, my fleet is still big enough to annihilate the Kzinti fleet in a fight to the death. So I'm happy to let you come trade as much as you want over 1401 each turn - I can absorb the damage better than the Kzinti. Not only do I have fighters myself, I've got the money to pay for the repairs.

I keep a fleet that is 20-30 SE bigger than the Kzinti up there, and usually have 4 or 5 full strength essentially unpinnable reserves. With lots of dreadnought, D6D's and maulers, so the Kzinti fleet is basically fighting 120-132 odd point lines where-ever they want (more if not at 1401, as the coalition can build SB's at the other planets if they want). I've never really been all that concerned at keeping 1401. Same with 617, but there you don't even need reserves and can build the SB/PDU's easily enough.

As for good ships vs the feds, no problems. I'll have enough DN's/good ships to fill out the 1-2 lines I really need - the early fed lines are probably the weakest of the entire alliance. And I'll just
keep getting more. (The game I am trying now I hope to stop that by directing Lyran DN's as often as possible. We'll see if it works...) I do not get to swarm the feds everywhere and gut them quick, as I don't have oodles of extra pincount - but that doesn't matter much. I can still basically just hop along the planet routes as I please, and mop up the rest later. Which pretty well much happens T10+ when the Romulans/Lyrans join in the fun.

It has been my experience that it is MUCH more valuable to keep the lead boot on the necks of the Kzinti and Hydrans than it is to have the extra ships against the feds. I don't want there to be the kind of havoc that can happen with uncontained Kzinti/Hydrans. I saw how bad that can get the one time I tried the Hydran first strategy and just didn't devote enough to holding the Kzinti at bay.

Another reason is that the Kzinti doesn't have to hit 1401, he can hit 1001 or 1802 (or both) if most CO forces are hunkered down in 1401 (especially if the CO doesn't try placing a base or PDUs in 1401)...

To win that battle you need 3x the Kzinti SE (1201/1401/1601) to keep those cats contained (as well as build bases in 1001/1202 for Lyran anchorage)...

To Ted and Michael, if the Kzinti didn't cripple at least 2 turns worth of ships the Capital fell pretty cheaply.

Next 4 TTs drop 4 PGBs the Kzintis won't want the Cap built up so you have to use directed damage on the planet not the TTs. If you destroy the TTs the PGBs still go active. If you are hitting the planets the CO is taking very little damage.

Let's do a run through this, Approach battle depending on the Coalition's forces they will probably fight one. Then they dump the whole static fleet in one system except for the TTs setting up the
PGB(unless they have a huge advantage). The CO fleet gets to see each force you sending into the systems and will be able to fine tune the battles in each system. So you are fighting at least one round at each of the outer systems (where the static fleet isn't). Then after that you have to beat the static fleet and the rest of the mobile fleet. Almost any CO player will take a stand up fight with the Kzinti prior to T9 some even later. Even if you wipe the CO out you lose most of your fleet too. The CO will gladly exchange part his fleet for all of yours. Until at least T12 you won't be producing many ships if your fleet gets wiped out the CO can still bring more ships you can't.

By Edward Kroeten (Ekroeten) on Wednesday, April 27, 2011 - 09:55 pm: Edit

To Stewart,

If he wants to kick the pickets off those hexes great, I hope he leaves ships out on the map so CO can hit him on their turn. Otherwise he is getting a couple of FFs (and maybe a reserve fleet or two to make a fight of it).

The CO generally isn't trying to block him off the map, they want the kitty to come out an play. Open space battles favor the CO (they have better EW, Maulers and usually can put up a higher COMPOT than the Kzintis)remember until T10 the Lyrans will not be able to send more than an expedition fleet into Fed space.

The CO doesn't need 3x the Kzinti fleet they need enough to keep 1401 say 120% of the Kzinti fleet and 2-3 reserve fleets.

Also on T7 the fleet on 1401 can pop almost the whole of the Marquis provices with limited additonal support (read extra CWs or CVs to absorb the casualties)

By Daniel G. Knipfer (Dgknipfer) on Wednesday, April 27, 2011 - 09:55 pm: Edit

Really Tim? You've never seen a Kzinti retake his capital? I find that stunning and would wager that your Kzinti opponents are vastly overplaying their defense of the capital or underplaying their
offensive advantage once the capital is no longer an issue. Something really seems out of kilter there.

What do the Kzin do to defend their capital and what do they give up to damage? How many PDUs to the have on the Capital itself when you attack it? By turn 5 there should be 16 without any problem and maxing out at 20 is not unreasonable. That’s 192 to 228 ComPot before you even add in the Kzinti fleet. He’s not making the mistake of directing on your ships when he has 300+ compot, is he?

After you take his capital are the Kzinti sitting off map and just throwing themselves at 1401 turn after turn or are they hitting all the targets within range of the Barony and 1704? As the Kzinti I tend to move the fleet to 1704 a quickly as I can. A single ship in 1701 during combat reconnects the Marquis zone to my grid so I don't have to worry about fighting out if supply and to get me out of there you have to activate the Fed a turn early. That usually lets me get up to all kinds of shenanigans as the Kzinti and I still convert a CV every turn so even though my ship production sucks, I find that the NR starbase usually comes under threat right after 1401 goes down. The Coalition just don't have the ships to defend both 1401 and 1509 with 100% assurance of holding while occupying the rest of Kzinti space. Lord knows I’ve tried often enough.

Ed, once the Kzinti kick pickets off why would they stay exposed? Territory automatically reverts to their control unless under long term capture. Kill the Coalition pickets and leave. That's one of the ways that the Kzinti constantly wear down the Coalition numbers.

Sorry, quick error correction you can kill the TTs to destroy the PGBs being set up (or devaste the planet). The point remains the same, you are using DD on a small ship and doing less damage to the CO than they are doing to you.
If the Kzinti take two turns of cripples I expect that in a turn 5 assault the Coalition is taking 6 turns of cripples adjusted by losses if not more. You're likely fighting into a huge EW disadvantage for several turns while you burn off PDUs and all the involuntary fighter losses make life painful. It almost sounds like the Kzinti is directing on maulers or something crazy like that. As the Kzinti you're doing 100+ points of damage for the first few turns. Let it fall.

I know Dan, and I agree they will go back off map. However Ted and Michael are making it sound like the Kzintis have enough ships to be on map after they lose their Capital.

I just haven't found that to be the case, sure they can come out and blast the pickets or do a strike mission. But for the most part they are not in a position to hold territory until their shipyards come back online.

The first couple of turns after loosing their capital the Kzinti should have no problem staying on map. The Coalition should have too many cripples to drive them completely off map. They have to consolidate and the Hydran should be pushing as hard as they can since the Coalition went Kzin first.

Plus they can use the Marquis SB on turns 5 and 6 without serious threat since the Coalition don't want to let the Fed bring the Home Fleet up to the border and start the money train early. I agree that the Kzinti on turn 5 and 6 should have no problem staying on map after losing their capital on T5C. Damage taken by the Coalition is just too great against a properly defended 1401.
Dan,

Who was the 10.12PM comment to?

The Kzintis can stay on map for a turn or two I agree but by T7 which is what I was talking about the Kzintis should either be off Map or in the Marquis area (while the Marquis is protected staying on map is easy). However I still think that the CO can keep and hold 1401 without crushing their prospects.

On the Hydran front you split the off map from the Capital and starve them out. The Hydran economy goes down too fast if they can't connect to their off map areas (even when the can, their income just isn't that good).

Just a general comment about a Coalition assault on 1401.

In any case, Ed, if the Kzinti do lose their capital their mission does not change much. Be the biggest pain in the butt that they can and grind on the Coalition every turn while the Federation economic engine shakes off the cobwebs. Properly managed they are quite a pain in the butt too. That doesn't mean that the Coalition can't manage to contain them; I just don't think it will be that easy.

Then again, I've been training the same guy to kick my butt for almost 7 years and he's gotten quite good at it. Better by far than he thinks; that might explain my difficulties.

I know Dan, and I agree they will go back off map. However Ted and Michael are making it sound like the Kzintis have enough ships to be on map after they lose their Capital.
Ed,

I said nothing like that at all, not sure where you got that but not from me and I doubt Ted said anything like that. What I did say was that a proper Kzinti defense will absolutely keep you from establishing bases and PDU's in 1401 since you CANNOT pin him out. They will hit 1401 and anything they do not need over 1401 to prevent MB's and PDU's slides in to wreak havok on the flanks. They absolutely do NOT remain onmap instead they bleed the coalition pincounts an E4 and F5 at a time.. killing 2-3 of them a round basically for free and elsewhere they face reserves where they do some cripples to the Coalition and likely lose an FKE to DD.

Also I would point out no longer can a single TT deploy a PDU, in F&E2010 it takes 3xTT to do so I believe. So everywhere you deploy a PGB/PDU with TT's you got 3 of them clogging up your line taking up command slots.. it narrows the compot gap, and if your deploying ind fighters or CV groups your are actually out compoted. I DD kill a F5T for 16 or an E4T for 12 and let you take the other damage. You kill an EFF/FF or let me cripple a MEC to repair cheaply. If you use D5H's I get to kill a CW hull for 22 which is even better... and a TGT at 24 is even better.

I think it very unlikely you will play that game long. If you keep a large fleet well stocked weith DN's and specialty ships at 1401 I am still keeping you from establishing bases, I am still coming out from the flanks of the offmap and raising Caine, AND I am grinning from ear to ear, as yep you are keeping me from regaining 1401, and I am keeping a very large well stocked fleet from pressuring the Feds.. as a Kzinti I am doing my job...

IF the Coalition takes out 1401 they are in for a war of insurgency that CAN if played properly by the Kzinti bleed the coalition white. As with anything playing the Alliance you have to take what the Coalition gives you. YES the Coalition can keep 1401 if they wish... but they will pay for the priviledge. And often that pricetag is too much.
Mike is right. It takes three FFTs to deploy a PGB.

Michael point taken, but I will still force you to come to 1401 if you are losing ships at the same rate I am while you have no shipyards I win. I will generally have to have more ships in Kzinti space than the Kzintis do anyway if I want to win.

Yes the Kzintis job is to be a pain and they do it well.

The Victory conditions are 3 capitals so that is what I general try to do.

DN: [LAV CWE DWE] [TGC:KBP/VP2 DWE] DW*7 DWG - admiral, MMG, two prime teams.

it's made of practically nothing but frigate hulls and cash, and it's big enough to kill a cruiser if one is on the line. it's also nothing that is any real good assaulting starbases, so what better to do than trade DWs for zin ships until the zin go extinct? with drone support, that 1401 subsidizes nicely, thankyouverymuch, you're looking at multiple approach rounds if you think you want to pick off a TGB setting up a PGC.

if 1401 really could be taken for 50 battle group units, which seems way too cheap to be true, there is just no way to spin that as some kind of advantage for the alliance.

Chris

That's abit disingenuous - claiming it's Frigate hulls and 'cash' - yes it can be done, but it's basically a near main battle line.
Swop most of the the DW's for a FF's - and it would be a fair claim.

Plus - if I was the Kzinti, I would happy facing that line - there is a slim chance of killing a 2TGC group (and if you have captured a mauler, it's a fair chance!) - or really good roll might kill the 3LAV!

All the Kzinti would do is a DN plus 3 Carrier line to face it - and will have more fighters to burn than the Coalition will - and so they do a stand up fight - trading fighters for cripples.

By Michael Parker (Protagoras) on Thursday, April 28, 2011 - 09:36 am: Edit

Chris's line is problematical in the sense of all the DW Hulls. For all the saying of FF's and cash that seems unlikely. The Lyrans start with 4 DW in their OOB and Build 3 a turn. Are folks really taking an FF and spending 3ep to make it a DW very often? I Understand FF to DWS but not the Vanilla DW, the DW repairs horribly and even the Lyrans cannot just throw away cash.

Chris's line puts up 10 DW hulls... that is alot given how many you have and produce.

But with that here are his line and a very reasonable proposed Kzinti Line. I am assuming the Klingons have a D6S or two here.. pretty reasonable I think. If you want an all Lyran line throw a CWS in there and the same net effect really.

DN(Form)+ADM/MMG(CMD) [LAV+PT CWE+PT DWE] [TGC+KBP-VP2 DWE] DW DW DW DW DW DW DW G D6S(FS) = 106.5 Compot 4ew

DN(Form) +ADM/MMG(CMD) [CVS+PT MEC EFF] [CVS+PT MEC EFF] [CVS MEC EFF] FFK FFK FFG TGT+SS(FS) = 100 Compot 4ew

For approach battles the Lyrans drop 4 CPT and the Kzinti 2 as neither side gets to use an MMG. Its a pretty fair fight here and the Kzinti are happy to let the damage fall onto all those very repair unfriendly hulls.. and have provided a wide variety of frigates to be
at 27.5% damage that is 28 scored for the Coalition and 27 for the Alliance. Is the coalition letting the damage fall? They will see 18 fighters and 2 crippled FFK's do they direct? Kill an EFF or an FFk and let the rest hit fighters? The Kzinti certainly let the 27 fall letting 13 through after fighters. Your crippling a couple of DW's and taking +1 for next round. Your fighter reserves are going to be going alot faster, you cannot really afford to cripple the CWE or DWE on the LAV until your ready to no longer put it on the line.

It will be hard faught but its not something the Kzinti shouldn't expect to be doing, and they are doing their job by garnering so much Coalition attention in ep and good hulls.

Do not forget we are predicating this entire battle upon the fact that the coalition is trying to set up MB's or establish PGB's in 1401 (or both). Otherwise the Kzinti are not fighting here (unless of course the coalition is weak enough the Kzinti can win the hex.. but that is bad coalition play so I assume it isn't happening). The approach battle exchanges are favourable to the Kzinti, and once they get through approach the payoff killing MB's and/or PGB's (along with the TT's setting them up) is a nice payoff, and needed since you cannot let the Coalition get bases established here.

And LASTLY, every cripple the Coalition takes in 1401 on a Kzinti turn either pulls out on the subsequent Coalition turn to be repaired on the coalition turn after that.. or its field repaired... an unenviable choice, pay double for repairs or spend an entire turn rotating them to repair facilities basically meaning you have to keep even more hulls in theatre to maintain pincount.

Michael

Your last paragraph is excellent - should have thought of it myself.

If the Kzinti can self cripple 10 hulls and force the Coalition to
cripple 10 hulls - who wins?

This turn - it's a 'draw'.

But safe in the Barony, those 10 hulls will be repaired - and as Michael said, you will have to send those 10 hulls back somewhere to be repaired - which is a minimum 1 turn delay.

If losses are higher (say Coalition run out of fighters for last 2 rounds) - it might be 10 cripples v 15 coalition cripples - the Lyrans build schedule is gone (plus more) - just to ensure 1401 is held....

Rinse and repeat....and you can see what a pain in the side the Kzinti can be.

And, due to the location of 1401 - it's impossible for the Coalition to stop this happening (other than capturing and not defending 1401!).

So although painful to the Kzinti - it's more painful to the Coalition.

The key phrase here is "And, due to the location of 1401 - it's impossible for the Coalition to stop this happening"

That is the entire backbone of the Kzinti strategy if 1401 is taken. And its the Primary reason the Coalition usually goes after the Hydrans first rather than the Kzinti.

Dan - one point is the majority of my games were pre-F&E2K. But, the 2K game I did finish (3 cap on T20) was the same - the Kzinti looked at the fleet on 1401, and saw they would lose the whole fleet and still not retake 1401 to save the game. I think I may have made a mistake in that game as well - the kzinti let a Lyran BATS up in 1401 and then came in to pop it while it was being converted to a SB. They did so, but it cost most of the Kzinti fleet crippled
(they had to fight lines of 13 DN's+DB for all approach rounds and two to kill the BATS. Did a fair amount to the coalition too, but the Kzinti got the worst of things.) They also put the whole fleet on 1509 and took their toll on the coalition there as well.

And I agree to some extent - I do feel I (and my friends way back when I had real opponents) weren't particularly good alliance players. But, we did try strategies ranging from minimal fortification and maximum fleet preservation/construction to continuous heavy engagement. I just found that overall the coalition managed to hold them down enough/absorb the damage well enough so that losing 1401 was never a problem, regardless of the alliance strategy. For the Kzinti to become a major problem they need to do a lot more damage than they take, which really isn't possible after their defenses are gone. Or gain SE superiority in Kzinti space somehow. Sure I may need to spend a fair amount of EP on repairs, and divert new ships to maintain the SE advantage, but with both 1401/0617 in coalition hands the Coalition is outbuilding the entire alliance and has more EP until around T15 or so, and that is assuming no minor shipyards. And it still takes a fair amount of turns to near SE parity, especially if the Coalition goes conservative.

Again, I'm keeping almost every ship I sent to the Kzinti front there. Only a few choice ships go anywhere, and not always. So I am keeping a good SE advantage, and have quality fleets to hammer the Kzinti wherever they attack. I also keep about 4 or 5 reserves there. So, with most of the fleet on 1401, a SB in 1202, the fleet can just react to a lot of the targets the Kzinti have, and I can throw strong reserve fleets elsewhere - which are typically enough to fight the Kzinti back offmap.

Another trick to use is small picket fleets on the Offmap edges so that wherever the Kzinti go past 1401 I can reserve fleets to block retrogrades. So if they aren't very careful, they may just end up with a fleet out of supply somewhere useless and soon to be hammered badly, or have to win a hard fight to stay on a planet to avoid that.

For repairs, as I have a fairly large SE advantage I can just rotate
ships out for repair. Not a big problem, as long as I don't lose track of the SE counts. And a SB in 1202 (a fair priority) makes a lot of the repair simple. Plus as always if needed, I can use field repair. Costly repairs aren't a problem as long as I have the EP, which if I hold 1401/617 I probably do for the most part.

The cost of course is that the feds aren't facing a horde of coalition T7-9, and beyond - relative to what a hydran first/mudslide or similar attack can do. But a frugal attack by forces with just a smallish SE advantage can push the feds back slowly but easily enough while the coalition gets 40 odd SE per turn (without the Romulans)(builds/activation/Imperial Reserves) to the alliance <30 total until the Romulans/Lyrans come in.

I also put almost all my carriers in the Kzinti/Hydran garrison forces. Garrison lines of 6DN, mauler, D5V,AD5, F5E, 12 ind. fighters (126 after DB, and 18 fighters on the line) make it really hard for kzinti lines (under 100 for even their best lines) to really rack up the relative damage needed.

I still don't know what levels are the best to pursue. Every EP spent on repairs/raids/etc by the Kzinti means less ships built. And every ship not built (eventually) means one less ship the Coalition has to divert to holding them down.

10 kzinti cripples is 10-15 ep to repair - which means 2-6 ships not built. 20EP for coalition repairs just means less superfluous fortifications for the most part, or EP problems late game. Where it may be too late (depending on how well the coalition can hold alliance space late game as things turn against them.)

By Edward Kroeten (Ekroeten) on Thursday, April 28, 2011 - 10:04 pm: Edit

Michael,

The cripples are not a problem you rotate the ships through, T5 cripples come back on T7, T6 on T8 etc. that is not a problem.

The average CO line is going to better than the Kzinti line AND will have better EW so they should take less damage and produce more.
By T7 the CO is producing (?) some good carrier so likely there will be at least some fighters to offset the Kzinti advantage in fighters. Yes, the CO can't pin you out but an attrition battle with a short term goal (T20 or so) the CO has a fair chance of winning.

Ted is running some games to the end so we will see how it comes out in a full game. I know he will be playing a different strategy but if they all have the same result we will have something to go on. (my guess is by the end the Alliance has a huge advantage). But I have only a small sample size 3 total games that went the distance (one I was in for a while, one on this board and one from my old group all Astounding Alliance victories).

By Paul Howard (Raven) on Friday, April 29, 2011 - 02:52 am: Edit

Timothy

I have to say, it looks like the Alliance allowed the Coalition to 'do as they please' in Kzinti space.

If I was the Alliance - and the Coalition had 4 or 5 reserves in Kzinti space - I would happy - the Hydrans and Feds would only be facing 2 or 3 in total - and so get a free hand in some areas/

What the Kzinti need to do, is keep the Coalition off balance - allowing a SB in 1202 isn't good for the Kzinti though!

We are all learning though!

By Chris Upson (Misanthropope) on Friday, April 29, 2011 - 03:49 am: Edit

in four rounds the zin cripple 8 DWs, taking 6 or 7 "repair efficient" FFK or MEC cripples in return. they spend a couple minutes giving hive fives or whatever, and then pack their bags for the pursuit round.

and meanwhile, somewhere, the front-line lyran units are accomplishing __something__, which is more than can be said for the grass-eating cruisers of the patriarchy.
which is more than can be said for the grass-eating cruisers of the patriarchy

I guffawed!

Paul, yes, to some extent. But I've also tried fighting tooth and nail, delaying the fall of 1401 a turn or even two, and generally coming out to fight as much as possible. But it is really difficult to do significantly more permanent damage to the coalition compared to the kzinti. Every ep they spend on repairs is ep not building new ships, while the coalition essentially isn't losing ships from the larger repair costs the kzinti can inflict (for awhile -once there are coalition carriers in numbers, then CVD's, then the kzinti cannot even cause more repair bills either). So it doesn't take all that long for the effect to be the same (even if both sides have less ships total).

Plus with the full weight of the coalition falling on the kzinti for the most part there isn't all that much they can really do. It lets the hydrans do some more, and even the feds, but not enough from my (pre-2k) game history.

For the reserves, there is a few turns where yes that can let the other alliance members do more than otherwise. But once the hydrans are offmap, you don't need any reserves there at all. And 2-3 reserves vs. the feds is generally enough, especially after the romulans come in and add theirs.

For SB's in kzinti space, if the coalition really wants them, the kzintis cannot stop it. They may be able to briefly liberate some other stuff, but that only costs the coalition some EP's. If there are SB's on some/most of the kzinti planets, there won't be really any targets but 1401 for the kzinti to come out and play at.
Anyhow, that's why I'm playing again - to see if I can figure out the likeliest 'best' general strategy to counter the standard coalition tactics that have always seemed to work in the past for me. With all the toys I haven't had/used before.

Quick question, in general (not over the Capital) in the Hydran theatre do you guys use directed damage on a mauler in the line. I always have, just wanting to get a feel for what others do.

A Couple of examples might help,

1 A weakly held SB early the CO has enough to win the hex no matter what. He throws in the Mauler looking to get a CA or something good.

Example 2 The fire wall Hydrans are off map, the Hydran fleet comes out with both a CV line or a CA line available. CO guessing puts in one of 3 maulers in Hydran space in the line. Obviously if the CV line is put in your unlikely to score enough points, but let's say the CA line is 120+ Compot do you smoke the mauler before or after hitting the MB?

1) No. If the Hydrans only have a token force at the SB, then you want to do as much damage as possible and using DD is throwing damage away basically. You don't really care if he mauls a DD or smaller, and heck maybe it'll shock effectively adding 10 to the damage you just did.

2) This question depends on if it's approach or not. In approach I'd use the CV lines and kill/cripple any mauler or stasis I could get, otherwise let the damage fall. If we're at the base, yes I'm putting up the cruisers as well as at least one G ship. The PGG is really good for this. Then I'd mill the mauler and take my G attacks (unless either the PGG is killed or VBIR drops by 2, in which case I'd kill the MB first, it's the mission after all).
I'd kill the mauler.

1) Kill the mauler.

2) Kill the mauler.

Now you are facing only one mauler in the theatre. 😊

I tend to grimace at the "wasting damage" commentary mostly because it is not as simple as the extra 14 points you could have had them spend crippling ships. Rather, it is saving your own fleet from an unknown number of turns at the hands of this specific mauler weapon. If he is willing to 'risk' a mauler for DD or smaller hulls you are not killing enough maulers to make him think this is a bad idea.

Secondly (and more importantly IMO) by doing this you force him to build a mauler (and send it Hydran way) whereas if you do not kill the mauler he can choose to build a mauler and send it to Hydran space (now having 4 to contend with) or somewhere else making life harder for the Kzin or Feds.

Now many players are on "auto-produce" when it comes to mauler production so you might say that they would build them anyway. My retort would be (along the lines of my first reason) that by letting the mauler live you allow them to use them more freely and in situations later where they might just be another 10-pt cruiser in the line against you. This elevation in ComPot will cost you economic points (in repair or lost units and territory).

Thanks all.
If it's before the fall of 617 then I would say kill any mauler you can manage. I would preface that with provided he doesn't already have plenty in theatre. If he has as you say 3 maulers and you still have PDU's over 617 by all means kill kill kill. If this is after he has pruned away your PDU's, then its a much harder choice. He doesn't need a mauler to kill your CA/CW if it hits the line anyway, and its early enough he cannot maul cripple a CV line (except the small GRV which should never see the line). So all maulers really have a use for in HTO is to kill PDU's. A coalition line is going to score 24 to kill a RN DG HR or TR (22 for those) that shows itself on the line, and the rest are going to plaster Stinger Fighters.... so if you use a mauler all you do is kill extra fighters.. I suppose that is of some use.. but not alot. So as the Hydrans you want to kill Maulers if doing so will help preserve PDU's over your capital. Otherwise, rejoice their are coalition Maulers in the HTO doing nothing and just let the damage fall on his ships. Making hom repair ships or bring in more ships to keep you contained is your job as a Hydran!

By Robert Padilla (Zargan) on Wednesday, May 04, 2011 - 06:11 pm: Edit

Anything you do all the time can come back to bite you. To always direct the mauler can be one of those things. The Coalition can build 7 maulers a turn once the Romulans come into play, do you really want to spend that much extra damage every turn just to keep the mauler population down? Early on it can pay off to kill maulers on sight, but once the Lyrans can build them too it becomes harder to keep them down.

And someone else said something to the effect of "if the Coalition is wasting maulers on DD and smaller ships to kill them", and I agree it is a waste to use a mauler in such a situation. Early in the game they should only be used as needed, not for cheap ship kills. As someone else pointed out, you can kill cruisers without them, and if you save them for the important fights early on, it's not tough to have 4 or more in each theatre.

Another way to look at it is this way: Say the Coalition is fighting a battle when they do not want to take big damage. They've observed that every time a mauler has seen the line that it was DDed.
Knowing this they build lines that include a mauler and at least 2 CV groups. They now have a line that can absorb 40 damage if the mauler is directed (34 if it was a baby mauler). Pretty good IMO and odds are you killed an Alliance ships in the process so pincount does not change. Had the damage been left to fall, 4 ships would have been crippled, and enough of that happening can swing the pincount advantage for at least the next turn

By Kevin Howard (Jarawara) On Wednesday, May 04, 2011 - 06:47 pm: Edit

If maulers are being directed upon every single time, then what they are is coalition damage sponges. Build more of them, keep the 28 or 22 damage off your other ships.

If the alliance lets it fall, yes, they get mauled every round -- but the coalition free damage sponge just became irrelevant, and 1/3 of the time those maulers now become additional damage from shock.

If they are short of maulers and are preparing for a major assault (capital or something similar), then yes, kill them on sight. But of course, the coalition won't be putting them on the line in random battles if they are saving them up, so the question is moot.

Now, a hypothetical scenario, and a question:

You're the alliance, you're in "random pinning battle #2017". You just scored 28 points of damage, and you see he has 12 fighters on the line, and could take the remaining damage by crippling a D7C and a D5.

You are then going to be running, hopefully avoiding pursuit.

Do you...

Let the damage fall, effectively scoring only 3.5 ep of damage on him?

Direct on the D6M mauler, effectively scoring 7.6 ep of damage on him? (That's 10 ep to replace the D6M, minus 2.4 ep for salvage.)
(Assuming, of course, that he feels the need to replace the D6M.)

Or Direct on the D7C, effectively scoring 6.3 ep of damage on him (9 - 2.7 salvage), and forcing him to continue to use the less efficient to repair D6M every round? (And harder to use because it needs consorts.

By Robert Padilla (Zargan) on Wednesday, May 04, 2011 - 06:52 pm: Edit

If I'm not there to stay, I'd kill the biggest ship I could then leave. In this case it's probably the D6M, so I'd pop it. Cost of repair or any of the rest would not be a factor to me, only sheer compot would be. But if you gave me the choice between a D6S or D6M I'd probably take the D6S.

By Richard B. Eitzen (Rbeitzen) on Wednesday, May 04, 2011 - 06:54 pm: Edit

Yes, you have to make a judgement call each time you do it (or don't), not just blindly kill the mauler when you see it.

By Lawrence Bergen (Lar) on Wednesday, May 04, 2011 - 09:43 pm: Edit

Hey, who said every time? 😊 I answered each question knowing that you had a shot to kill 2/3 of his maulers in the theatre and force them to take them from another theatre or redirect a new build to this theatre in order to restore the level of maulers he had.

Direct damage is a tool to use deprive your enemy of economics. Would I kill a mauler if he had a BT on the line and I could take that out instead? Nope, BT dies. Or a FV/DWE/CVE group. Nope kill them all. Or a BCP? Nope, BCP dies. And they would die because they cost more to replace or take up a limited resource (PFs/FFF). If it were a 7 pt mauler in a group of junk ships...Let it fall because it would cost more to repair the junk so that would be the best course of action IMO.

I do tend to bang on Maulers because (especially in the early game) they ARE the best ship in the fleet 10+/4. They are typically found ON THE LINE and unescorted, it is within the realm of damage to
get their magic kill number unlike say a C8 (which only happens occasionally). I do not care that they can build 7 maulers a turn when the Roms come out because by then the Feds are rolling and I will (when it makes sense) trade dead maulers for my fighters. But at that time there are many other 10 point ships and coalition goodies to be targeted so the maulers still die but not nearly as often.

Late war I get my own maulers in the form of X-ships so it does not matter how many maulers they have because I can build some too.

Hey guys, Lar answered the questions based on my examples so I appreciated it. Specifically about there only being 3 maulers in the HTO.

Now changing examples will of course change how you react.

if you kill one mauler per turn, it's ten EPs to replace. the second one costs the coalition replaces is 13 EPs, and the third requires the sacrifice of a highly valuable L-CA hull. increasing returns to scale!

hydran inner escorts are so outrageously powerful, if you garrison the offmap edge, each turn you have to figure they are coming back on with overstuffed all-carrier lines and trading three frigates for the three biggest ships they can get their hands on. its regrettable but tolerable to trade CWs for those frigates, but i don't know how overjoyed i would be to swap maulers for frigates.

pretty much you keep a mauler or two in occupied HTO in case you get a juicy pursuit, and send the rest of them wherever the DNs are, to keep the CVSs and CVBs of the galaxy in overstuffed groups.
Memo to myself to tell Joel to archive and clear this.

SENT