Jeffrey,

Definitely escort any G-ship in the raid pool that intends to do a commando raid. Do remember that the G-ship in the raid pool can also do regular raids though, so only add escorts from the current turn's builds the turn of the commando raid. For general use, a tug with a g-pod and a battle or scout pod can disrupt an isolated extra enemy province per turn, in addition to potentially doing a commando raid when a likely target presents. The raiding commando group will suffer one round of damage at BIR 4 plus or minus the VBIR and score no damage in return before conducting the G-attack, so only undefended locations where only one reacting ship can be added to the defense are realistic targets.

At a base or planetary assault against a defending fleet the enemy will score enough damage to direct your G-ship and any escorts (plus probably his normal allowed directed attack on your command ship or scout), so you in effect give the enemy extra kills by escorting (and indeed by declaring a g-attack at all). In general I don't escort G-ships for that reason. Sometimes, such as in conjunction with an SAF and Mauler, you might escort the commando ship hoping the enemy won't score enough to direct your SAF, the mauler, and the G-ship plus escorts. Your compot will suffer if you use escorts though, so put out lots of heavy units in this line to take advantage of knowing what your enemy will likely direct and to make up the difference in compot. To use the G-ship you must also pick BIR 4, and your enemy will know this and fine-tune his own BIR pick. If the VBIR goes up, he can blast your G-ship to prevent you getting free SIDS. Because of all this, I only use G-ships in major fights if a MMG can add them for free, and in my experience they generally accomplish nothing in such fights. Keep in mind that the enemy can put his own G-ship in the reserve echelon, transferring the G to his base. That G (or more than one) will absorb SIDs, nullifying the effect of any successful G-attack on the off chance you succeed. For me, G-ships are mostly useless in SB or
other major base/planet assaults.

In my experience, G-ships have more success in small battles. Most BATS busting operations don't expect serious opposition. Consider a Lyran CC, CA, 4 DD, 1DDG, and 1 SC in the BATS busting role (42 compot). If a reserve fleet arrives, the force leaves a DD (one of the top three command ship choices) to die and flees. If not you pick BIR 6 (not 8 so you will take less damage in return). Battle damage cripples the BATS, and with luck the G ship finishes it off—for 5-6 damage in return. Same applies to undefended planets. Reserves can't show up everywhere, so hit all your secondary targets with similar forces and your G-ships will score hits and do you some good.

A G-ship on the line in open space or approach battles (to increase capture chances) is another good use. Often, the enemy may direct the g-ship to eliminate your increased capture chances. If he forgoes directing a better ship for this, you can count it a tactical victory. If not, you have a better chance to capture.

G-ships are good to help garrisoning captured planets (to reduce chances for rebellion)—especially Hydran and Tholian planets. A captured Hydran capital requires many G-ships for garrison duty (alternately purchase independent Gs for PDUs on those planets and then move the G-ships away) to prevent guaranteed rebellion and loss of income. The captured population can infiltrate and sabotage one of the three smallest garrison ships at any location though, so don't use large g-ships for this unless there are three frigates also at the location.

I recommend building small G-ships every turn, so that you have them available for all the above purposes. The larger G-ships are less useful in my experience, since G-ships die like flies anyway (as described above). More powerful G-ships are useful for pursuit battles and the raid pool mostly.

All other things being equal, kill an enemy G-ship rather than a vanilla of the same size. If you can gain superiority in G-ships the above equations can change in your favor. More likely, your
opponent will do the same, so don't allow him to gain an advantage.

G-ships can be a force multiplier against lightly defended bases/planets, but that has not been my experience against any serious opposition. I have heard that others have had different experience--so all this probably depends on the predilections of your opponent.

By Matthew Smith (Msmith67) on Sunday, March 01, 2015 - 02:50 pm: Edit

Paul,

Remember that the attacker doesn't get the option to withdraw before combat. The 8 ship force you mentioned as attacker must up at least half of the 6 ships after excluding the CC & CA.

By Paul Edwards (Pablomatic) on Sunday, March 01, 2015 - 05:56 pm: Edit

Thanks Matt. It has been a couple years since I played. The 8 = 1 situation applies on defense when you can withdraw half before combat.

The BATS busting force in my example needs to be 4 ships in order to only lose one ship if forced to retreat. In this case, a Lyran BC, TGC+TT, and two DDs could work, but using a tug here might be a waste of assets.

By Jeffrey Tiel (Platoaquinas) on Monday, March 02, 2015 - 10:09 am: Edit

Paul,

Thank you for the suggestions. I have found the G-ships to be all but useless in capital assaults. The SAF is another story; that's a terrific asset. But it's my understanding that you cannot launch an SAF attack and a Ground combat attack with the same battleforce, so the tactic you suggest of including all these ground units in one line probably cannot work.
Jeff

By Rob Padilla (Zargan) on Monday, March 02, 2015 - 11:50 am: Edit

Jeffery,

G ships are far from useless in capital assaults. Perhaps you are not using the right ones, or are not escorting them?

By Alan De Salvio (Alandwork) on Monday, March 02, 2015 - 12:52 pm: Edit

I think you should post a tac note on their proper use in a capital assault Rob - I will be interested to see. Against a capital planet I mean - not non-capital planets.

By Jeffrey Tiel (Platoaquinas) on Monday, March 02, 2015 - 02:31 pm: Edit

Rob,

Please explain how to use them offensively in a capital assault. My problem is that the defender has enough firepower to destroy whole escorted "groups" of ships. And then, if I do get any G-ships through, I face his entire rear echelon G-ship reserve upon which he takes all the G casualties I'm lucky enough to inflict. So, if I'm doing this wrong, please do explain how to make this work properly.

Jeff

By Rob Padilla (Zargan) on Monday, March 02, 2015 - 03:03 pm: Edit

I would love to do so, but I will defer now to Pete D, as prior to me playing him I was in the same camp you are in right now. However since then I have had my eyes opened on how they can be much better employed on the Offensive.

I always suspected they have a place, but was never able to get the right mix together to make it viable. The Coalition should be
entering the hex with 2 to 3 times more G factors than the Alliance can field, and with Hospital ships they last even longer.

By Kevin Howard (Jarawara) on Monday, March 02, 2015 - 11:40 pm: Edit

Of course if they direct to kill your troopships over their capital, the troopships have done their job - absorbing tons of damage at 2:1. A CWG with two DW escorts would absorb enough damage to cripple an entire battlegroup plus 3 command cruisers.

But you're giving up critical firepower to put those 3 ships on the line instead of more cruisers. If they don't direct, you lose out on damage scored and still have to burn through the defending G factors.

By Rob Padilla (Zargan) on Tuesday, March 03, 2015 - 10:19 am: Edit

Kevin,

It's an illusion that the defender has a lot of defending G factors. Sure you will probably have the FTL and 2 FTSs for 8, but the attacker can be bringing in 20-30 or more of their own. It may take a few rounds to get through the defenders, but it will eventually happen.

By Ted Fay (Catwhoeatsphoto) on Tuesday, March 03, 2015 - 10:39 am: Edit

Rob should know. I've done that to him. =)

By Alan De Salvio (Alandwork) on Tuesday, March 03, 2015 - 01:44 pm: Edit

Each capital PDU gets the free hit gcu, one defender troop ship could be in the defending battleforce for even more defending casualty hits, the defender can buy more igcus (admittedly at 1 EP each). But if you are going to keep sitting there in front of an alpha defender fleet (remember the defender sees your marine battleforce first) perhaps I will direct on the marine ships - most of them just need to be crippled to really cripple their marine attack capability (pun intended). Meanwhile every defending weapon is firing (and
you have to choose attacking BIR 4, so it could be BIR 8...). It is a possible non-mauler round option to burn off the fighter damage soak, but it will be a costly round since you likely can't direct yourself due to the -24 - those rounds are guaranteed BIR8. Ugly. But we need to hear from Pete.

By Matthew Smith (Mgsmith67) on Tuesday, March 03, 2015 - 03:00 pm: Edit

Quote:

Each capital PDU gets the free hit gcu

I'm thinking that the target for the marines isn't the ground defenses.

It's the SB. And the PDU marines don't protect the SB.

By Jeffrey Tiel (Platoaquinas) on Wednesday, March 04, 2015 - 09:02 am: Edit

Well ... Rob, Ted, Alan, Kevin, and Matthew:

Yes, I should very much like to "hear from Pete." But whether or not Pete says anything, I want to hear the offensive case. Alan presents the problem very well. I tried the mauler strike round followed by the G-ship strike on the negative soak up round, and all my G-units were destroyed or crippled. Hitting the SB before the PDU's are destroyed doesn't make much sense to me, since it takes so many SB hits to cripple it and you can only do one per round (assuming you are directing on PDU's with your fleet firepower). But please, someone, just lay out the full picture here.

Jeff

By Matthew Smith (Mgsmith67) on Wednesday, March 04, 2015 - 11:34 am: Edit

Quote:
I tried the mauler strike round followed by the G-ship strike on the negative soak up round, and all my G-units were destroyed or crippled.

If you're the Coalition, you LOVE to see the Alliance using directed damage.

It means you can stay longer and do more at each fight, suffer fewer total casualties, and reduce the Alliance economy quicker.

Putting a Lyran CWG/DW/DW on the line costs no more EP than a straight CW/DW/DW. You lost 16 compot, or up to 18 if you also lose the leader bonus, but that's only about 6 damage scored.

However, if the Alliance uses directed damage to stop your "G" attack, he spends an extra 23 damage to make it happen, or an extra 29 if he also destroys the escorts.

But you were going to suffer casualties anyway, right? And having your opponent spend 58 damage to destroy only three ships, when he could have let it fall and let you cripple 8 sounds like a good deal for the Coalition.

If it's a short fight, and the Alliance is going to voluntarily self-sids the SB to resolve damage anyway, such as might happen at the Count's SB, then this won't help much. But if the SB is heavily defended, as is typical for 1401 or 0617, putting G-ships on the line threatens to get rid of the SB before the Alliance is ready for it to go.

If you pull back the focus from the G attack you've listed there to the battle forces and the die rolls, you will see that things get a bit more problematic. Generally, G attacks are not likely to be conducted unless the variable die roll is favorable.
Generally, if the variable die roll is favorable, the defender will do a lot more damage and is more likely to direct your G ship group and still have left over damage to do stuff. More so over SB and PDUs, less so over less defense.

By Alan De Salvio (Alandwork) on Wednesday, March 04, 2015 - 12:33 pm: Edit

First of all, an SB assault is a lot different than a capital assault. For an SB assault you absolutely determine whether you SIDS or whether you drop damage - a straightforward calculus, and if you SIDS yes marines could help. Still a bad idea if there are defending marine casualties but yes it is possible.

Second of all, a capital assault is different. I will know you are trying a marine attack, even against a naked SB. CWG with 2xDW escorts is laughable - please try it. I will have marine casualties ready, in addition to the SB garrison itself. You just took 12 of your own compot out plus a little more for the CWG, and you are certainly right, that force may get all the BIR8 damage dropped on it. The comparison should be between the Coalition options - is a marginal marine battleround better than a full battleround? I would say no, since the marginal marine attack has no chance. This means you ate more damage for no increased benefit - do the cost benefit analysis yourself.

By Jeffrey Tiel (Platoaquinas) on Wednesday, March 04, 2015 - 02:00 pm: Edit

Matthew,

It strikes me that you are correct in your evaluation of the role that a CWG group can play in offering an inviting and, perhaps, necessary target for the Kzinti Home World defenses. But effectively, you are granting the real point, namely, that G-ships don't work in capital assaults; your argument is that they provide cannon fodder.

As to individual starbase assaults, they were never in question.

Jeff
Quote:

But effectively, you are granting the real point, namely, that G-ships don't work in capital assaults.

Actually, since writing that, I decided to go find the write-up in the "reports from the front" where Rob was the defender and Pete was the attacker.

It would seem that if you bring along 6 FTLs, and use them unescorted on the line to attack PDUs (along with the obligatory D6M or STT) at the same time you're using 9 SAFs to attack the SB, you can indeed force the defender into directing on the FTLs to prevent PDU losses.

And if he's directing on FTLs, he's wasting 6 damage to do so, and it only cost you 7 or so compot to put it on the line, which then translates to 2 or 3 damage points. Net advantage of about 3 damage points.

Of course somebody will argue that Rob didn't have to direct upon the FTLs, and that he had plenty of marine fodder available to take damage instead.

These same people will also argue that Pete was stupid to bring along the 3 at start FTLs plus an additional 3 that he paid another 18 EP to buy, and that it was all a waste of time.

But I think each of them probably knew what he was doing.

"your argument is that they provide cannon fodder."

As is mine! If the defender is of mind to direct upon my troopships,
I will gladly build more just to absorb double damage and shield more important targets from DD. Doubly so in a capital assault, though one must admit that they *will* be able to kill the target of their choice PLUS my troopships. But... at a cost of not doing much in cripples, which allows me to stay longer.

If you're not directing on my troopships, then I might actually score something with them, but I'm not ready to claim it's worth the effort in the high damage environment of a capital assault.

Matthew,

Is it permissible to combine SAFs and FTLs in the same battleforce to attack two different targets? I thought this was prohibited.

I grant that SAF's are effective. In my view converting all FTL's into SAF's and just running the ground assault that way works half way decently.

Jeff

The PDUs on a capital planet are considered supported by the free G, but that G cannot be given up to resolve a casualty. Rules reference coming.

(521.835) Every defense battalion on the capital/shipyard Planet (one planet Per race) has an assigned GCE at no cost and the planet recruits another one at no cost whenever a new defense battalion is added. The IGCE provided by this rule represents the National Guard (or other reserve) Planetary defense troops. This IGCE can only perform the defensive support role (521.38); it is destroyed with its defense battalion rather than being given up in place of it; this is the only way this IGCE can be destroyed). This IGCE is used
to defend against every Marine attack on that battalion during a given turn in an exception to (521.38). Any ship-based "supporting" GCEs provided under (521.38) could be given up as casualties under (521.34) but each can only be used against one such attack and they provide no additional bonus beyond the intrinsic IGCE.

By Ken Rotar (Sir_Krotar) on Wednesday, April 08, 2015 - 03:29 pm: Edit

On April 16, 2014, Peter Bakija wrote, "I think basic, unexpanded F+E is still (25+ years later) moderately unbalanced in the direction of the Coalition. Early in the game, the Coalition have all the money and all the momentum. I mean, like, if they are over zealous and make some grand strategic errors (like killing the Kzinti instaed of the Hydrans, or killing both the Kzinti and the Hydrans and then immediately attacking the Feds on T7), they can go off the rails. But careful, considered, conservative play by the Coalition can see the Alliance get really mangled early in the game, and have a lot of trouble coming back."

I was wondering why it is a "grand strategic error" to kill both the Kzinti and Hydran capitals and then immediately attack the Federation on turn 7. Is it because it is assumed that the Coalition will not have had enough time to prepare a proper massive assault by that time given the losses it has probably taken in the capital assaults? I am asking because it seems that taking both of the Alliance capitals would be a good thing as long as one does not delay too much in making a solid attack on the Federation.

By Kosta Michalopoulos (Kosmic) on Wednesday, April 08, 2015 - 03:51 pm: Edit

While it is possible for the Coalition to attack the Federation on Turn 7 after taking both the Hydran and Kzinti capitals on or before Turn 6, it is unlikely to be much of an attack. Assuming the Hydrans and Kzintis put up a reasonable defense of their home systems, the Coalition will have a bunch of crippled ships they will need to repair and reposition to the Federation border. This is not a realistic possibility for Turn 7.
The result of a weak Turn 7 attack on the Federation is worse than delaying the attack for a turn or two or three: it awakens the sleeping giant early without doing any significant harm to their economy. Furthermore, unless the Coalition penetrates well into Federation territory on the first turn of attack, they will not be in a position to exploit the rich and lightly defended Federation bread basket on subsequent turns.

As a result, the strategic decision for the Coalition in the early stages of the General War is to choose between: (a) capture both the Kzinti and Hydran capitals, but delay attacking the Federation until Turn 8/9/10; (b) capture one or the other of the Kzinti and Hydran capitals, while bottling up the other's forces, then shift to an aggressive assault on the Federation on Turn 7.

Yeah, for my money, the issue is that taking *both* the Kzinti and Hydran capitals by the end of CT6 is that they will have to take an insane amount of damage, and just won't have enough ships ready to make a significant attack on the Feds on CT7.

The Coalition can pretty easily take the Kzinti capital by the end of CT4. But if they do, they have a lot of ships committed to that theatre, and will take a lot of damage doing so. Which means that they won't have a ton of ships on the Hydran front to attack with on CT4, meaning that the Hydrans will not have a significant attack on their Capital on CT4 (as they just won't be enough ships). If the Coalition take the Kzinti Capital on CT4, they *might* be able to get the Hydran Capital on CT6. But by not smothering them on CT4, they have a lot more money to spend on PDUs and ships and whatever, which means taking the Hydran Capital on CT6 will be difficult and costly. The end result of which is that the attack that the Coalition can make against the Feds on CT7 will be anemic, at best. Which just sets them off without an overwhelming attack. Which likely just puts the Coalition in a horrible spot against the Feds.
In light of the **Day of the Dragon** fiction story headlining *Captain's Log #50*, I was wondering about the kind of on-table experiences which Gorn players have had when it came to them entering the General War in *F&E* terms - be it through a Grand Campaign, or via a scenario with a start date closer to the day in question.

By and large, has it been more common to see Gorn players enter the war with a concentrated push at the Romulan capital complex, with a broader assault across the length of the Romulan border, or by leaving the border untouched and instead launching large-scale expeditions into Federation space?

I suppose the answer would depend a lot on how well (or badly) the war had been going for the Alliance up until then, to a greater extent than even the Day of the Eagle's impact can be judged. But even so, I was curious as to what kind of role Gorn players most often found themselves playing when their time came to join the fray...

...or if the Gorns are *really* waiting for Mapsheet P to be formally printed in a future *F&E* module, so that they (and the ISC) can have a more active neighbourhood to delve into.

---

Kosta and Peter just proved that the game is fine and that improving Kzinti or Hydran carrier groups would be a horrible mistake. Thank you. Case dismissed.

---

is this a joke, steve?

---

No, Chris, it is true. Case dismissed.
So if the Coalition takes heavy damage on CT4/5 taking out the Kiziti capitol and the Hydran on CT7/8 would that not open up the possibility of a combined Klingon/Romulan strike or a one-two punch?

By Richard B. Eitzen (Rbeitzen) on Wednesday, June 10, 2015 - 01:29 pm: Edit

This is kind of vague. Be more specific.

By Keith Plymale (Zaarin7) on Thursday, June 11, 2015 - 07:38 pm: Edit

To better clarify:

Coalition takes Kizinti capital with heavy loses on CT 4 or 5,

This delays taking Hydran capital till CT 7 or 8,

Big back log of repairs for both Klingon's and Lyran's,

So would it be better for the Coalition overall to delay the Klingon/Lyran attack on the Federation till the turn before the Romulan attack or the same turn the Romulan's attack? The Federation will be stronger but will they be strong enough?

By Richard B. Eitzen (Rbeitzen) on Thursday, June 11, 2015 - 07:52 pm: Edit

That's too vague to say for sure, and even with explicit information it really depends on the player and how they like to play.

I prefer a turn seven attack if I can do decent damage, you can cheaply kill the 7th fleet starbase on this turn.

By Peter Bakija (Bakija) on Thursday, June 11, 2015 - 10:22 pm: Edit

Yeah, I'm yet to be convinced that it is ever a good idea to delay the attack on the Feds past T7. Even if it means capturing the Kzinti and Hydran Capitals.

On T7, the Klingons can do devastating things to the Feds if they
attack with the number of ships they can attack with assuming they only capture one Capital (Kzinti or Hydran; I'd suggest the Hydrans). That level of brutality is very effective.

Giving the Feds three turns (T7, T8, T9) of unhindered production (even at limited war) and ship repositioning before you attack them, even if the Klingons and Romulans attack simultaneously on T10 always seems like a horrible plan to me.

By Randy Blair (Randyblair) on Friday, June 12, 2015 - 11:14 am: Edit

Agreed.
When I play Coalition, I tend to spank the Kzintis and kill the Hydrans and scream across the Fed border on CT7 come hell or high water.

By Kevin Howard (Jarawara) on Friday, June 12, 2015 - 02:54 pm: Edit

I've seen situations where attacking on turn 7 did not go well - right after the destruction of the Hydrans, the coalition is so exhausted they cannot hit the Feds hard enough. But I've not seen how delaying the assault on the Federation would have helped.

In fact, I've found sometimes that delaying the destruction of the Hydrans to be more beneficial. Get enough ships in position to hit the Feds on turn 7, while taking your time to systematically reducing the Hydrans to rubble, can sometimes work out better than overwhelming the Hydrans early in an attempt to keep to schedule with the Fed invasion.

By Randy Blair (Randyblair) on Friday, June 12, 2015 - 04:19 pm: Edit

Yep, it's all in how you play it and who you are playing against. If I am playing an unskilled person, then I usually try to bake both the Kzintis and the Hydrans. But if I'm playing someone fairly experienced, I tend to not hit the Kzintis as hard, but still bake the Hydrans because they are easier. There's a LOT to get done in those first 6 turns.
I have a question about Tugs. The Lyran's/Klingon's start without about 5 tugs each. They also have quite a few pods.

With 1 Tug/year and 1 LTT/turn as max builds, if I have read the rules correctly, how many additional Tugs/LTT's does a nation need?

I need one for a repair tug, several to move MB's and FRD's, etc. I also need others to use pods and pallets as some have good effectiveness.

So how many should I build to maximize the benefits and uses of them?

Also, I assume that adding CV pods to a Tug to make it a CVT is one of the allowed carrier builds/conversions per turn, correct? I was looking at turn 1 and 2 carrier builds for the Klingon's and a D6V(5 FFF), F5V(1 FFF and buy 2) and a CVT(using pods) seems to maximize fighter and CV usage on 168F and 169S.

This is a very open ended question. It highly depends on the expansions used, the empire in question, grand strategy, ship losses, and probably other things that do not immediately come to mind.

Generally if you aren't sure if you should build a tug, build one.

Never having played a game I was going to solo play soon and was trying to get a feel for what I needed.

Say I have the Klingon's who have IIRC 3 TGC and 2 TGB at start. I would like to convert 2 TGC to CVT's on turns 1 and 2. I also sub a tug for D6 or D7 on 168F, 169S, 170S, 171S and 172S. I build LTT's
1 per turn starting in 170S(IIRC) through 172F. I now have 6 TGC, 2 TGB and 6 LTT's. Should that be enough to cover most of my uses for tugs or should I continue Tug/LTT builds longer?

Hi Daniel!

The question of how many tugs do I need is actually a great question, but you may not realize that its a question that goes so deep and so intricate that essentially it can be replaced with "How do I win F&E?" Maybe I'm overstating things, but logistics, which is about 80% all about the Tugs, is probably the single strongest factor in winning an F&E game in the General War.

Logistics planning for offensives is so critical for their success that a Coalition player that doesn't understand how to use their Tugs will find themselves unable to get past the outer defenses of the Federation. Or they won't have supply to the critical areas of Hydran space when they need it. They won't be able to transfer economic points from their wealthy empires, to the ones best able to spend them. They won't establish the bases they need to hold territory they no longer wish to defend with mobile assets. They won't have command rating 10 ships where they need them. They won't have that extra carrier group handy to absorb casualties cheaply.

Tugs are what allow you to make mistakes or compensate for a bit of bad luck here or there. Lost your mobile base, because you miscounted the ships your opponent could bring? Good thing you have a tug to become a supply point. Need a full reserve to cover the Kzinti capital, will just drop a battle pod into the grid and strat move that new construction TugA to Farlan and assign it mission A to lead your reserve. The minute you convert Tugs into CVT, you give up that flexibility to move those pods from one theater to another and those Tugs can never be anything but carriers and you give up 1 compot for the honor of doing that. Okay you can build new pods, one pair per turn, but why spend your fighter factors what way when you could be building normal carriers?
Even the humble TugB is far superior as a Tug than making it into a CVT (by converting to TugA first, then to CVT). The TugBs will most likely never be idle between performing missions C, D, F, H, J2 they should be kept rather busy. Occasionally you may find need of them to do J1, B, K1, K2, or L. And yes, I'm mentioning the uses by mission because you need to look at all the things a tug can do (although some of them are only available in full game rules and if you are just starting, I recommend playing some basic first). They are all found in rule 509.0. You don't need to know those missions by letter, but just know you can do all those things, you will find that the occasion arises to perform them with great frequency.

My partners in the AFD game, in preparation for starting this play by email game, has told me to plan out the missions for all my tugs for the first 5 to 7 turns of the game. They aren't kidding and they aren't wrong. Good logistics will win games. Its possible to win with "good enough" logistics, but your margin for error will get smaller. But I don't see how a Coalition player that, for instance, builds no Tugs will be able to win a game against a well planned Alliance defense.

You may convert TGAs to CVTs later, but only when you plan on building the replacement CV Pods in a game using advanced rules where the Klingons are able to make new CV pods with 3 full fighters factors each, rather than 2.5 fighters factors. Even then, I'd be hesitant because I'd worry about getting short on Tugs (and I build 1 a year, every year, as the Klingons). I'd probably still only convert the exiting pods for 2 points each.

I hope this hasn't sounded too preachy or like I'm talking down to you, because I've been where you are right now. No one starts playing this game realizing things like this, you learn it by playing other players that know these things, most of what I'm saying isn't stuff I figured out from my own brilliance, but I was told and have since realized why it is right. Which leads to the last thing I'll leave you with, try and find a person to play by email. I suggest starting with a basic game and maybe even playing a small scenario like the Federation - Gorn conjectural war, a sector scenario or the Four Powers War, just to get a feel for how to play the game before
getting into the General War. I hope you enjoy the game, because its always good to have new players in the community!

Thanks for the reply. I was leaning towards lots of tugs before but I am sure to build them now.

Lots of pods to use, repair tug, supply points, building bases, moving PDU's, etc. require a lot of tugs. 8 Tugs and 6 LTT's by Y172 sound like a lot until you realize all the things you can do with them.

The only reason I thought about the two initial CVT conversions is that because they are pre-war already bought pods the fighters are part of the pods and cost nothing.

I was considering doing 1 D6V's, 1 CVT's and 1 F5V's in Y168F and Y169S. That would use 8 Fighter Factors and I would only have to buy 2 of them in Y168F(D6V for 5, F5V for 3, CVT pod). I would still have 4 FFF left for 169F.

I will do the first 4 turns several times solo to get a feel for all the rules.

Preach it Brother Byron!

Lots of good advice there Bryan. Might make a good tactics note for inexperince players.

Danial I'd be up for a Vassal/Skype game if you are?
I really don't see CVTs as a good conversion, as you really aren't increasing your carriers available, because you consume the pods. I might see an argument to make them when you are switching from the old VP2 pods to the newer VP3, but that doesn't exist in basic. It can be done in full game, but you really have nicer carriers you can build at that point. I'd just convert my old pods to the newer ones.

By Thomas Mathews (Turtle) on Monday, June 29, 2015 - 06:31 am: Edit

Playing Solo gives you a feel for the mechanics of the game, but not the strategy. Granted it is a good idea as the first two to three turns have some very limited options as to what the Alliance can do in response.

As to Tugs, when doubt build them. If nothing else build a LTT every turn, because in pairs they can do a lot of useful things. Yes, even the poor Kzintis and Hydrans should build a Tug and LTT at almost every point they can. No you don't need them every turn, but the more you have the more you can do later in the war when you don't have bases to do things.

By Ted Fay (Catwhoeatsphoto) on Monday, June 29, 2015 - 09:19 am: Edit

Bryon, that was a singularly great response!

Personally, I always - in every game - maximize my tug builds (I'm primarily a Coalition player, but do play Alliance from time to time). As Byron stated, logistics is key. I can't tell you the number of times I realized I needed a supply point somewhere and patted myself on the back because I make it a point to have a tug in as many fleets as possible. Even if you don't need the logistics, tugs can be used in rescue mode during combat to save yourself damage points and to rescue key crippled ships when retreating from a capital assault. In a pinch they can also fight on the line, so you don't lose much relative to a combat variant - and tugs (when *built*, as opposed to converted) don't cost any more than the base hull. When you have plenty of LTTs floating around it's not a problem to move your entire FRD park to another theater. Tugs give you tremendous flexibility in logistics, and make planning, capability, and flexible responsiveness
All of my empires always build the limit on tugs: Typically 1 heavy tug per year and 1 LTT per turn.

On the other hand I usually don't that many FFTs. Their usefulness is limited, but I usually have some for colony duty, WYN trade, etc. Having a few FFTs floating around in fleets is also useful for establishing useful supply points. Although short ranged, FFT supply points can make *all* the difference when setting up where you want to retreat after a combat.

Also, don't neglect building the humble APT. I like having around 35 or so across all Coalition empires. That allows you to transfer 20 EPs from one empire to another, 10 Kestrel points to the Romulans, and a few for redistributing admirals and prime teams - all for no burden on your strategic movement capacity.

My 2 cents.

-T

Awesome responses on tugs, much appreciated. It has changed my whole idea on building them.

I was looking in Strategic Operations and had a couple of questions on diplomats. Sending diplomats to the capitals of the Lyran's and Klingon's on turn 1 generates 1 EP for each(2 if each send a diplo team to the others capital). From turn 1 you generate 2 EP for each empire for the whole 34 turns of the war. If the Klingon's decided to send a team to the Romulan's and vice versa they could strategic move to a BATS on the Tholian border but would they then need to operationally move across the neutral zone for 2 turns before using the others strategic network to reach the capital? Giving the Romulan's any extra EP seems like a great idea.
I have a separate question about the use of commercial convoys.

The Klingon's and Lyran's have one to use but because the nearest Klingon SB is 4 turns of movement from the Lyran SB in 0608 this severely limits the EP they can generate.

Would it make sense to upgrade the BATS in 0908 to a SB on turn 1 and start the commercial convoy from there on turn 2? It does cost 36 EP to upgrade the base but you get that all back from the reduced transit time of the convoy by turn 9. You also get another minor conversion location for the Klingon's as a side benefit. Worth it?

---

By Byron Sinor (Bsinor) on Monday, June 29, 2015 - 11:37 am: Edit

They thought of this, you can only deliver EPs to a Starbase that is more than 3 hexes from where you started, meaning you're best upgrade possibility is 1009. Its an interesting idea, but I doubt I'd want to divert a Tug and EPs in the first turn to do this, but perhaps there will be a turn where it would make sense.

As for the additional minor conversions, I haven't maxed out the Klingon conversion capacity very often, but that is mostly because I've only played basic game. I'll get a better feel for conversion needs as I play games with a more complete set of the full rules.

---

By Ted Fay (Catwhoeatsphoto) on Monday, June 29, 2015 - 12:12 pm: Edit

1009 is a good SB to upgrade. Don't bother to pay for the extra fighters, though.

Regarding diplomats, I had a whole tac note on that issue (that I think was well received).

Short of it: Your best bet is for the Klingons to build a diplomat on turn 1, put diplomats on all of the neutral planets you can, and then put the rest onto duty earning EPs. As they get released after converting a planet (or if you go to war with the neighbor) the move the DIPs back to EP trade duty.
After all is said and done, the Klingons should put the D7N in Lyrantan (extra EP is secure), the D5N in Romulus (combat capable, need a diplomat there to ensure Romulan entry), and the extra DIP they buy should go to the LDR, where it will earn an EP a turn for the rest of the game. Lyrans and Roms should exchange diplomats.

Remember, there's a ruling on converted neutrals. They add to your empire's income immediately. There's no convincing reason at all not to try to convert them (IMO).

---

By **Daniel Waugh (Coriendal)** on Monday, June 29, 2015 - 12:42 pm: Edit

I am guessing that the Tac Note was in one of the Captain's logs. Since I just ordered all three compendium's and the 2010 rulebook I will read through them before asking more questions.

Just waiting on UPS to deliver early this week.

Thanks

---

By **Keith Plymale (Zaarin7)** on Monday, June 29, 2015 - 02:38 pm: Edit

Just a note that some of the things in the CL's prior to 41 will no longer be legal and 2010 rules are supposed to have incorporated all the Q&A prior to 41. I have the most recent one and there is a lot of good reading there.

---

By **Stewart Frazier (Frazikar2)** on Monday, June 29, 2015 - 07:20 pm: Edit

A side note for the 1009 SB is that the CC travels from 1411 [on Turn #1 (443.41)] to 0608 then back to 1009 by Turn #6 so the SB needs to be there before then otherwise it's Turn #14 next ...

Secondary note - if playing with the SO, the Lyrans have a TG/SR choice to make (SR as tug with EW or off-map duties)...

---

By **Thomas Mathews (Turtle)** on Monday, June 29, 2015 - 07:45 pm: Edit
Q&A and rulings found in CL39 and older and related to rule numbers found in F&E2010 have been incorporated into the 2010 rulebook. Q&A and rulings for other expansions will be incorporated as they are updated to the 2010 standard.