

Frequently Asked Questions Archive

By [Steve Cole \(Stevecole\)](#) ON Monday, June 10, 2002 - 03:51 pm: [Edit](#)

We won't need this topic until after the product ships.

Alex Chobot will be in charge of answering rules questions for GPD.

By [Alex Chobot \(Alendrel\)](#) ON Monday, June 10, 2002 - 04:25 pm: [Edit](#)

Whoot!

By [Aaron Hendricks \(AarOn\)](#) ON Monday, June 10, 2002 - 06:51 pm: [Edit](#)

OH...good.

Chobot... could you explain chapter 9 to EVERYONE!!!!!!

By [Alex Chobot \(Alendrel\)](#) ON Monday, June 10, 2002 - 06:54 pm: [Edit](#)

Very carefully.

And once I get GURPS SPace 3rd. After Origins, like The Man said.

By [Gary Plana \(Garyplana\)](#) ON Monday, June 10, 2002 - 11:59 pm: [Edit](#)

Sorry, Aaron -- if *you* don't understand 9, no one else can explain it to you.

By [Alex Chobot \(Alendrel\)](#) ON Tuesday, July 16, 2002 - 01:30 am: [Edit](#)

We're open for business here, if any one has any questions on how things are supposed to work.

By [Matthew J. Francois \(Francois42\)](#) ON Tuesday, July 16, 2002 - 05:32 pm: [Edit](#)

What does "LC" stand for in the weapons charts for the Phasers and Disruptors?

The only weapons that have non-zero LC values are the Phaser-1 and Phaser-2.

EDIT: Never mind, got it. LC = Legality Class, page 120.

-Francois

francois@purdue.edu

By [Alex Chobot \(Alendrel\)](#) ON Tuesday, July 16, 2002 - 05:44 pm: [Edit](#)

Legality Class, stat that starts at 6 (for everyday civilian stuff) and goes down to 0 or less (for hardcore military gear). It interacts with a society's Control Rating to determine how easily available stuff is, expect to see more detailed rules in a future sourcebook.

In the meantime, here's some quick benchmarks:

LC6 Non-lethal weapons

LC5 Powerful nonlethals, low-tech armor

LC4 Hunting weapons and low-tech melee weapons (swords and such)
LC3 Light concealable weapons and light body armor
LC2 Medium/security weapons
LC1 Military hand weapons (rifles, phasers, heavy armor)
LC0 Heavy/squad support weapons, explosives.

Basically, the more restrictive the society, the more classes that are off limits and the more the remaining ones permits and liscenses.

In the meantime, the full rules are in GURPS Basic Set 3/e Revised, p.249 or Compendium II p.188.

By **Steve Cole (Stevecole)** ON Tuesday, July 16, 2002 - 07:07 pm: [Edit](#)

LC is defined on page 120 of GPD.

By **Gary Plana (Garyplana)** ON Tuesday, July 16, 2002 - 09:57 pm: [Edit](#)

SVC: add "Legality Class, 120" to index, please.

By **David Kass (Dkass)** ON Tuesday, July 16, 2002 - 10:05 pm: [Edit](#)

I hope all the abbreviations are in the index (either as separate items or listed with their definition). Ie "Legality Class (LC), 120"

By **Aaron Hendricks (AarOn)** ON Wednesday, July 17, 2002 - 01:06 pm: [Edit](#)

Is there anywhere in the book that describes how to use the range/speed chart? It's on the character sheet.

By **Alex Chobot (Alendrel)** ON Wednesday, July 17, 2002 - 01:57 pm: [Edit](#)

No, as the basic GPD combat system is based on GURPS Lite combat, which doesn't use the Speed/Range chart. It's there for fprward compatibility with the more complex combat systems in GURPS Basice Set (some form of which will likely be in MPA).

In a nutshell:

Add Range to target and speed of target together, find the value that exceeds this on the Linear column, and apply that modifier to ranged attacks.

Do the same for the target's size.

By **Andy Siviter (Andys)** ON Monday, July 22, 2002 - 10:34 am: [Edit](#)

Is any of the Original Prime Directive Material usable with GPD or do we have to start from scratch?

By **Steve Cole (Stevecole)** ON Monday, July 22, 2002 - 10:59 am: [Edit](#)

Well....

The universe is the same, but the rules are different.

One would assume any decide GM or really good RPGer could do a hasty conversion of any PD1 material without too much of a problem, and we plan to do this for you in Modules Prime (although maybe not all in the first one).

Gary is working on a formula to convert PD1 characters into GPD characters and we should have that in MPA.

By **Bryan Stephens (Salvik)** ON Saturday, July 27, 2002 - 09:34 am: [Edit](#)

What happend to all the great PD1 Source Material? I have to say I am glad I have that book already. Is all the Prime Team stuff going to come out in its own book?

By **Alex Chobot (Alendrel)** ON Saturday, July 27, 2002 - 10:48 am: [Edit](#)

A lot of the core background is in the GPD book of course.

Much equipment has been adapted already, either in the book or the suplmental file (which will be in Module Prime Alpha, quite likely with more stuff).

Gary is working on guidelines for converting PD1 characters to GURPS.

Prime Team material is at this point undefined. It may be done up as a Module Prime article, it may get its own sourcebook (a GPD SpecOps book), it may get folded into the racial sourcebooks, or some combination of the above.

By **Randy Buttram (Peregrine)** ON Saturday, July 27, 2002 - 12:07 pm: [Edit](#)

I'd like to see a GPD SpecOps book myself, with appropriate pointers to GURPS Special Ops (or integration of the material, or whatever).

By **Gary Plana (Garyplana)** ON Saturday, July 27, 2002 - 02:25 pm: [Edit](#)

I'm working on a guide to convert PD1 characters to GURPS, but it is a bugger. Try converting the attributes in PD1 to HT, for example.

It isn't going to be quick or easy to do right, and until I'm happy with it I'm not releasing it.

By **Steve Cole (Stevecole)** ON Saturday, July 27, 2002 - 03:17 pm: [Edit](#)

Bryan: Some of it gets reused, some gets tossed, and for some of it we do conversion data.

Prime Teams are well defined in the GPD core book; I'm not sure we would need a whole book to tell more about them.

Gary: get it done.

By **Gary Plana (Garyplana)** ON Saturday, July 27, 2002 - 07:49 pm: [Edit](#)

SVC: oh, I will. It's just that the PD1 and GURPS game engines are so bleeping different that there is no simple, easy way to do it.

By **Steve Cole (Stevecole)** ON Sunday, July 28, 2002 - 04:50 pm: [Edit](#)

Then, Gary, you can have until tomorrow to get it done.

By **Troy J. Latta (Saaur)** ON Monday, July 29, 2002 - 03:46 pm: [Edit](#)

I've never seen PD1, but I've found that most GURPS conversions are much easier (and make more sense) when using the optional fatigue/hp rules from the sidebar of Compendium I, pg 7.

This might be a problem, though, in that GPD already is defined as using the standard rule.

By **Gary Plana (Garyplana)** ON Monday, July 29, 2002 - 03:59 pm: [Edit](#)

Which is how I'm going about it.

The problem is that PD1 does not have an attribute for HT, CON, or anything similar. I'm having to bodge this stat.

By **Alex Chobot (Alendrel)** ON Monday, July 29, 2002 - 04:13 pm: [Edit](#)

Gary, the best you can do may end up being a set of guidelines and not hard-and-fast rules, so try not to get too hung up on having an iron-clad plug-n-crunch systems.

By **Steve Cole (Stevecole)** ON Monday, July 29, 2002 - 05:57 pm: [Edit](#)

Gary: I flipped through the PD1 book, and I can't make much sense of it. Seems that PD1 has, what, a dozen stats that GPD has four? I could be reading the wrong thing, but one of the PD1 stats is leadership, right? Just translate that into a skill. Another is accuracy, right? Possibly translate that into DX with really accurate people getting a skill too? I dunno. Just get it done.

By **Robert Gilson (Bobcat)** ON Monday, July 29, 2002 - 07:02 pm: [Edit](#)

I was looking through PD1, trying to see if I could find something to help you out with the translation. Man I had forgotten how different it was from GURPS.

I think I would go with something like this.

GURPS.....PD1

ST.....Strength + 6 or 7

DX.....Accuracy + Speed +2

IQ.....Logic + Technical + Perception

HT.....Strength + Discipline + 3

I would at least have everything brought up to racial norms after doing this but this is pretty close.

Hope it might help.

By [Gary Plana \(Garyplana\)](#) ON Monday, July 29, 2002 - 11:31 pm: [Edit](#)

That's very close to what I've got. I'm working thru the skills and such now.

Maybe tomorrow. I'll post it here so everyone can tear it apart, I just *know* you

guys are lying in wait for me...



By [Matthew Pulido \(Talison\)](#) ON Tuesday, August 27, 2002 - 11:48 pm: [Edit](#)

Is the DR on a Military Uniform really 16? That seems really high to me for armour described as "clothlike".

By [Alex Chobot \(Alendrel\)](#) ON Wednesday, August 28, 2002 - 12:12 am: [Edit](#)

That's more the "hazardous duty but still gotta look nice" uniform, made out of a high-tech Kevlar equivalent (monocrys for those following at home).

Your generic everyday uniform is gonna be covered in MPA. For the time being, PD 0 and DR 1, weight pretty much negligible (maybe a pound or two) will do nicely.

Also, the note on the armor table about a hit of damage being passed on to the wearer for each damage die that comes up as a "6" should apply to the uniform only (as it is a flexible armor, the other suits incorporate lots of rigid plating).

By [Matthew Pulido \(Talison\)](#) ON Wednesday, August 28, 2002 - 12:52 am: [Edit](#)

OK, that makes more sense.

By [michael john campbell \(Michaelcampbell\)](#) ON Wednesday, August 28, 2002 - 02:06 am: [Edit](#)

Quote:

Your generic everyday uniform is gonna be covered in MPA. For the time being, PD 0 and DR 1, weight pretty much negligible (maybe a pound or two) will do nicely.

Two pounds...you are counting the boots in that, right!?!

By [Matthew Pulido \(Talison\)](#) ON Wednesday, August 28, 2002 - 02:19 am: [Edit](#)

Yeah, I wear combat boots and I think they are roughly 5 pounds for the pair.

By [Matthew Pulido \(Talison\)](#) ON Wednesday, August 28, 2002 - 02:34 am: [Edit](#)

Ok, here's something that seemed fuzzy to me.

Are the reputation points mentioned on page 100 their own thing, or are they points that are supposed to be spent on your Reputation advantage.

If it's the Advantage, is it the Star Fleet Officer Reputation that is in the Academy Templates or should players buy a separate Reputation (Professional or Heroic) Advantage.

This would make sense because Civilains might be affected by the fact that you are an Officer, but only other military personal would be affected by your Professional Reputation. I think this is what was intended, but like I said it didn't seem 100% clear to me.

Could just be me.

By **Alex Chobot (Alendrel)** on Wednesday, August 28, 2002 - 10:29 am: [Edit](#)

Uniforms> For those playing the home game, I'm just grabbing the battledress uniform from GURPS Ultra-Tech 2, and it is two pounds (it also doesn't indicate the boots have any better protection, so they probably aren't all that heavy, just very sturdy and serviable). Until MPA comes out, I'm loathe to make up new armor here, as part of the process for that is figuring where the high-end of materials and defense technology for the SFU lies.

Reputations>

The points mentioned on page 100 are referring to ProRep and HeroRep. Note that by p. 50, once play has begun a character may only increase his levels of these via such specifically awarded points. These advantages are specific builds of the Reputation advantage with extra importance in the GPD system. ProRep, since it only applies within your profession (in this case, Star Fleet), costs 2.5 points per level, while HeroRep, since it applies to everyone (or close enough) costs the full 5 per level. Star Fleet Officer Rep, since it applies to everyone in your society, and is oft recognized those outside of it, is also a full 5 point per level Rep.

Clarification on the costs of PreRep (and any Rep with a fractional cost per level): The entry for Pro Rep on page 50 indicates it costs 2 points per level, which is incorrect. The way it is supposed to work is this: when calculating the cost of X levels of Reputation with cost Y, you multiply X times Y, then drop any fractional point. If you later increase your Rep, you do the calculation again, and pay the difference. Or, here's a table for 2.5 points/level:

Rep Cost


1	2
2	5
3	7
4	10

Note that whether it costs or gives points depends on whether it is a positive or negative Rep.

Hope that helps!

By **Gary Plana (Garyplana)** ON Wednesday, August 28, 2002 - 01:01 pm: [Edit](#)

ProRep and HeroicRep points are a leftover from PD1, but one I liked. Take Scotty, for example: he had tons of ProRep -- more than any other engineer in Star Fleet -- but no more Heroic Rep than any other ENTERPRISE officer. Spock had lots of Pro Rep too, but didn't really begin to accumulate HeroicRep until after the fourth

movie; cowboy diplomacy is not logical.  I could easily see "Not impressed by Heroic Reputation" as a common 1-point Quirk taken by Vulcans (I almost built it into their racial template).

Kirk, of course, was dripping with both ProRep and HeroicRep! These two stats give an additional dimension as to how professionals within the same hierarchy view each other, be it Star Fleet, the GIA, or whatever. While a cadet might worship the ground Kirk walked on, someone OUTSIDE Star Fleet would not be affected by Kirk's accumulated professional and heroic reputation -- there are too many examples on film re how Kirk got along with civilians to mention.

Another use, for example: in order to be assigned to a ship with the ENTERPRISE's reputation, you could say (in terms of game mechanics) that you would not be assigned to a ship like THAT one unless you had above-average ProRep and at least some HeroicRep on your character sheet. Ditto the later

ENTERPRISEs (maybe not the -B, though). 

It also allows us to "explain" why Klingons act the way they do -- this is why I put "Higher Purpose (improve Heroic Reputation)" in their racial template!

Hope this helps!

By **Matthew Pulido (Talison)** ON Wednesday, August 28, 2002 - 03:49 pm: [Edit](#)

Thanks, that helps a lot. Plus I had originally missed the part about such Reputations on page 50, which also clarified things.

I do have a follow up question. Understanding everything you just said, should the sample Lt. Commander in the supplement file have one level of Professional Reputation being that he has attained the rank of Lt. Commander?

By **Dale McKee (Brigman)** ON Thursday, August 29, 2002 - 01:39 am: [Edit](#)

One thing to keep in mind, guys... and I speak both as a GM and a longtime TOS fan... is that in its day, the Enterprise was just another ship in a 12 ship fleet of Constitution-class vessels. What made her legendary was the results of the 5-year mission. DURING the 5-year mission, was Kirk any more highly regarded than, say, Commodore Bob Wesley of the Lexington? In fact, Kirk was the new kid on the block, if anything. The Enterprise was NOT established as the flagship;

that wasn't set until TNG.

Just a thought and a retro-reminder from us old folks.

By **Gary Plana (Garyplana)** ON Thursday, August 29, 2002 - 03:22 am: [Edit](#)

If memory serves, Enterprise was the only one of the initial 13 CAs that survived, and *that* was the reason it became legendary.

By **Dale McKee (Brigman)** ON Thursday, August 29, 2002 - 03:31 am: [Edit](#)

Yeah, that's what they said in one of the chronologies post facto. One could also look at the episodes and say, wow, they sure did accomplish a lot.

My point was just that, if you look at the Ultimate Computer, for example, and several other episodes, Kirk wasn't exactly kow-towed to by command or other commanders. In fact in the Omega Glory, Ron Tracy very nearly hands him his assets. ;-) Base on what I've seen in TOS, I don't imagine the Enterprise was any harder or easier to get postings to than any of the other 12 Connies...

By **Randy Buttram (Peregrine)** ON Thursday, August 29, 2002 - 09:10 am: [Edit](#)

However, a posting to *any* Constitution-class starship could have been highly sought after. This assumes that they were the premiere ships of their day.

By **John Sickels (Johnsickels)** ON Thursday, August 29, 2002 - 10:52 am: [Edit](#)

I always thought that Kirk was something of a wet-behind-the-ears boy prodigy captain. I mean, look at the other starship captains we meet in TOS.

Captains Krasnowski and Chandra who sit on the court martial board in "Court Martial" are considerably older than Kirk.


Commodore Matthew Decker looks to be in his late 40s. The episode implies that he is something of a mentor to Kirk, possibly his direct superior, ie., Constellation (even though she is not a CC in the SFB universe) could have been acting as squadron flagship.

Commodore Robert Wesley looks to be in his late 40s. SFB establishes Lexington to be a CC, with Hood and Potemkin being CAs. I've always theorized that Excalibur was a CA in this episode and was converted to a CC after being badly damaged by M-5.

Captain Ron Tracey of the CA Exeter looks to be in his 50s.

I think Enterprise is just another CA at this point, and only became "legendary" after the end of the 5-year mission. I also don't take seriously the whole "Enterprise was the only CA to survive a 5-year mission" thing. I know Roddenberry said that, but I don't think it was ever made canon.

By **Gary Plana (Garyplana)** ON Thursday, August 29, 2002 - 02:21 pm: [Edit](#)

I think that it is one of those things that gets repeated so often that everyone believes it  but that's just my opinion.

I think that if the STAR TREK II series (that Roddenbury wanted to make in the early 70's pre-STAR WARS) had happened that would have been defined and made canon; it was apparently mentioned in the background canon there.

By **Robert Herneson (Rherneson)** ON Thursday, August 29, 2002 - 02:54 pm: [Edit](#)

It's noted in fandom that Kirk was the youngest man to make captain. Additionally, consider that the other captains would have been doing their cadet cruises on late 'early years' or more likely 'middle years' ships, Kirk and his generation were the first to train up totally on the 'new' regular ships. (Steve, we gotta find a better terminology to standardize references to these periods and technology. To a Y80 Character, a CA must have been X tech!) Also, I don't have a problem with Enterprise being a CA for Kirk's 5 year mission (the first?), especially when you consider it was staffed with all legendary officers and after a point, an outstanding crew. As for getting posted to the Enterprise, I agree, that may not have been too hard a trick (all normal stuff considered) but *staying aboard* -- well, that may have been rough if you didn't lock on fast.

Just my random opinions. (And why are we doing this in the FAQ area?)

Robert

By **John Sickels (Johnsickels)** ON Thursday, August 29, 2002 - 03:02 pm: [Edit](#)

Hmmm....could the Security department on the Enterprise truly be considered "outstanding"?

I can see outstanding ratings for Scotty's engineers. Certainly the science labs and staff. But the Big E's security detail looks pretty weak to me.

Let's see....you've just beamed down to a colony, only to find it's been obliterated. Peeking over a paripet, you see something odd moving in the distance. Do you

- 1) Warn the other members of the landing party by saying "get down everyone, I see something unusual"
- 2) Say, "Sir, could you please run a tricorder check in that direction"
- 3) Yell "Captain I see something" and stick your head UP so you can be conveniently disintegrated by a Gorn phaser.

By **Robert Snook (Verdick)** ON Thursday, August 29, 2002 - 03:16 pm: [Edit](#)

He's got a point there...
The Red Shirt Brigade didn't seem all that outstanding to me.

By **Gary Plana (Garyplana)** ON Thursday, August 29, 2002 - 06:23 pm: [Edit](#)

Spec for a Legendary Security Officer: he survived a landing party led by a senior officer.

By **Robert Hernesson (Rhernesson)** ON Thursday, August 29, 2002 - 08:15 pm: [Edit](#)

Did any of the stars die? No? OUTSTANDING SECURITY!



Ok, seriously, what little security we saw, it appears it was Navel and not Marine. (The guys standing outside Spock's quarters in armor in ST-III, *those* were marines.) So Kirk most likely didn't have a Legendary Marine Major. As for the standard boarding parties -- uh 50.1% of them (barely) qualified as outstanding because they could multi-task, how's that?



R

By **Dale McKee (Brigman)** ON Thursday, August 29, 2002 - 09:29 pm: [Edit](#)

But as we all know, Kirk could ACT as a Legendary Marine Major whenever he felt like getting his shirt ripped... so he didn't really need one. ;-)

By **Robert Hernesson (Rhernesson)** ON Thursday, August 29, 2002 - 11:49 pm: [Edit](#)

Plana: "Is he... yes, I believe he is... he's going for the double fist clasp!"

Orsini: "Plana san?"

Plana: "Yes, Orsini san, go!"

Orsini: "As we all know, when an Iron Captain goes for the double fist clasp, it means he is invoking his ability as a Legendary Marine Major."

Plana: "Right you are, Orsini san, good call! He was staggered for a second, but look at that wind up! WOAHH!! A solid hit and this monster fight is OVER!"



By **Richard Brown (Richardb)** ON Friday, August 30, 2002 - 05:26 pm: [Edit](#)

"But as we all know, Kirk could ACT as a Legendary Marine Major whenever he felt like getting his shirt ripped... so he didn't really need one. ;-)"

Kirk could act???

By **Andy Palmer (Andypalmer)** ON Friday, August 30, 2002 - 06:04 pm: [Edit](#)

LOL 

By **Richard Brown (Richardb)** ON Friday, August 30, 2002 - 06:19 pm: [Edit](#)

On a more serious note, how far away can you hear a transporter when someone is beaming in? Does it vary based on whose transporter it is (ie. Klingon vs Federation)? Finally are X ship transporters quieter?

By **Matthew Pulido (Talison)** ON Saturday, August 31, 2002 - 01:53 am: [Edit](#)

I have a question on Skills.

The skill table on page 113 lists specializations for the various technical skills.

Under the listing for Legendary Chief Engineer, he has many of the skills specialized for "Starship". Does he have all the different skill specializations that apply to a Starship as different skills, or does he just have one skill as a catch all?

It seems to me that that would be a heck of a shortcut.

By **Gary Plana (Garyplana)** ON Saturday, August 31, 2002 - 05:04 am: [Edit](#)

Richard: yes, it varies depending on the race. As noted in GPD, each race uses a different scan method, which is why the sparkly special effects are all different. I would imagine that would hold true for the sound levels that the scanning produces, too.

Transporter tech became available at TL9 and is mature at TL12. I'd say there were no further improvements at TL13, which would include sound levels. I'm basing this on the fact that from TL9 up through TL12, there are incremental improvements in the range, but no change from TL12 to TL13.

TL14 would be X2 technology, and as that hasn't been written for SFB yet, I wouldn't even attempt to guess what improvements might occur then!

Matthew: no. There is no skill named "Starship" as you don't repair Starships.

Think about it: you repair their transporters, you clean out the life support system, you weld the metal that happens to be part of the hull of a starship, but you don't fix the starship directly -- you fix the various systems, bits, and pieces that go into constructing a starship. They are just too big and too complicated to have one skill that covers everything! Sorry.

(IMHO this is why they tolerated people like Reginald Barkley on TNG -- he was one of the few people who could see "the big picture" as to how all the pieces fit together.)

I have to say that an exception would be the Omega races that use bioships -- living organisms that have been created/evolved/bred/whatever for use as starships. Defining that would be Bruce Graw's turf, not mine.

By **Matthew Pulido (Talison)** ON Saturday, August 31, 2002 - 12:02 pm: [Edit](#)

"Think about it: you repair their transporters, you clean out the life support system, you weld the metal that happens to be part of the hull of a starship, but you don't fix the starship directly -- you fix the various systems, bits, and pieces that go into constructing a starship. They are just too big and too complicated to have one skill that covers everything! Sorry."

No need to appologize. This is exactly what I was thinking. But as I said, The Legendary Chief Engineer on page 131/132 has both Mechanic and Engineer specialized as "Starship." I'll just assmume a given engineer has to have every specialization of these skills that would pertain to his races Starships or the ship he is serving on (For example a Starfleet Engineer wouldn't likely have skills pertaining to Stasis Field). This would agree with the fact that he is listed as having the Armoury skill for "each ship weapon" and not "Starship Weapons."

By **Matthew Pulido (Talison)** ON Saturday, September 14, 2002 - 02:16 am: [Edit](#)

Again, looking at the tech skill chart. What's the differance between the Computer Operations skill and the Electronics Operation (Computers) skill?

By **Robert Hernesson (Rhernesson)** ON Saturday, September 14, 2002 - 11:20 am: [Edit](#)

(UNOFFICIAL)

Computer Operations skill is sitting down at the input terminal (keyboard in my case) and getting the computer system to do what I want.

Electronics Operation (Computers) is being a tech that can take the cover off, check circuits, cards, chips, polymorphic biologic integrates and so on make the system operate so that a person with Computer Operations skill can do what he wants.

R

By **Matthew Pulido (Talison)** ON Saturday, September 14, 2002 - 02:19 pm: [Edit](#)

Robert

Wouldn't what your describing be the Electronics (Computer) skill which is also listed on page 113?

Electronics says design, build, and repair.

Electronics Operation says general use.

Computer Operation says general use of a Computer.

In other words it looks to me like Computer Operations is already a specialization of Electronic Operations. However, the tech section and Legendary Officers section are using Electronic Operations (Computer). It just seems like we have multiple skills doing the same thing.

By [Robert Hernesson \(Rhernesson\)](#) on Saturday, September 14, 2002 - 06:42 pm: [Edit](#)

(AGAIN, UNOFFICIAL)

Matthew, part of your snag is coming from the point that GPD uses the GURPS Lite rules as a basis. If you look at the full GURPS Basic Rulebook you find the answer.

Professional Skills:

Computer Operation/TL (Mental Easy) Defaults to IQ-4

This is the ability to operate a computer, call up data, run existing programs, play video games, et cetera. This is **not** the same as programming -- that is a separate and harder skill. Modifiers: -3 or more for an unfamiliar computer or unfamiliar program. This skill is only available at TL7 and above. Characters from tech levels below 7 cannot even use it by default unless they have had time to gain some familiarity with computers.

Electronics Operation/TL (Mental Average) Defaults to IQ-5 or appropriate Electronics-3

This skill allows the use of all electronics gear within a known speciality. For normal, everyday use of equipment, no skill roll is required. Rolls should be required in emergency situations, or for "abnormal" use of equipment, or for each use of complex gear by the unskilled.

--

COMPUTERS. Aiming and fire control systems, calculators, robot brains, artificial intelligences.

SCIENTIFIC SKILLS:

Electronics/TL (Mental/Hard) Defaults to (Other electronics) -4

Prerequisite: Mathematics

This is electronics **engineering** - the ability to design and build electronic apparatus. A successful roll will let you (for example): identify the purpose of a strange device; diagnose a glitch; perform a repair; design new systems; improve a gadget to solve a problem.

-

An electronics engineer **must** specialize in one of the types of electronics listed under Electronics Operation.

Note that an Electronics engineer is now necessarily a skilled operator of the things he designs and fixes; Electronics Operation defaults to Electronics at -3.

* * *

While GPD does say pretty much the same thing, the key is in the POINT COSTS. One is ME, one is MA, one is MH, each allows for increasingly harder tasks to be

performed.

Would the Recreations Officer need Electronics? Nope, they just need to use the stuff. Does the Helmsman need Electronics? Nope, he just needs to know what to do to make it do what he wants. But the Engineer who comes around to fix things after the ship took a Hull hit and a Bridge hit, HE needs to have Electronics skill AND in the right specialties.

Also note that a PRE-TL7 character CAN have Electronics but can not have Computer operation.

Until you get an official answer, I hope this helps.

Robert

By **Matthew Pulido (Talison)** ON Saturday, September 14, 2002 - 06:50 pm: [Edit](#)

You know, you think I would have looked in my Gurps main book before asking. I'm surprised with myself for not doing so.

Thanks, Robert. That does help a lot.

By **Alex Chobot (Alendrel)** ON Saturday, September 14, 2002 - 07:37 pm: [Edit](#)

I'll bounce this through SHG channels, but I believe Robert more or less hit on it. Basically, Computer Operations lets you sit down and use a common PC type terminal, the type of thing most people in a technological culture can do. Electronic Operations (Computers) allows you to use more specialized/less user-friendly forms of computing equipment.

By **Matthew Pulido (Talison)** ON Saturday, September 14, 2002 - 07:44 pm: [Edit](#)

Thanks, Alex.

The only reason I asked is because the Academy Templates provide Computer Operations. None of the professional requirements list Electronics Operation (Computers), but then the Legendary Officers requirements require Electronics Operation (Computers).

But yeah, what you and Robert said makes sense.

By **Mike West (Mjwest)** ON Sunday, February 16, 2003 - 01:10 pm: [Edit](#)

OK, since this is supposed to be the correct forum, I will ask my specific question here.

What is the Professional Certification skill list that a captain or XO (1st officer) must match? (I imagine this would actually apply to any command officer.)

I know the answer is not "must meet all of the listed ones" because there is no need for a captain to qualify as a doctor, special forces or even a science officer. You could probably drop others as well.

So, is there a specific skill list or combination of existing Professional Certifications that should be used?

My guess is that a command officer must have all the skills listed in the following Professional Certifications:

- Communications
- Damage Control
- Helm/Navigation
- Operations
- Transporter
- Weapons

All such skills must be at least level 12, or the listed value, whichever is lower. In addition, the command officer must fully qualify for one (or two?) of the above Professional Certifications.

Is this at least close?

By **Mike West (Mjwest)** ON Sunday, February 16, 2003 - 01:14 pm: [Edit](#)

While I am here, what is the "normal" and the "average" age of an officer when the following positions are attained?

- Lieutenant
- Lieutenant Commander
- Commander
- "Watch" Officer (i.e. "commander" position in AUX or EMER)
- XO / First Officer of SC4
- XO of CW
- XO of CA/NCA
- captain of SC4 (rank of Commander)
- captain of CW (rank of Commander)

This is the Federation.

By **David Kass (Dkass)** ON Sunday, February 16, 2003 - 10:07 pm: [Edit](#)

I would guess the answer will be different depending on when (ie Y175--five brutal years into the GW is probably different than Y169).

By **Garth L. Getgen (Sgt_G)** ON Monday, February 17, 2003 - 08:42 am: [Edit](#)

Mike,

Based off modern-day USAF figures, if memory serves:

- O1 -> O2 = 2 years
- O2 -> O3 = 2 years
- O3 -> O4 = 8-12 years
- O4 -> O5 = 4-6 years

O5 -> O6 = 4 years
O6 -> O10 = 2 years each

A fast-burner can make full-bird Colonel (O6) in 20 years; it's unlikely that someone behind the power-curve will ever see it. Also, remember that above the rank of Major (O4), the selection rate drops sharply and keeps on dropping. There are only about 9 or 10 four-star Generals (Admirals) in each branch of the service (3 or 4 for the Marines).

As far as ages go, figure graduating high school at 17, then spending 4 in college, so the youngest officer should be 21, give or take a couple months. If memory serves, the oldest they'll accept someone with a degree into OTS (90-day Wonder School) is age 32. Hope that helps!

Garth L. Getgen, MSgt USAF

By **Jeremy Gray (Gray)** on Monday, February 17, 2003 - 09:20 am: [Edit](#)

Mike,

I'll use myself as an example for the officer ranks - my career path is very typical of a naval officer. I entered the US Naval Academy at 17. Graduated at 21 as an Ensign (O-1) in May 1996. I spent about nine months in the Surface Warfare Officer training pipeline before reporting to my first ship as a Division officer (Divisions are usually 10-20 Sailors). Two years after commissioning (May 1998), I was promoted to Lieutenant Junior Grade (O-2). In April 1999, I transferred to a new ship for a second division officer tour (this time a 50 man division on a CV). Four years after commissioning (May 2000), I was promoted to Lieutenant (O-3). I transferred to shore duty in December 2000.

I'm currently going through the training pipeline to become a Department Head (typically in charge of 3-5 divisions). I will report to my new ship as Weapons Officer late this year. In 2005, I will be "in zone" for Lieutenant Commander (O-4) - 9 years after I was commissioned. I will get three "looks" for the LCDR promotion, once per year. So I will promote to O-4 at the 9-11 year mark. Most folks who make it will promote on their first look.

As a LCDR, I can expect to finish my two department head tours (roughly 2 years each), spend a tour on shore duty, and then report to a ship as XO. During that tour I will be "in zone" for Commander (O-5), about 6 years after I put on LCDR - so at about 15 years after commissioning.

Finishing up the XO tour as an O-5, I will do another shore tour and, assuming I screen for command, report for my first command tour. This will likely be a Destroyer or Frigate. This will be about a two year tour and will just about take me to the 20 year point (eligible to retire). I will likely finish it up with about one

year left to serve before that point. At about the same time, I would get my first look for O-6.

Assuming I stay on, I would go to a "major command" tour - a Cruiser command or a Destroyer Squadron Commodore. Usually you don't get these unless you are an O-6 or are about to put it on.

Flag ranks come rather quickly if after that, assuming you actually get promoted. Frankly, the idea of making Admiral is WAY off my scope at the moment.

In wartime (such as WWII), with a massive increase in the size of the Naval service, this career path would likely be accelerated. The second division officer and department head tours would likely be dropped if more XO's and CO's were needed.

As for the skills acquired, Surface Warfare Officers in the US Navy are trained in a wide variety of disciplines, including Engineering, Damage Control, Weapons, Navigation, and Operations (Communications, Shiphandling, Deck work). Officers tend to specialize a bit during the middle of your career (Weapons in my case) but to make XO, they will almost certainly need to be a qualified EOOW (Engineering officer of the Watch) and TAO (Tactical Action Officer). In fact, it is hard to make O-4 without these qualifications. So, by the time officers get to be an XO, while they may be particularly strong in one area, they are required to have a broad base of skills.

Hope that helps.

By **Robert Hernesson (Rhernesson)** on Monday, February 17, 2003 - 10:23 am: [Edit](#)

Mike,

First, let's get this out of the way; anything in my posts in the FARQ is *unofficial*. Alex and SVC are the final say on things, so unless you hear it from them it's just my opinion.

You ask, "...why is the Tactics skill not differentiated? The Tactics required by Special Forces is completely different from that required by starship command. It could even be argued that starship tactics is even different from fighter tactics. So why no differentiation? (Particularly considering how fragmented other skills are, e.g. Electronics Operation.)"

One significant misunderstanding about Strategy and Tactics comes from the point that GPD was written using GURPS Lite. If you look in the full Basic Rules for GURPS, Strategy is further expanded and goes on to say, "A Strategist must specialize (Basic p. 43) in a type of strategy: important types are land, navel, and space. The specific units being commanded are less important; at worst, a strategist might have a -1 or -2 when planning for units of another nation or TL, as long as he has accurate information about their capabilities."

That puts a new wrinkle in thing. Additionally, when you also note that Tactics and Strategy have defaults to one another, there is an implied connection between the two skills.

Also, let's look at the first sentences of each skill's description for a moment. Strategy says, "This is the ability to play military actions and to predict the actions of the enemy." Tactics says, "This is the ability to outguess the enemy when the fight is man-to-man or in small groups."

Last, note also that, if your opponent has Strategy skill, you must do a contest of skills between the two strategist to gain pertinent information, whereas if you have Tactics, you need only make a successful Tactics roll to (at the GM's option) gain useful information.

We can now apply these two skills better for the SFU point of view.

Commanding officers will use Strategy long before the battle is engaged. They will read historical and technical analyses, fleet reports, movement, intelligence, and operations updates, study charts, and take decisions position their fleets, ship, or men in the best ways possible based on those studies. These are Mental/Hard skills after all! Any character that wants to attempt a Strategy roll will have undertaken some of this work in learning the skill and should regularly continue to do so after creation to help support that skill. Usually, this is considered 'off camera' activity, much like studying spells and cleaning weapons is in other genre.

Tactics is the application of immediate resources when the enemy is personally engaged, either with your unit, ship or self. It allows you to maneuver, defend, and attack in ways to have immediate results. Tactics is more about technique, yours and your enemy's, than positioning. It too requires study, but more often also require constant practice. This is usually accomplished with simulators, field maneuvers, or sparring, again frequently 'off-camera', although, these activities can be interesting 'color' or hooks for adventures.

The two skills support each other, however, in that when both are successfully brought to bear they radically improve the chance of success, be that in any kind of interaction, combat or personal. You may have the best captain or sergeant but without being in the right place or not having the right material, then they are ineffective. Additionally, you may have the best planning staff or Thought Admirals, but without people on site with the ability to prosecute the plan, then nothing happens.

Hopefully, this analysis of these two skills will help your application of them in your game and bring you great success in your engagements.

By [Alex Chobot \(Alendrel\)](#) ON Monday, February 17, 2003 - 10:57 am: [Edit](#)

I have these on my docket, and will try to get to them this week.

By **Mike West (Mjwest)** ON Monday, February 17, 2003 - 06:56 pm: [Edit](#)

One point of clarification. Please understand I am not saying that GPD is doing anything "wrong". It is just that I have been "corrupted" by Traveller (both GT and CT) and am approaching this from that point of view. If they work the same, great. If not, that is fine, too.

I am asking to understand, not to criticize or denigrate. (I realize it can sometimes sound that way. And for that I apologize.)

And thank you Garth, Jeremy and Robert. Those answers do help.

By **Mike West (Mjwest)** ON Monday, February 17, 2003 - 07:07 pm: [Edit](#)

Jeremy,

That is amazing.

Assuming I am reading you correctly, the two hardest steps are O-4 and O-5, taking 5+ years for each step.

However, it sounds like any time an officer spends in command is very short-lived. They are likely to spend more time as an O-4 than as the captain of a ship.

Again, if I am reading you correctly, after reaching command of a ship, most are quickly (quick meaning less than 6 years) promoted OUT of command into the flag ranks. (Or out of the service all together.)

Quite a difference from SFB and TNG where it is presented as normal for an officer to be captain of a single ship for 5+ years.

By **Jeremy Gray (Gray)** ON Monday, February 17, 2003 - 07:52 pm: [Edit](#)

Tours for officers in the Navy these days are all pretty short, typically about 2 years each. Generally, the career path is:

- Two Division Officer tours
- One Shore tour
- Two Department Head tours
- One Shore tour
- One XO tour
- One Shore tour
- One O5 Command tour
- One O6 Command tour
- Flag assignments there after...

You also typically have several months of training prior to each sea duty assignment. You definately don't stay in one place very long.

Competition for promotion to O4 is typically pretty tough, but promotion rates tend to be high because lots of officers choose to leave the service as LTs. It is really brutal when you go up for O5 because very few folks get out once they make O4. By that point, you've invested so much time that leaving before retirement just doesn't make since.

Command is sort of a funny thing when you think about it. You spend about 16 years trying to get there and when you finally make it, you only have a couple years in the sun.

By **Garth L. Getgen (Sgt. G)** ON Monday, February 17, 2003 - 09:16 pm: [Edit](#)

Mike,

As I said, in the USAF the promotion rates drop off rapidly above O-4. You have to screw up royally to not make O-2 or O-3. Promotion is automatic and nearly 100%. I don't have firm numbers, but promotion rates to O-4 are probably around 80% or so. This drops to maybe 50% for O-5 and O-6. Factor in separations and other losses and you can figure that less than 10% ... perhaps only 5% of any particular Academy graduating class will make O-6.

In the enlisted corps, the hardest rank to make in the USAF is, by far, E-6 (Tech Sgt). Selection rates from E-4 to E-5 have been above 50% for the past few years and nearly 67% last year. The rates from E-6 to E-7 have been hovering just below 50% of eligibles. However, the rates for E-5 to E-6 are UP from 25% to about 33%. For E-8 and E-9, the total number of these two ranks are limited by Congress to 2% and 1% of the total enlisted force.

Garth L. Getgen

By **Jonathan McDermott (Caraig)** ON Tuesday, February 18, 2003 - 10:59 am: [Edit](#)

In the Coast Guard, promotion for enlisted depended mostly upon available slots. For most rates, there were a designated number of persons at each grade permitted. So, for example, the Marine Science Technician (MST) rate had, at its top, two Master Chiefs (E-9); the running semi-dark-humor joke was that no MST could be promoted until one of the E-9s in that rate was assassinated. Then the promotions would come like ripples starting at the top.

For most services, O-1 seems to be the 'probationary' grade; promotion to O-2 is automatic; as Garth said, you have to REALLY screw up to not get picked up for O-2. The Coast Guard worked with this by having O-1s (ensigns) and O-2s (lieutenant JGs) be eligible for the same billets. After four years in service, I would have been eligible for O-3.

Most services have an 'up or out' policy, where if you aren't picked up for promotion after two promotion periods, you're either dismissed, put into the

reserves, or put on the Inactive Service List; it varies depending upon your service, the nature of your commission (that is, regular vs. reserve) and, for all I know, consulting Tarot cards deep in the bowels of the Pentagon or USCG Headquarters. =)

By the way, this may be apocryphal, but this came up once in an almanac and I wonder if it's true. We know that five-star ranks appear only in wartime (I believe they have to be approved by an act of Congress) but wasn't there once a six-star general, 'General of the Armies,' a rank held by Pershing?

By **Randy Buttram (Peregrine)** ON Tuesday, February 18, 2003 - 12:03 pm: [Edit](#)

Pershing, and posthumously (and way after the fact) awarded to George Washington, as I recall.

By **Steve Cole (Stevecole)** ON Tuesday, February 18, 2003 - 01:30 pm: [Edit](#)

It wasn't a six-star rank (although it is casually called that). It was, technically, a higher form of five-star rank.

There were a dozen or so five-stars in WWII and I think Grant was promoted to five-star rank in the 50s or 60s.

By **Randy Buttram (Peregrine)** ON Tuesday, February 18, 2003 - 02:07 pm: [Edit](#)

Interesting distinction. I've never heard it before. Makes a lot of sense, though.

By **Steve Cole (Stevecole)** ON Tuesday, February 18, 2003 - 02:25 pm: [Edit](#)

Well, the story goes something like this....

We had major generals and brigadier generals from the revolution.

Lieutenant General was a rank known in Europe and the US Army gave it to Grant so he would outrank Meade. (Long story there. They wanted Grant to take over the Army, but Meade had won Gettysburg and nobody had the heart to fire him. So they made Grant a three-star in charge of "all" armies and left Meade, a 2-star, in command of the Army of the Potomac. Since Grant was in the same place as Meade, this effectively made Meade chief of staff and Grant the commander of AotP. This was the first time that the chief of staff of a field army was higher than a colonel and it worked so well that the Germans copied it and invented the General Staff Corps. Go figure.)

Full four-star generals came along after the civil war, although Lee was one he wasn't in the "US Army" at the time.

When we expanded the Army for WWI, they invented a five-star rank and made Pershing "General of the Armies" since four-stars commanded a field Army and

five-stars was an Army Group Commander.

When WWII came along and they expanded the army again, they made MacArthur five-star but called him General of the Army (not Armies) so that Pershing, the great victor of WWI, would always rank higher. At the same time or the next day they appointed two or three other five-stars (MacArthur, a hero of WWI and a field marshal of the Philippine Army, was made senior to all other WWII generals) and eventually there were, I think, 14 of them.

After all of them retired, there were no more five-stars.

By **Mike West (Mjwest)** ON Tuesday, February 18, 2003 - 02:57 pm: [Edit](#)

Jeremy and Garth:

Again, thanks for the explanations. They are very enlightening for "military illiterates" like me.

SVC:

I my assumption correct? Is it "normal" for an SFB captain to retain command of his ship for an extended period of time? Or is there a combination where captains of SC4 ships move through quickly, but captains of SC3 ships tend to linger?

Thanks.

By **Jeremy Gray (Gray)** ON Tuesday, February 18, 2003 - 03:50 pm: [Edit](#)

Just to follow up on SVCs post about five-stars.

[Moved to Military History thread by author, don't need to clutter up the PD topic with military history stuff]

<http://www.starfleetgames.com/discus/messages/25/91.html?1045603997>

By **Robert Herneson (Rherneson)** ON Tuesday, February 18, 2003 - 05:00 pm: [Edit](#)

A factor to keep in mind, besides the war/conflict factor is also the issue that prior to Y160 exploration was a significant part of a ships duty. Maybe not like TOS's 5 year mission, but there were areas to be mapped, both big & small, infrastructure to lay and so on.

A captain might hold his posting longer due to missions being longer than our modern navy deals with.

Thoughts...

By **Jeremy Gray (Gray)** ON Tuesday, February 18, 2003 - 05:30 pm: [Edit](#)

I agree Robert. If a ship was to be assigned to a five year exploration mission it would seem reasonable that would retain its senior officers for much longer. High rotation rates are possible in the US Navy because we are deployed for six months, then spend 12-18 months getting ready to deploy again. This gives

everyone a chance to get familiar with the ship before it sails into harms way...including new captains. While some officer replacement would obviously occur on a five year mission, it is really not possible for ships to conduct what we in the Navy would think of as a training cycle. Our COs and XO's almost never turn-over while deployed to maintain command continuity (other officers do turn-over while deployed more often). I doubt Starfleet would be any different.

Makes since.

By **John Kasper (Jvontr)** ON Tuesday, February 18, 2003 - 05:59 pm: [Edit](#)

From various websites: The Stargazer was under the command of Captain Jean-Luc Picard from 2333 to 2355 on a historic mission of deep-space exploration, prior to his assignment to the Enterprise-D.

The Constellation class ships are defined to be deep space explorers.

Was Picard then a Captaion for 22 years?!

By **Jeremy Gray (Gray)** ON Tuesday, February 18, 2003 - 06:29 pm: [Edit](#)

No wonder he's bald! If I was Captain for that long I'd lose all my hair too!

By **Garth L. Getgen (Sgt. G)** ON Tuesday, February 18, 2003 - 07:57 pm: [Edit](#)

Mike,

"I my assumption correct? Is it "normal" for an SFB captain to retain command of his ship for an extended period of time? Or is there a combination where captains of SC4 ships move through quickly, but captains of SC3 ships tend to linger?"

Well, when I said that a full-bird (O-6) can make one-star in two or three years, you must also remember the promotion rates are very low. Ergo, it's possible and very likely for someone to max out at O-5 or O-6 and stay there for eight to ten years, if not more, before hitting manditory retirement. Those that make two- or three-stars are recongized and groomed when they're O-3s, thus make rank fairly quickly. Same with enlisted ranks ... one must start working for E-9 when still a junior E-5. I ddin't do that, so I know I'm pretty much maxed out at E-7. And I'm perfectly OK with that.

Garth L. Getgen

By **Garth L. Getgen (Sgt. G)** ON Tuesday, February 18, 2003 - 08:01 pm: [Edit](#)

John K. "Was Picard then a Captain for 22 years?!"

While he was a captain of a ship, did he hold the rank of Captain (O-6) when he commanded the STARGAZER?? {Hey, that's my old CB handle!!!!!!} Or was he a Commander (O-5) back then??

Garth L. Getgen

By [Frank DeMaris \(Kemariss\)](#) ON Tuesday, February 18, 2003 - 08:23 pm: [Edit](#)

Considering that the Stargazer was (look at the warp nacelles) a very old HDW then he might easily have been an O-5.

By [Peter Miller \(Thegolem\)](#) ON Tuesday, February 18, 2003 - 09:46 pm: [Edit](#)

[all info from the Star Trek Encyclopedia]

Picard graduated from the Academy in 2327 (O-1), and in 2335 was a Lieutenant on board the Stargazer when its captain was killed. For this, he was 'offered command of the Stargazer'. He was definitely a Captain by the time of the Stargazer's destruction in 2355. Also, the Stargazer clearly returned to the core worlds of the Federation at semi-regular intervals, because Picard had a romantic relationship with Jenice Manheim which ended in 2342, seven years after being given command of the Stargazer.

Is there any real-world military precedent for being promoted two or more grades at once, perhaps for an act of extreme heroism, courage, skill, etc.?

By [Robert Hernesson \(Rhernesson\)](#) ON Tuesday, February 18, 2003 - 10:40 pm: [Edit](#)

Allow me to clarify the question of TNG's layout.

IGNORE IT.

Riker was XO for what, 4 years and he's getting pressed to move up or out, but Picard hangs out as Captain for *20 years*? Or that Picard goes from Lieutenant directly to Captain, collecting \$200 as he passed Go?

Even if you allow that fleet gave command to an officer who could manage to only achieve Lieutenant in eight years, *maybe* that he got a promotion to Lt. Commander when he took over Stargazer, this whole scenario is still hard to believe.

TNG is, in my opinion and experience, a highly spurious source for basing design off of. I suggest we really don't consider it, especially in this matter. And, as noted before, "... The Next Generation is not within the scope of the Star Fleet Universe."

By [Richard Wells \(Rwwells\)](#) ON Tuesday, February 18, 2003 - 10:53 pm: [Edit](#)

There are historical examples of officers jumping multiple grades at once, though I can't imagine that happening in the highly bureaucratic TNG universe. More fun are Kirk style rapid rank fluctualations; for example, Milton Miles went from Commander USN in 1943 to Lieutant General* to Captain to Commodore to Rear Admiral back down to Captain in 1946 before finally retiring as a Vice Admiral.

* That rank occurred while assigned to SACO and was Chinese(KMT). He retained

the US Naval ranks as well.

By **Jeremy Gray (Gray)** ON Tuesday, February 18, 2003 - 11:11 pm: [Edit](#)

In peacetime, spot promotions do occur if a junior officer is taking a job that requires an officer (by regulation) to be of a particular rank. Usually this is a "frocking", or promotion to the higher rank without the accompanying increase in pay. These spot promotions require approval from VERY high-up in the military hierarchy and tend to be pretty rare. This more like an "early promotion" and advancing more than one rank is almost unheard of. In my experience, I've only seen it in the junior officer ranks - going from O2 to O3 in the cases I've seen.

Battlefield promotions tend to be a different matter, where the urgency of the situation requires the immediate replacement of someone in a leadership position to get the job done.

By **Gary Plana (Garyplana)** ON Wednesday, February 19, 2003 - 12:32 am: [Edit](#)

If you want an USAF example, Jack O'Neill has been stuck at O6 for nine or ten years and has NO hope for promotion. And he's even regenerated once in that time!

(running away, very very fast)

By **Garth L. Getgen (Sgt. G)** ON Wednesday, February 19, 2003 - 12:34 am: [Edit](#)

Robert H. "an officer who could manage to only achieve Lieutenant in eight years" ... if you re-read what Jeremy and I said before, at eight years of service one would expect to be an LT (Navy O-3). That would be the extreme earliest one might get a Below-the-Zone promotion to O-4.

The Navy routinely frocks enlisted to allow them to start wearing the next rank if they're listed in the promotion selection list. And I've heard that all branches used to frock one-stars to two, and two-stars to three, if they were stationed at the Pentagon ... for obvious political reasons. Don't know if they still do that.

Except for war time, I have never heard of anyone "jumping" a rank. Save for Doctors with specific medical specialities, I've heard that they can come in as an O-3 or even an O-4.

Remember the ST:NTG episode "Lower Decks" where the three Ensigns were all competing for a promotion to LT-jg?? The way >>I<< view that is it was NOT the standard promotion system; rather each major command (and the E. is large enough to be a "command" for this) is allowed one early promotion slot. Note that Dr. Crusher said she submitted the nurse for a promotion as well, but she (the nurse) didn't seem to be competing with the other three? I would say that, as medical staff, she fell under Star Fleet Medical Command for this promotion, not the E's command.

Garth L. Getgen

By **Mike West (Mjwest)** ON Wednesday, February 19, 2003 - 12:45 am: [Edit](#)

Robert: While I completely agree with your assessment of TNG's usability, SFB is not without its own whoppers. Have you ever looked at Kosnett's career?

He graduated in Y155, gained command of the Kongo in Y160(!) and stayed captain of the Kongo until Y184 when he moved on to a CX and the Flying Squadron of X-ships.

By **David Lang (Dlang)** ON Wednesday, February 19, 2003 - 12:57 am: [Edit](#)

there are many reasons why someone can make it to O6 and no further. General rank is VERY political.

also the 'up or out' policy that the US military operates under is relatively new and it's not unreasonable to think that it may go away in the future.

By **David Kass (Dkass)** ON Wednesday, February 19, 2003 - 01:40 am: [Edit](#)

I finally got around to reading the actual GPD rules and I have no GURPS experience. There are several parts that are confusing to me. I apologize if I've just missed things.

First, what is DX, especially outside of combat (I read the description and it doesn't really mean anything to me)? I'll note I have somewhat the same problem with D&D Dex. Perhaps a couple of examples of when you'd have a player roll a success roll against DX (and not a skill or skill default). Or maybe another way to approach it is to describe the experiment(s) you'd conduct to determine a person's DX score.

I assume Intelligence (IQ) is intended to be roughly equivalent to the standard IQ (Intelligence Quotient) divided by 10 (as far as scaling goes).

I'm confused by what exactly the "Rule of Twelve" applies to. Is a correct application an Andorian's Faz sense (but checked against what attribute? DX?). What about a Cygnan (one with an IQ 8) using a natural (hard?) science they don't actually have (ie the IQ-6 default--is his target $12-6+4$ (racial bonus) = 10? Or would it be $8-6+4 = 6$?). Does it apply to straight ability rolls? Ie a ST roll to shove open a door?

I'm not clear on how to cost skills when building a character. Does the character have to pay for skills point by point or just the cost of their target. For example, a human with an IQ of 12 wants Computer Operations (at their current TL, Mental/Easy) at 14, what would they pay? 4 points? Or 7.5 points? Or something else (since there is no cost listed for the skill levels below $IQ-1 = 11$)? Furthermore, what about getting skills at levels that aren't listed on the table (ie below the ones listed)? Are they free? Take the same case above but this time at

skill 10, what is the cost? While the chart implies 0, I'm guessing that's not correct. Note that if the character didn't take the skill, it would default to skill 8 (IQ-4), thus if the cost is 0, the character could get 2 free levels over default (and since this would be true for all characters, wouldn't everyone do it? And it seems to apply for a fair number of skills--I wouldn't want to go through listing them all explicitly).

I'm also having a difficult time seeing what a given skill level corresponds to (for example, what would a professional in a field be expected to have for their primary skill, take a programmer)? Based on the skill rolls, I'm gussing at least 14, with 16 being expected for someone with experience... Or is should the values be more like 12 and 14 (or 15)?

By **George M. Ebersole (George)** ON Wednesday, February 19, 2003 - 01:47 am: [Edit](#)

DK; I haven't RP'd since my college days in the late 80's (Traveller), but I'd guess that DX stands for dexterity; a measure of one's physical coordination.

I can't really help you on the other questions. I only bought the thing as source material for fiction.

By **Richard Wells (Rwwells)** ON Wednesday, February 19, 2003 - 03:35 am: [Edit](#)

David: I will focus on full GURPS rather than the GPD Lite version, since I know full GURPS better.

DX is agility. The most common examples of rolling against DX out of combat are dodging traps or grabbing objects without having them move excessively.

IQ is both intelligence and education. Children have lower GURPS IQ values though they should have the same Benet IQ number through their lives. This does lead (by literal reading of GURPS rules) to 8 year olds that can not find the corner bodega.

Rule of 12: this is historically one of GURPS more poorly defined areas. The rule is supposed to make the character never have a roll below 12 for a racial advantages, if the relevent stat for the race is less than 12. It only applies to racial advantages that require rolls, though some GURPS products have expanded that to innate racial skills or even skills applied to a racial advantage. Raw attribute rolls like ST rolls don't get the bonus.

Faz is rolled against IQ; a character with IQ of 8 (either young or mentally challenged) with racial Faz would roll against a 12. Another character with IQ 13 rolls against a 13.

The Cygnan with IQ 8 should roll against a 6; rolling against skill not the advantage. (Actually not even that high, since racial bonuses don't work on default skills CI177.)

Skills are listed at the total cost for buying up to that point. Use the difference in values to move up a point. With M/E skill you listed, IQ+2 costs 4 points with going to IQ+3 costing an extra 2 points.

Skill levels: There have been lengthy flame wars on various GURPS fora regarding what skill level indicates competence. These often show differences in GMs assigning skill modifiers. Most job tables indicate a skill between 12 and 14 are the minimums needed to work at most jobs; some jobs have additional higher skilled variations in addition to a version requiring skill 12-14. If the character does not have at least 12 in the relevant skills, the character is probably underskilled. Check the character story for low skilled characters; the concept may fly even if the character should have much more knowledge.

By **Robert Hernesson (Rhernesson)** ON Wednesday, February 19, 2003 - 04:15 am: [Edit](#)

Gary; LOL!!

Garth; Good points, but it has always seemed that the Trek universe was more direct in its ranks, less uppers & lowers & classes, but I could be very wrong. It is clear that (from your medical personel example) it is a Hollywood understanding of command structure.

Mike; I seemed to have missed that one. Hmmm... STEVE!!!!!! 😊

David Kass; Hang in there.

R

By **Robert Hernesson (Rhernesson)** ON Thursday, February 20, 2003 - 05:49 pm: [Edit](#)

Mike,

(See the disclaimer above.)

I'd suggest that the following skills (in addition or as an increase to skills from prior training) would be required for any Command grade officer in the UFP Starfleet;

- 12 - Beam Weapon (Phaser pistol)
- 10 - Mechanic (Warp drive) [Naval only]
- 10 - Mechanic (Impulse drive)
- 12 - Electronics Operation (Computers)
- 12 - Electronics Operation (Sensors)
- 12 - Electronics Operation (Hand Weapons) [Marine only]
- 12 - Gunnery (Ships weapons - Phasers) [Naval only]
- 12 - Gunnery (Ships weapons - PhoTorps) [Naval only]
- 12 - Gunnery (Vehicle Mounted Weapons- Phasers) [Marine only]
- 12 - Gesture [Marine only]

- 12 - Computer Operation
- 12 - Astrogation [Naval only]
- 10 - History
- 10 - Psychology
- 12 - Administration
- 10 - Diplomacy
- 12 - Leadership
- 12 - Strategy (Space)
- 12 - Strategy (Land) [Marine only]
- 12 - Tactics
- 12 - Tactics (Naval) [Naval only]
- 10 - Pilot (Shuttle) (12 for Marine / Carrier Cmd)
- 10 - Pilot (Starship)
- 10 - Area Knowledge (Galaxy)
- 12 - Law

I would also suggest at least 2 levels of the advantage Strong Will to reflect Command Conditioning.

Some notes:

At TL9+ Computer Operations is an almost unused skill by civilians, but I think that Military personal will still need to have the skill to reflect that they do more with computers than just the equivalent of a civilian going to an ATM.

Jeremy's post points out that the path to command goes through other areas, Engineering being most common.

The specializations in Strategy & Tactics come from the full GURPS Basic Rules and Compendium I.

Law will be required for both military and civilian reasons. There are occasions where a ship captain is also the military governor and representative ambassador for the UFP by the fact he is the highest ranking government official in the area. The '10' scores above should most likely be 12s but I left some fudge room.

Robert

By **Robert Snook (Verdick)** ON Thursday, February 20, 2003 - 07:08 pm: [Edit](#)

The computer nerds of the 9th Time Line would beg to differ with you on the suggestion that computer operations are unused outside of the military.

By **Robert Hernesson (Rhernesson)** ON Thursday, February 20, 2003 - 07:30 pm: [Edit](#)

Again, another direct application, but also, would they really or would they have advanced enough systems that they themselves wouldn't be involved with the system but instead with the operating system? They may be 'expert users', so to speak'.

Even still, the percent of the population that qualifies as true computer nerd still fills the requirement of "an almost unused skill" when applied to the general populous, imo.

It is not brought up in GPD, and the only reason I mention it is to show that 'heroes' are usually the exception. NPCs in most cases may not have that skill.

R

By **Robert Snook (Verdick)** ON Friday, February 21, 2003 - 12:15 pm: [Edit](#)

I am thinking of today's ratio of computer experts in the military versus outside the military. The private sector, in my opinion, has more experts than the military. Why would that change just because the tech level has? The private sector businesses would be driving a large portion of technology. The tech levels describe technology in terms of weaponry and propulsion, but they also indicate the rest of the technology level. That is where the civilian experts come into play. And since not everybody who touches the stuff is an expert, there will be plenty of people who know what to do, hence having the skill.

By **Richard Brown (Richardb)** ON Friday, February 21, 2003 - 02:09 pm: [Edit](#)

I think a stumbling block to understanding here is the difference between computer operation and computer programming. Computer operation is the skill of knowing how to use the operating system, today it is most commonly learned in tech support and few laymen have it, in or out of the military. Computer programming is learned only by computer programmers which are almost always civilian since the military contracts such work out. Gurps TL default assumption is that by TL 9 (in about 50 to 100 years) computers will be so user friendly that most people will not need special skills to get them to do things so the skill will die out. This assumption seems to be accurate for Trek and presumably SFU since they operate the computers by talking to them. I would expect in the SFU that Computer Programming would be a skill in high demand in and out of the military, but the only people who would know computer operation would be those who need computers to do unusual things like overriding safety protocols and so on. I would expect the demand for such skills would only exist in espionage, crime, law enforcement and the military.

By **Alex Chobot (Alendrel)** ON Friday, February 21, 2003 - 02:21 pm: [Edit](#)

Or to put it another way, using modern day Windows machines:

If you want to connect to a website, download an image, and insert it into a document you then send via e-mail, that's a no-skill operation.

If you need to edit your registry to get rid of invasive spyware, then use Hardware manager to figure out why your sound card isn't working, that's Computer Operation.

If you want to write a trainer utility for WarCraft III or crack the copy protection inherent to Windows XP, that's Computer Programming.

By **Robert Hernesson (Rhernesson)** ON Friday, February 21, 2003 - 02:44 pm: [Edit](#)

Exactly. See the earlier message about the difference between the various Electronics skills as a similar case.

By **Mike West (Mjwest)** ON Friday, February 21, 2003 - 02:52 pm: [Edit](#)

Alex,

That is a great discription of the distinction between those three items.

But I have one follow-on question: Where does Electronics Operation (Computers) fit in there? What does it allow that Computer Operation does not?

Thanks.

By **Alex Chobot (Alendrel)** ON Friday, February 21, 2003 - 03:00 pm: [Edit](#)

That's always been one of the grey areas for me, as well. I'll add that to my list, but off-the-cuff, I always imagined Electronics Operations (Computers) to handle systems with more specialized functions and interfaces, while Computer Operation covers general use computers. If that makes much sense.

By **Mike West (Mjwest)** ON Friday, February 21, 2003 - 03:01 pm: [Edit](#)

Robert,

That is pretty close to the list I generated for myself. (Though I only did the naval version.) I had two main differences:

- I would use the DamCon requirements rather than Engineering. I don't know what happens today, but in Trek/SFB it appears that very, very few (if any) command candidates come through Engineering.

From what I can tell, Engineering is a guarantee (or close to one) that an officer will NOT reach command.

I would think that the vast majority of command candidates would come from Helm/Nav, Operations, Weapons and, maybe, Science. The others look like they are "dead ends" for those who don't qualify (or don't want) to be a command candidate.

- I would expect that the command candidate fully meet the requirements of one of the ProCerts. I would expect that before an officer becomes a command candidate, he or she must prove themselves as a department head first.

By **Mike West (Mjwest)** ON Friday, February 21, 2003 - 03:19 pm: [Edit](#)

Alex,

Until someone pointed out that their difficulty levels differ, I had assumed that they were the same.

I guess the way I would distinguish between them is this:

NoSkill: Do default usage of imbedded computers. E.g. all the voice stuff we see on TV: "Computer, do this or that or whatever ..." I also think that unless the computer system provides a pure verbal interface layer, your example would require CompOp skill to perform.

CompOp: This allows the normal use of complex computer systems and programs. E.g. using Word to make a full Document (including all formatting).

EIOp(Comp): This allows the exceptional use of computers and programs. So those examples you gave for CompOp would actually require EIOp(Comp). While CompOp will let you use the computer, EIOp lets you tweek the computer for better performance, tweek the programs for additional capabilities, etc. This probably also allows the construction of a computer from components (i.e. case, power, motherboard, CPU, video card, OS media, etc.).

Elect(Comp): This allows you to modify the computer. Given the right tools, this allows the construction of a computer from PARTS (i.e. resistors, wafer boards, etc.).

CompProg: This allows you to modify programs. Given the right tools you can create new programs, modify/hack existing ones, modify/hack the OS, etc.

By **Alex Chobot (Alendrel)** ON Friday, February 21, 2003 - 03:25 pm: [Edit](#)

Mike> I'll double check Basic Set when I get home, but I believe GURPS assumes "no Comp Op for standard use" as off the modern day. Basically, CompOp becomes unnecessary when computers reach the point of being a ubiquitous tool. Such that doing a fully fleshed out Word document would be more a matter of Writing (for the content) and Professional Skill: Desktop Publishing or Graphics Design to make it actually look good. The ability to push things around in Word itself is assumed.

By **Robert Hernesson (Rhernesson)** ON Friday, February 21, 2003 - 06:50 pm: [Edit](#)

Mike, it's outta UT1, p29, 'Using Computers'. Also, don't forget that another reason CompOp may become a less common skill is voice recognition tech.

By **Andrew Harding (Warlock)** ON Friday, February 21, 2003 - 07:12 pm: [Edit](#)

My take:

Using basic programs (email, simple word processing & spreadsheets, etc) is included as part of Literacy at TL 8+. If a player really wanted, I would allow "not computer literate" as a small disadvantage, around 5 points. (Same as semi-literate - computer use at TL 8 is easily as important as reading is at TL 5).

"Advanced user" word processing et al uses Computer Operation OR the appropriate professional skill. (eg. Accounting-TL 8 would include use of Excel,

but not PaintShop).

Basic OS tasks (eg. defrag the drive by running a utility, setting up simple scripts) use Computer Operation.

Writing those utilities or modify existing ones would need computer programming.

Fixing hardware conflicts would be Electronics Op (Comp Sys).

By **David Kass (Dkass)** ON Friday, February 21, 2003 - 09:09 pm: [Edit](#)

Robert and Mike, have you compared the above list to the requirements for a Legendary Captain (in the ship combat section)? While the levels will obviously be much higher, I'd expect the list of required skills to be about right. (No I don't have my GPD copy in front of me, so I can't do the comparison).

By **David Kass (Dkass)** ON Friday, February 21, 2003 - 10:55 pm: [Edit](#)

Richard Brown (and others), from my experience, anyone with significant Computer Programming skills is probably going to have some Computer Operation skills (for any of the definitions used). This is necessary to write good programs (in many fields, but not all--but enough that anyone hoping to work as a programmer is going to be severely limited if they don't have the skill). It is important to make the code work well and often to figure out what unusual problems are (both in debugging the code and in making it work in less than ideal situations).

Computer Ops is generally taught in any computer science curriculum that leads to programmers. I don't see this changing with time. So any character who learned Computer Programming in a formal setting is almost certainly going to have some level of Computer Ops as well. I'd guess a BS would computer programming at IQ+2 and computer ops at IQ (giving 12 and 10 for average human IQ). Now someone who has followed an unusual path might not have above default Computer Ops (or if they learned on a different type of system).

By **David Kass (Dkass)** ON Friday, February 21, 2003 - 11:00 pm: [Edit](#)

Richard, thank you for the answers. I was surprised by your implication that IQ 8 was very low (childlike) since GPD indicated that human normal (presumably adult) is the range 8 to 12 (average 10).

Also, you didn't address the issue of wanting a skill at a level below those listed with point values on the cost table. From my original message:

Quote:

Furthermore, what about getting skills at levels that aren't listed on the table (ie below the ones listed)? Are they free? Take the same case

above [IQ=12 Computer Ops Mental/Easy) but this time at skill 10, what is the cost? While the chart implies 0, I'm guessing that's not correct. Note that if the character didn't take the skill, it would default to skill 8 (IQ-4), thus if the cost is 0, the character could get 2 free levels over default (and since this would be true for all characters, wouldn't everyone do it? And it seems to apply for a fair number of skills--I wouldn't want to go through listing them all explicitly).

By **Richard Wells (Rwwells)** ON Saturday, February 22, 2003 - 12:01 am: [Edit](#)

David: The child comparison is in Basic Set page 14. The IQ incorporates education into it. A young child, no matter how intelligent, is unlikely to be a knowledgeable prospector or zoologist. So, rather than create an endless number of special cases, GURPS simplifies the issue by giving a low IQ number which makes most skill defaults work well. Does mean some character concept can not be built without major house rules but few actually play those characters.

Regarding having a skill between the default level and the 100 hour (1/2 point) level, standard GURPS does not let you do that. The Incompetence quirk does allow for a character below default level. A common house rule is to charge 1/2 point, give the character the preferred lower value, but let the character easily jump up to the paid for level.

By **David Kass (Dkass)** ON Saturday, February 22, 2003 - 12:11 am: [Edit](#)

Richard, thanks for the latter explanation. Perhaps I just missed it in GPD. I noticed the issue since I've played with a number of min/maxers before and look for loopholes like that. It didn't help that the test character I was building (see my example--a computer programmer) actually was looking at the situation, I'll just charge him the 1/2 point and bump the Computer Ops up to 11...

By **Robert Hernesson (Rhernesson)** ON Saturday, February 22, 2003 - 12:11 am: [Edit](#)

Also, please note the defaults, skill difficulties, and prereqs. You must have CompOps before you can buy CompProg. CompOps has a default of IQ-4, CompProg has none. Please make sure to use the skill description as a guide, not an interpretation.

By **Richard Wells (Rwwells)** ON Saturday, February 22, 2003 - 12:14 am: [Edit](#)

David Kass: GURPS lists Computer Operations as a prerequisite for Computer Programming so characters will need 12 in Comp Op before starting to learn programming. Seems workable to me.

I tend to view default skills differently than others. I expect much computer usage ability would be ingrained into Literacy in the future, same as the ability to use an inkwell without making a mess was in the Victorian era.

By **David Kass (Dkass)** ON Saturday, February 22, 2003 - 12:42 am: [Edit](#)

Robert, I don't understand your last statement at all. Are you saying there is something in the two skill descriptions that requires a character to actually buy points in CompOps before they can buy any points in CompProg? If so, I certainly don't recall anything like that in GPD (I'll have to check more carefull--I could have just missed it since I'm trying to absorb everything from scratch).

Or are you saying that because CompOps has a default value, all characters will have some CompOps ability, including one who buys CompProg? If so, yes I was aware of that. But IQ-4 for an important skill for a job seems very low. Unless I misunderstood how things work, with an IQ of 10 (human average), this defaults CompOps to a 6, or less than a 10% chance of success for a normal difficulty task. From experience (I did a CS degree and several years of internship and still program), I'd suggest a CompOps 10 (50% chance of success) as being about the minimum level. 50% chance to solve the problem first off, add in some references, a search of possibilities (I'd call it +2, -1 for a second attempt) for a ~60% chance, and then call in the "guy down the hall" for him to take a shot (another 50% chance, say). Or a total chance of over 90% of solving the problem...

By **Richard Wells (Rwwells)** ON Saturday, February 22, 2003 - 01:07 am: [Edit](#)

David: The use of prerequisite skills are in full GURPS but were dropped from GURPS Lite. Only a handful of non-magical skills fall into this category and most players will buy both skills anyway.

Every prerequisite skill has to be at 12 before the later skills can be learned. The magic system is built around this but I can't think of another skill outside of the Computer Operation - Computer Programming pair that requires prerequisites.

By **David Kass (Dkass)** ON Saturday, February 22, 2003 - 01:19 am: [Edit](#)

And guess what? I'd go pick the one example where GURPS Lite is on thin ice... OK now your statements make sense (as do Robert's). I wonder if the simpler solution for GPD would have been to give CompOps a default of CompProg at -3 (or whatever works well). Sure its a free point or two, but it keeps the link between the two skills.

I suppose it isn't really a big deal--it'd take someone (GM or player) with serious programming skills to spot the problem. And now that I'm aware of it, I can just enforce it informally (when I'm a GM and by default as a player).

Thanks again for all the clarifications.

By **Mike West (Mjwest)** ON Saturday, February 22, 2003 - 11:17 am: [Edit](#)

David,

You can't really use the Legendary Captain as a reference for a command officer's skill requirements. The reason is because of the SFB rule that allows a captain to perform the roll of any other officer. That means the captain must be legendary in

every position, not just "captaincy".

Again, my goal is to create a ship captain of rank Commander for 150 points. If that's not possible, that's fine. But that is what I am trying to do.

By **David Lang (Dlang)** on Saturday, February 22, 2003 - 08:14 pm: [Edit](#)

if you are talking about the captain of a police ship during wartime when they are deperatly short of qualified people then you could do it with 150 points.

but remember that the normal characters are 125 points and they are a LONG way behind a captain in terms of the training and responsibilities, somehow 25 points just doesn't seem enough to cover it.

look at all the differnt skills and I think you will find that you need 175-200 points (for a full captain, a commander filling the role isn't really qualified and can get away with a little less).

I think the example of a legendary captain is the correct thing to look at. if the legendary captain can fill in for any other officer and get legendary status it makes sense that a normal captain can fill in well enough to be considered competent.

By **David Lang (Dlang)** on Saturday, February 22, 2003 - 08:17 pm: [Edit](#)

also remeber that getting good skills becomes MUCH cheaper if you have high stats to begin with, and given the relatively small number of ships compared to the size of the empires you would expect that only the best are picked to be captain

so rather than assuming that you ahve a INT of 10 and need to spend all the points to get those skills at 11-12 assum that you have a INT of 13-14 so you are buying all those skills for the minimum price to get stat-2

By **Richard Wells (Rwwells)** on Sunday, February 23, 2003 - 12:40 am: [Edit](#)

150 points is a good baseline for Captain. One can expect the normal character to gain about 5 character points per year. 5 years from department head to ship command would give about 25 points, enough for increasing some skills and filling any skill holes.

This does not reflect the TV series Captain as polymath with many high skills, expert status in many academic fields, contacts in every port, and all the other items added to rapidly get the character into the action. But for a more realistic baseline template where the character might be expected to add more points for hobbies or specialties, 150 points should cover it.

By **Ken Humpherys (Pmthecat)** on Sunday, February 23, 2003 - 09:31 am: [Edit](#)

I found a strange thing about CompOp/Comp Prog. in Basic Gurps: Computer Programming requires you to get Computer Ops at 12 before you can learn programming. BUT, once you learn programming above 12, Computer Ops is now equal to your programming skill at no additional cost.

Another advantage to having Computer Ops is that it helps you run an unfamiliar system as you have been taught to look for the logic behind the "display". An example of this: Computer operators can often use a website that is written in a foreign language even though they do not know that language.

By **Mike West (Mjwest)** on Sunday, February 23, 2003 - 12:32 pm: [Edit](#)

David,

The Legendary Captain template is bad as a guideline for a Command ProCert because it requires things your "average" captain will not need to know.

A normal Captain will not need to know how to be a Ground Forces Officer, nor will they need to know how to be an Engineer, nor have the training of a Science Officer. Plus, while they will need to be able to operate most of the ship's systems, they will not need to know how to fix them.

The intent is not to create Kirk, Picard, Sisko or even Riker. The normal captain will not, as Richard said, have such a diversity of skills. They will have the skills necessary to do the jobs on the way up, and the skills to do the job now.

Also, as the normal captain of a war cruiser and smaller ship is a Commander, not a Captain, a Commander is not "filling the role", but is actually the intended captain.

Finally, the reason I was looking at 150 points is that gives a good "high point" value to go for. Remember that 100 is an "adventurer" level character. 200 just seems way too high, except for those "TV-style" characters.

By **David Lang (Dlang)** on Sunday, February 23, 2003 - 05:37 pm: [Edit](#)

on the way to being a captain the officer will serve a stint in most if not all of the other departments, thus will need skills in all areas (although the skill levels may vary greatly)

in GURPS standard characters are 100 points, but in GPD standard characters are 125 points, which is why I think an extra 25 points for the captain of a starship is cutting things a little close.

By **Jonathan McDermott (Caraig)** on Sunday, February 23, 2003 - 08:41 pm: [Edit](#)

David Lang,

That doesn't sound entirely plausible.

Assuming that there are four or five departments -- Deck, Ops, Weapons, Engineering, with a possible Flight dept. for ships with subordinate craft -- even in the modern maritime services there is not enough time in a career for an officer to go through each department from division officer up to department head, then to serve one or more XO stints before getting the Big Chair. (I have met many engineers, in fact, who would not trust anyone in charge of an engine room who had not ate, slept, and breathed engines since day one of their active career.) I imagine the situation is exacerbated for the SFU, where even with computers duties are much more complicated.

It is more likely that an officer will start in a single department as a division officer (say, photorp division, weapons department of a CA, if he graduated high in his class) in a given department and remain within that department right up until their XO tour. This lack of broad knowledge of other departments is ameliorated by education throughout the officer's career, starting with their OCS/Academy/SFROTC where they are given (for example) courses and texts in 'Weapons for the Engineering Cadet,' 'Engineering for the Deck Officer,' and so on.

As they reach XO, their duties involve less and less the specifics of each division's and even department's duties. For example, the XO may very well know what to do to overload the photorp launchers, but everyone from the photorp div officer to the Old Man/Old Woman will be damned if they're going to let the XO overload the photorps; it's not the XO's *job* to do it. A ship runs on the teamwork and trust of its officers; the captain and XO (and the Flag staff, if one is embarked) have to trust that Deck knows how to steer the ship, Ops can find the enemy effectively before the enemy locks on to them, Engineering can keep the ship moving, and Weapons can blow the enemy out of the stars. This is why, when a captain no longer trusts one of the officers, that dramatically deleterious effects can happen to the ship's effectiveness, and the captain does everything possible to get that officer off of the ship. (And knowing the interpersonal politics of some services, drummed out of the service, as well. Though it can be argued that if you have a personal problem with your captain that damages his trust in you, you really shouldn't have gotten in that position in the first place.)

An XO does not need to know what it means to be a department head for each department, and certainly doesn't need to have stood a division officer stint in each division, either; if that was the case, captains would be fifty-sixty years old when they finally took command of a major combatant. It is enough that the skipper and the XO know who to tell what in order to get things done, and let the department heads and the division officers do their jobs, though both these two worthies need, at the beginning of their career, the experience of being at the lowest rungs, before they are trusted with increasingly greater responsibilities..

Not, of course, that anything I say I will gladly allow to be trumped by SVC/SPP or anyone who has served on a surface or submarine unit. =D

By **David Lang (Dlang)** ON Sunday, February 23, 2003 - 08:50 pm: [Edit](#)

I didn't say that the captain went through each department up to department head, just that he served a stint in each department.

this will mean that he was a O-1 in some department and a O-4 when he served in another department so his skills in each department may vary, but he will have at least the minimum skills for working in each department (if a skill of 12 is the minimum to be a professional in that field the department heads are going to have skills significantly higher then that, but even the most junior officer will have skills of 11+ in these areas, almost certinly 12+ by the end of their stint, at least if the person is good enough to be on the fast track to captain)

By **David Lang (Dlang)** ON Sunday, February 23, 2003 - 08:50 pm: [Edit](#)

also anyone with an acadamy background may have 'served' their stint in some of the fields while still in the acadamy

By **Alex Chobot (Alendrel)** ON Sunday, February 23, 2003 - 09:24 pm: [Edit](#)

Also, a fair chunk of the LegCap ability to act as the other LegOffs is likely inspirational, rallying the department, and the like.

By **David Kass (Dkass)** ON Sunday, February 23, 2003 - 09:51 pm: [Edit](#)

One reason the Captain may have to have all the skills is to account for casualties. Ships regularly fight with significant damage (and given that most ships have a multi box bridge the Captain may well survive bridge damage). Thus the captain (and XO probably) is going to have to be able to assume the bridge duties of at least any bridge officer.

Note that I'm talking here about a peacetime Federation officer. Other races and wartime will have different requirements (many of the secondary skills will probably not be emphasized, but the character may be expected to have higher levels of "combat" skills).

I could see a regular Captain lacking one concentration of a Legendary Captain (ie no engineering or no science, or maybe no ground combat), but no more. A Commander might also have some of the "command" specific skills a bit weak (eg law). I vaguely recall someone trying to build Kirk et al. and ending up with 250+ point characters.

By **Matthew Pulido (Talison)** ON Friday, March 14, 2003 - 09:43 pm: [Edit](#)

Thumbing through my GPD today and noticed something that caught me as odd. Vulcans have one level of extended lifespan. They have no levels of early maturation.

According to Gurps Compendium, this means that a Vulcan does not reach physical maturity and become "legal" (our 18 year old equivalent)until the age of 36.

This means Spock would not have been able to enter Star Fleet Academy until he was about 36. This would make his mother around the age of 60+ in "Journey to Babel" and well over 70 in Star Trek 4.

I was always under the assumption that Kirk and Spock were near the same age.

Is this accurate? Do they mature slower than us in addition to having longer lives?

By **Alex Chobot (Alendrel)** ON Friday, March 14, 2003 - 10:52 pm: [Edit](#)

That is correct (unless SVC rules otherwise).

Keep in mind that, with the aging benefits afforded by the high tech level, Spock's mother could very easily be 60 or 70 and just as hale and healthy as she appeared.

By **Steve Cole (Stevecole)** ON Saturday, March 15, 2003 - 12:42 am: [Edit](#)

Hadn't noticed. Probably should have had EM. Nobody else noticed either. Too late to fix it now.

By **Gary Plana (Garyplana)** ON Saturday, March 15, 2003 - 12:42 am: [Edit](#)

Matthew, one error re the above: Spock's mother Amanda is human, so she does not get the EL advantage. So her age is more 30~35-ish in "Journey To Babel."

IIRC it was mentioned in one of the paperbacks that her hair was prematurely white.

By **Matthew Pulido (Talison)** ON Saturday, March 15, 2003 - 12:48 am: [Edit](#)

"Matthew, one error re the above: Spock's mother Amanda is human, so she does not get the EL advantage. So her age is more 30~35-ish in "Journey To Babel.""

That's my point exactly. She couldn't be 30-35 ish if Spock had lived 36 years, entered the Academy, and had spent 18 years after that estranged from his father.

That's assuming she was in her early 20s at earliest when she had Spock.

By **David Kass (Dkass)** ON Saturday, March 15, 2003 - 12:52 am: [Edit](#)

With Spock being neither race, would he necessarily inherit the EL? Or if he did, might he have also ended up with an effective EM due to his human heritage?

By **Loren Knight (Loren)** ON Saturday, March 15, 2003 - 01:00 am: [Edit](#)

I can't recall where exactly I know this from but I believe Spock is older than Kirk but younger than McCoy who was in his 50s during the Five Year Mission.

By **Robert Herneson (Rherneson)** ON Saturday, March 15, 2003 - 01:14 am: [Edit](#)

Actually, from the other Trekish stuff we've seen, that may be close to accurate.

Remember that Spock is not true Vulcan; he is a Human - Vulcan genetic fusion. McCoy was noted on occasion as saying he was abnormal for either race. Additionally, Spock may well have entered the academy at an earlier age than a full Vulcan might have. He was the first Vulcan to enter Star Fleet Academy. Before anyone goes and has a snit and suggests we do something different in the SFU, may I suggest that prior to Spock entering the academy in ~135-140 it was the practice for Vulcans to attend the Vulcan Science academy, an institute that I am sure the Vulcans consider to offer superior training. Any Vulcans that wanted to enter Star Fleet after that were given an officer's commission based off of that degree, much like the US military does today with doctors and such.

Again, I'd like to make sure every is aware, as Alex pointed out, that the standard life span is different at TL10+. Please see Compendium II, p. 161.

R

By **Matthew Pulido (Talison)** ON Saturday, March 15, 2003 - 01:21 am: [Edit](#)

So, Steve, should we consider 1 level of Early Maturation to be in the Vulcan package?

By **Richard Wells (Rwwells)** ON Saturday, March 15, 2003 - 02:00 am: [Edit](#)

The current official Star Trek view is that Spock is 3 years older than Kirk with McCoy being 3 years older than Spock. Doesn't fit everything but what can one do. <http://startrek.com/library/individ.asp?ID=112508>

I would ignore the whole Spock as first Vulcan through Starfleet issue. Now, even seems to be first Vulcan in Starfleet, sigh. Star Trek writers have been too heavily focused on making characters unique by being first rather than being simply interesting. Just won't be fun setting a Y100 campaign but telling players they can't use a Vulcan unless we play a totally Vulcan ship.

For the SFU, we should have all officers receiving training from their racial academy until some years after the fleets are all combined. A unified Academy probably won't form until the unified Starfleet is proven to be workable. Conversely, the various National Guards would have to be limited in the number of graduates every year. Not sure it would matter enough to set up benchmarks as to when each race sends the bulk of its potential candidates to the combined Academy as opposed to local academies.

By **Matthew Pulido (Talison)** ON Saturday, March 15, 2003 - 02:05 am: [Edit](#)

Yeah, I hadn't thought about him being a hybrid effecting things.

However, by dates in The Star Trek Encyclopedia, Spock is indeed three years older than Kirk.

Kirk entered the Academy at 17, Spock at 22.

By **Robert Hernesson (Rhernesson)** ON Saturday, March 15, 2003 - 02:47 am: [Edit](#)

Watch as I take the 'first Vulcan in Starfleet' discussion to the General Discussion area....

--BAMF!--

By **Alex Chobot (Alendrel)** ON Saturday, March 15, 2003 - 10:31 am: [Edit](#)

Spock's version of the half-Vulcan racial package would have Early Maturation as well as Extended Lifespan.

Or maybe just Longevity.

By **Jeff Wile (Jswile)** ON Saturday, March 15, 2003 - 05:09 pm: [Edit](#)

Question: Wasn't Spock part of the Enterprise crew under Captain Christopher Pike in TOS first episode "The Menagerie?" Thinking it was 10 years before the events of "To Go Where No Man Has Gone Before" episode with the ship crossing the Galactic Energy Barrier? (might have been 25 years...it's been too long since I've seen either of the episodes)

By **Loren Knight (Loren)** ON Saturday, March 15, 2003 - 05:22 pm: [Edit](#)

He was Second Officer and Science Officer under Pike. He served with Pike for 10 years (two missions).

NCC-1701 is indeed an old ship.

By **Jeff Wile (Jswile)** ON Sunday, March 16, 2003 - 05:47 pm: [Edit](#)

She was!

(still, it's too bad about the licensing issues from Paramount. Seems like a whole line of ships in TOS-TNG-DS9-Voyager_Enterprise_multiverse that won't be able to see SFB print.)

So that means that Spock's mother's age at the time of Journey to Babel episode, she was something between 55 and 75 years old? (risking a nasty comment here) I must say she was a very attractive woman for her age!

By **Matthew Pulido (Talison)** ON Sunday, March 16, 2003 - 06:51 pm: [Edit](#)

According to DC Fontana's script for the episode, Spock's parents had been married some 38 years and Spock was supposed to be Leonard Nimoy's age at that point (37, I think).

My Star Trek Omnipedia points out that that fact did not make it into the final aired episode, but they take most of Fontana's work on Spock very seriously because she was the main one to develop him.

So... for what that's worth.

And yes, Amanda was an attractive older woman. I think she was still attractive in Star Trek 4. Some women never loose it. Must have been all that clean living on Vulcan.

By **Alex Chobot (Alendrel)** ON Sunday, March 16, 2003 - 07:22 pm: [Edit](#)

For some ideas of benchmarks, here's a rough on how the aging rules in GURPS works.

Starting at age 50, you make an aging roll every year. This increases to every 6 months at 70 and every 3 months at 90.

An age check basically involved rolling against HT for each attribute, with a failure causing a loss of a point or two. And, of course, if you fail the check on your HT, then you're more likely to fail the next set of rolls. If an attribute reaches zero, you die a natural death (though you are more likely to expire from some minor natural cause before then as you scores decline. The HT roll gets a modifier based on tech level.

In the main time frame of the SFU, at TL12, aging rolls start at 110, and accelerate at 130 and 150, and the HT rolls involved are made at HT+7.

So Spock's mother being in her 60s or 70s isn't all that much different, in terms of lifespan and health, than being 30 or 35.

By **Robert Herneson (Rherneson)** ON Sunday, March 16, 2003 - 10:23 pm: [Edit](#)

To add to Alex's explanation, Vulcans at TL10+ start aging rolls at 170, accelerating at 190 & 210.

By **Richard Brown (Richardb)** ON Friday, March 21, 2003 - 01:24 pm: [Edit](#)

I found a possible errata on one of the ISC races last night. The Q'naaib(? sorry I don't recall the spelling and don't have the book handy) are listed as 15 points total cost, but when I add up the cost of all the racial advantages and disads it comes out 5 points. Does my printing have a typo? I added it up three times so I'm fairly certain I didn't leave anything out.

By **Alex Chobot (Alendrel)** ON Friday, March 21, 2003 - 01:38 pm: [Edit](#)

Richard, you are correct on the math. I will dig in my notes later and see if I can find the point of discrepancy (I'm tempted to say that the Increased Life Support may have been dropped, as being Aneorobic already includes the penalties for not being able to handle standard campaign conditions in its cost), but for now the template package stands and the template cost should be 5 points.

By **Richard Brown (Richardb)** ON Friday, March 21, 2003 - 03:49 pm: [Edit](#)

OK. I was just wondering if my copy of the book had a misprint in a racial attribute

or something (like HT +1 where it should have been +2).

By **Alex Chobot (Alendrel)** ON Friday, March 21, 2003 - 04:31 pm: [Edit](#)

There's only been one print run of GPD, so if yours has a typo, all of ours do.

By **Richard Brown (Richardb)** ON Tuesday, April 08, 2003 - 05:47 pm: [Edit](#)

I can't seem to find a price listed for a transporter beacon, nor can I find a price or weight for the Klingon Sword. Am I not looking in the right place or have the values not been put into print yet?

By **Robert Herneson (Rherneson)** ON Friday, April 11, 2003 - 02:49 am: [Edit](#)

Well, let me take an unofficial swag at the sword at least. There is a lot more to be said on this, but for now, try these stats:

Type Dam

Cut sw+6

imp thr+6

(I recommend dropping the +6 & adding a die)

Reach: 1,2 (unbalanced weapon if used for range 2)

Cost: \$500

Weight: 8#

Min ST: 11

Notes: This is a 'Super Fine' blade (will not break on parry, though your house rules will cause your performance to vary), adjusted for TL 10+. See additional rules GPD p. 75.

By **Alex Chobot (Alendrel)** ON Friday, April 11, 2003 - 08:03 am: [Edit](#)

Let me confer with Gary on the Transporter Beacon.

Robert, the Klingon sword is listed on p. 90, and just needs a weight and price. I'll sit down this weekend and try to reverse engineer where the sword came from and what those should be.

By **Richard Brown (Richardb)** ON Friday, April 11, 2003 - 12:45 pm: [Edit](#)

BTW are the listed stats for the Klingon Sword a "traditional" version W/O such options as vibroblade or monomolecular edge. If so, do such options exist in SFU and would SFU Klingons use them?

By **Robert Herneson (Rherneson)** ON Friday, April 11, 2003 - 02:19 pm: [Edit](#)

Oops, sorry, that was a different Klingon Sword I was thinking of.

By **Alex Chobot (Alendrel)** ON Friday, April 11, 2003 - 02:26 pm: [Edit](#)

Richard, correct, those are non-vibro/mono stats/ I'll have to confer with SVC on whether those technologies exist in the SFU.

Robert, no prob



Working on the TB.

By **Matthew Pulido (Talison)** ON Wednesday, May 07, 2003 - 07:12 pm: [Edit](#)

Question about Klingons. I'm looking at their racial package, they have both Early Maturation and Short Lifespan.

When do they reach maturity? With one level of Short Lifespan it's 13 years. With one level of Early Maturation you half the age so normally it's 18 halved to 9.

Or do the two combine to half the Short Lifespan age from 13 to 6.5?

By **Richard Brown (Richardb)** ON Thursday, May 08, 2003 - 01:30 pm: [Edit](#)

I'm not an authority on the rules, but I would say since the racial package has both they combine.

By **Nick G. Blank (Nickgb)** ON Thursday, May 08, 2003 - 04:10 pm: [Edit](#)

I don't think they combine, since Klingons mature in their teens, not at 6 and a half years old. When a human (age 18-19 or so) is entering starfleet academy, a klingon of that age would be graduating from their equivalent training program.

But I am also not a rules expert, I am just pretty sure the above is how the background has been written before.

By **Matthew J. Francois (Francois42)** ON Monday, July 14, 2003 - 04:52 pm: [Edit](#)

Quick verification with regards to character creation:
Racial disadvantages do NOT count against the -40 point limit for disadvantages. Disadvantages selected as part of a character template, such as the Star Fleet Academy academy template, DO count against the -40 point limit for disadvantages.

Am I correct?

-Francois

matthewfrancois@charter.net

By **Steven E. Ehrbar (See)** ON Monday, July 14, 2003 - 07:04 pm: [Edit](#)

Mr. Francois:

Yes, at least under the standard GURPS rules. Racial disads do not count against the -40 limit, while character template disads do.

Mr. Pulido:

Under the standard GURPS rules, Short Lifespan and Early Maturation *are* cumulative. I would recommend, given the SFU background, that you ignore the Early Maturation and cut the racial package price to 37 points.

Other wonky maturation bits seem to exist in the Seltorian section. Specifically, since they mature at the same rate as Workers, Seltorian Experts need 4 levels of Early Maturation. Assuming the males (Rams and Sages) mature at the same rate, Sages also need 4 levels. Rams can be ignored as unplayable (they're hard to model anyway.)

By **Richard Brown (Richardb)** ON Monday, July 14, 2003 - 07:10 pm: [Edit](#)

I believe that this is correct. As I understand it the racial disads don't count against the 40 point limit to offset the fact that players have less choice about them. The templates on the other hand reflect what is expected of someone with that background and in other Gurps games if you don't like a disad from a template you can remove it and adjust the template cost accordingly. I don't know if this is kosher in GPD however. After all you can't be a Star Fleet officer without having a Duty to star fleet, and it would take some doing to explain how how a officer would get by without obeying the prime directive even if he didn't believe in it deep down (creating the effect of the disad but through different motivation). I don't see why you couldn't make some slight adjustments to a template however, for example change the COH for Prime directive to a duty of the same point value for a Cygnian officer to reflect that he has to obey it but doesn't necessarily like it.

By **Matthew J. Francois (Francois42)** ON Monday, July 14, 2003 - 10:05 pm: [Edit](#)

Disadvantages:

I don't know if this is written in one of the core rulebooks anywhere (GURPS Basic Set, Compendium I, or Compendium II), but it appeared as a constant in every sourcebook I referenced:

Racial Disadvantages: Not counted against limit

Template Disadvantages: Counted against limit

The only exception is that disadvantages **required** by the campaign (even in the template) do NOT count against the limit. But, this doesn't apply to GPD, because, and I quote the response I got verbatim:


Quote:

In, for example, a Black Ops campaign, the campaign requires a few disadvantages in order to be a Black Ops member. Those wouldn't count against the Disadvantages limit.

But what if the GM and players decide to do an all-Marine game. Would the template disadvantages from Star Fleet Boot Camp be exempted?

Quote:

No. That would make the characters from your campaign more powerful than characters from another campaign. The reason they aren't exempted is because the restriction on choosing a template is required by the GM... not the campaign. Now, for example, if GPD said everyone (in the whole universe) had to take the Duty disadvantage, then Duty would be exempted from the limit

Note, however, that each GM can do anything they want.  But next year, when we're running GPD campaigns side-by-side with SFB and F&E (I can dream, right?) at conventions across the country, we can make sure characters from campaigns all over the world are measured against the same ruler!

-Francois
matthewfrancois@charter.net

By **Alex Chobot (Alendrel)** ON Monday, July 14, 2003 - 10:22 pm: [Edit](#)

Klingon Template> Yeah, there's somethign wonky there. I'll dig out the books and try to find the developmental notes and see what's up and make a ruling.

Selt Experts: The template is correct as written. A Selt is not born as an Expert, and thus never has to mature as one. As a Worker begins to grow old, there is a tiny chance that its aging process will suddenly arrest and it will become an Expert, swapping one template for another. For NPCs, this is no problem. For PC Workers, the transition may be handled in one of two ways. One, it may be "fore-ordained" that the PC will become an Expert, in which case apply the Edpert template (not Worker) and the 4 levels of Early Maturation. Secondly, the PC starts with the Worker template, and when it changes into an Expert, swap the templates (and charge the difference against the next 80 points earned).

Rams and Sages...I'll have to check with SVC, but it may well be possible that males mature/live longer than females.

By **Alex Chobot (Alendrel)** ON Monday, July 14, 2003 - 10:32 pm: [Edit](#)

Racial va. Template Disadvantages:

Correct, racial does not count against the -40 limit, templates do.

However, on GM-required...

Matthew, who are you quoting there? GPD is a setting, not a campaign. A campaign is an ongoing series of games played by a given group with common characters, and the nature of the campaign is defined by the GM, with input from the players. I'd be inclined to say that if the GM is running an all-Marines game and requires everyone to take the Marine template, then the GM may rule that the disads don't count against the limit (and may even adjust the starting point level such that the players have the full starting allotment of points plus the cost of the template).

This still has characters measured against the same ruler (points value). However, individual groups can play at different points on that scale (e.g. you can grab GURPS Special Ops and use that to help run a GPD game of 500-point crack GIA agents). In the event of a Living Prime Directive type of organized play, such a thing would have character creation rules, including a specified point value. For one-shots at conventions, such characters should be pre-generated, just to save the GM's time and sanity at the table if nothing else.

By **Matthew J. Francois (Francois42)** ON Monday, July 14, 2003 - 10:41 pm: [Edit](#)

After I posted my first message, I found a guy at work who has been running GURPS campaigns for years now and picked his brain for this issue. I then went to a FLGS and spent a few hours looking at other GURPS sourcebooks. 😊

I agree with you Alex; if a GM is running an All-Marine game he could make a few concessions. But by not counting the Marine disadvantages against the limit, the characters get a few more points for skills and advantages and attributes. But a 125-point character with 10 points that don't count against the limit would be equal to a 135 point character created in a different campaign.

To tell the truth, this is what I like about GURPS. Instead of having a book that lists everything that the players and GM's can and can't do, it simply has guidelines. Want to create a character with -100 points in Disadvantages? Go ahead. The game suggests not doing it (due to the freak-show effect), but the system won't break if you do so.

And I'm just being pie-in-the-sky about conventions. But I'd like to see it come to pass. 😊

-Francois

senor_pez@hotmail.com

By **Gary Plana (Garyplana)** ON Monday, July 14, 2003 - 10:59 pm: [Edit](#)

Matthew, etc: the rule that states "disads from a Racial Template do not count against the -40 limit" is on CI page 175, second para from the top. When I was working on GPD, I briefly discussed this with Kromm; as Racial Templates are a core factor in character generation in GPD, we decided to make it a hard-and-fast rule as half of the races in GPD would otherwise be impossible and/or illegal.

But in a non-GPD game, the GM may choose otherwise, of course.

By **Richard Wells (Rwwells)** ON Monday, July 14, 2003 - 11:00 pm: [Edit](#)

Campaign required disadvantages are covered on page 26 of GURPS Basic Set. Counts for points but not against the limit.

I would suggest care in choosing which disadvantages are mandated. For example, mandatory duties tend not to be penalties because the PC that ignores Star Fleet orders is also the PC that fails to participate in the adventure.

You may want to charge a PC less for removing any of these mandated disadvantages that serve to force the PC into the adventure. The PC whose background makes the disadvantage impractical gains very little by dropping the disadvantage.

By **Alex Chobot (Alendrel)** ON Monday, July 14, 2003 - 11:01 pm: [Edit](#)

Matthew, actually, the two characters, assuming the disads are played and applied are both 125 point characters...one with 165 points of good stuff and 40 points of bad stuff, the other with 175 points of good stuff and 50 points of bad stuff.

By **Matthew J. Francois (Francois42)** ON Thursday, July 17, 2003 - 09:40 pm: [Edit](#)

After thinking it through, and discussing it with a few people, I've come to the opposite consensus with regards to Academy Templates and counting against the -40 limit on Disadvantages. The argument (and I thought it was a very good one):

What if, it was argued, a group played from the characters' entry into, for example, Star Fleet Academy, they would eventually, throughout the course of the campaign, pick up the disadvantages of the Academy Template, which would be considered to be "required" by the campaign (since this part of the campaign is about gaining the advantages and disadvantages of the Academy Templates).

The salient point here is that I feel that a character with Disadvantages that don't count against the limit have an edge, since they can have more total disadvantages, and thus more points to pour into Attributes, Skills, and a few extra Advantages. Thus, characters are penalized for jumping straight into their careers...

Plus, having that -1 point Disadvantage in "Follow the Prime Directive" really

screws up the points...

Is it possible that we could forward this to the "official" GURPS Gurus and get an official ruling (included or not) printed into MPA. Yes, a GM is free to do whatever, but I'd like to see a general-use rule printed!

-Francois

By **Steven E. Ehrbar (See)** ON Thursday, July 17, 2003 - 11:06 pm: [Edit](#)

The official GURPS rules (and I'll confirm them on the sjgames.gurps boards with Sean "Dr. Kromm" Punch if you insist, but he'll say the same thing):

- 1) By default, "professional" (as opposed to "racial") template disads count against the -40 limit on disads taken during character creation.
- 2) If the same disad is required of **all** PCs as a condition of being in the campaign, that disad does not count against the -40 limit on disads taken during character creation, whether or not it is part of a template. If it is **not** required of all PCs, it counts against the -40 limit on disads during character creation.
- 3) No disads gained in play ever count against the -40 limit. Ever. The -40 is a limit on disads taken during character creation only, and ceases to apply after play begins.
- 4) No disads gained in play give the character points. Ever. If a character with 40 points of disads joins the Academy and gets the Academy set of disads during the game, the character's disad total goes to 66, but he gains no points whatsoever to spend on attributes, advantages, or skills.
- 5) All attributes increases, advantages, and skills gained after play begins must be paid for by earned experience, as many as possible out of the character's accumulated pool and the rest against future earned experience. The character above who joined the Academy after generation will have to pay, out of earned experience, the points for anything on the template he didn't already have coming into the Academy.

By **Richard Wells (Rwwells)** ON Friday, July 18, 2003 - 12:44 am: [Edit](#)

Some advantages gained during play should be given to the PCs free, if those advantages are unlikely to be useful. In a classic ST style game, the PCs may well help befriend the ruler of a planet. That in turn provides a nice advantage to the PCs. But the next adventure will most likely take place on a different planet where the gained advantage is not applicable. Charging PCs character points for advantages that they neither want nor use encourages players to do a poor job and preserve their experience for advantages the players want to grant the PCs. Penalizing PCs for doing a brilliant job is definitely the wrong form of reinforcement.

By [Alex Chobot \(Alendrel\)](#) ON Friday, July 18, 2003 - 08:48 am: [Edit](#)

Such advantages can also be granted by the GM as part of the reward for a completed story.

By [Matthew J. Francois \(Francois42\)](#) ON Friday, July 18, 2003 - 11:13 am: [Edit](#)

Steven:

Thank you for a *great* response. I'm assuming that we can consider the GPD Academy Templates the same as a "Professional" template! And, given your response, I think that all the template disadvantages probably should be counted... except for the -1 point "Uphold the Prime Directive." Let's face it... that

one really screws up the math.



-Francois

By [Steve Cole \(Stevecole\)](#) ON Friday, July 18, 2003 - 11:26 am: [Edit](#)

I think Steven's post needs to be an article in Module Prime Alpha.

By [Richard Brown \(Richardb\)](#) ON Friday, July 18, 2003 - 11:58 am: [Edit](#)

The -1 point "Uphold the Prime Directive" could be counted as a quirk rather than a disadvantage. Remember the standard limits are -40 points disadvantages and -5 points quirks. This gives you a little more leeway. Also if a GM is working with a all starfleet campaign he can dictate the disads common to all the academy templates as required, so you don't have to worry about working the math around that little -1 point "Uphold the P. D." at all.

By [Matthew Pulido \(Talison\)](#) ON Monday, July 21, 2003 - 09:03 pm: [Edit](#)

Here's a question. I just got GURPS Psionics. Very good book. If I were to use it with Prime Directive which powers would I attach Mind Meld and Neck Pinch to? I'm thinking Telepathy on both.

By [Alex Chobot \(Alendrel\)](#) ON Monday, July 21, 2003 - 11:05 pm: [Edit](#)

Right in one, Matthew.

By [Gary Plana \(Garyplana\)](#) ON Tuesday, July 22, 2003 - 03:53 pm: [Edit](#)

Agreed.

By [Matthew J. Francois \(Francois42\)](#) ON Tuesday, July 22, 2003 - 04:39 pm: [Edit](#)

Can anyone find a problem with this:

A Vulcan, with IQ 14 and with Eidetic Memory 1, could get his First Aid skill (Mental/Easy) to 30 (IQ + 16) for 16 character points.

-Francois

By [Gary Plana \(Garyplana\)](#) ON Tuesday, July 22, 2003 - 08:17 pm: [Edit](#)

Looks correct to me.

GPD page 72, right column, top paragraph says the progression is +2 points per level for Mental/non-Very Hard skills, so IQ+16 would cost 32 points, divided by 2 for Eidetic Memory 1, giving a final cost of 16 points.

Having Eidetic Memory 1 in the Vulcan RT is a big reason the RT cost is so high. But it is a BIG part of what makes Vulcans what they are!

By **Steven E. Ehrbar (See)** ON Tuesday, July 22, 2003 - 09:36 pm: [Edit](#)

Looks right to me.

EM is a tremendous advantage for any character focused on one or a few skills. (Characters with broad but relatively shallow knowledge do better with high IQ.)

By **Matthew J. Francois (Francois42)** ON Tuesday, July 29, 2003 - 10:26 am: [Edit](#)

Question about uniforms:

Is the combat armor worn over a duty uniform, gaining a small but possibly important bonus for "armor layering"?


Or does the combat armor include it's own "underclothes"?

-Francois

By **Robert Snook (Verdick)** ON Tuesday, July 29, 2003 - 07:24 pm: [Edit](#)

I doubt you'd be able to call it layering armor if you used the duty uniform as the underlayer.

By **Gary Plana (Garyplana)** ON Tuesday, July 29, 2003 - 11:58 pm: [Edit](#)

Matthew: yes, probably, what you wear under your combat armor is your own choice. But you should always wear clean underwear. 

Yes, the layering rule would apply -- there is no reason it would not.

By **Alex Chobot (Alendrel)** ON Thursday, July 31, 2003 - 11:54 am: [Edit](#)

TOPIC DOWNLOADED TO THIS POINT FOR PROCESSING.

By **F. Douglas Wall (Knarf)** ON Sunday, August 03, 2003 - 05:50 pm: [Edit](#)

When I ran a Prime Directive game, I told my players that Duty to Star Fleet was a "campaign" disadvantage and not subject to the limit. Also, I declared that the Sense of Duty in the templates was purely optional. It's too easy to see Star Fleet characters who aren't as idealistic. Some enlistees may sign up to see the other planets, or a Marine may simply have a desire to blow stuff up. Some officers may be focussed on getting their own starship command. so not everyone is up on "all that hippy-dippy crap" (in the words of one of my players).

By **Matthew J. Francois (Francois42)** ON Sunday, August 03, 2003 - 08:28 pm: [Edit](#)

I found it interesting that Sense of Duty was in the template, but an Officer's Code of Honor isn't. Except for the Federation Marshals...

This shows the great flexibility of the system!

-Francois

By **Matthew J. Francois (Francois42)** ON Monday, August 04, 2003 - 10:37 am: [Edit](#)

Can someone describe the math that makes a point of Professional Reputation in GPD only 2 points? Normally, a point of Reputation is 5 points, and the only modifier I can think of is that it's only applicable to a "Large Class of People, x 1/2" That makes it 2.5 points? What modifier am I missing?

-Francois

By **Alex Chobot (Alendrel)** ON Monday, August 04, 2003 - 11:41 am: [Edit](#)

GURPS doesn't use half-points outside of skills, so levels of things with modifiers get rounded off.

By **Matthew J. Francois (Francois42)** ON Monday, August 04, 2003 - 09:49 pm: [Edit](#)

Thanks Alex. I was just confused because according to GURPS Character Builder (the official character builder program), two levels of Reputation with the Large Class of People modifier is 5 points. I've reported it as a bug.

-Francois

By **Matthew J. Francois (Francois42)** ON Monday, August 04, 2003 - 10:27 pm: [Edit](#)

Or is it a 2-3-2-3 type progression?

-Francois

By **Richard Wells (Rwwells)** ON Monday, August 04, 2003 - 11:59 pm: [Edit](#)

GURPS BS p. 17 says to round down.

2-3-2-3 is how an advantage that falls down to 2.5 points per level is usually charged. If it bothers you, you can certainly charge all advantages or disadvantages to the nearest half point. Trying to fine tune to use smaller than half point increments tends to be more work than it is worth.

By **Alex Chobot (Alendrel)** ON Tuesday, August 05, 2003 - 03:45 am: [Edit](#)

It is a 2-3-2-3 type progression. The advantage still costs 2.5 points per level, you just round down after figuring the cost for a given number of levels, not on the cost for each individual level.

Or, it's $2.5 * N$, drop remaining fraction for a given level. Pay the difference between what this gives you for raising from X to X+1.

By **Matthew J. Francois (Francois42)** ON Tuesday, August 05, 2003 - 10:39 am: [Edit](#)

Okay, we might want a clarification in MPA about that, then. Because someone without Basic Set (one of my old players) would only be paying 4 points for a +2 ProRep rather than 5.

-Francois

By **Richard Wells (Rwwells)** ON Wednesday, August 06, 2003 - 12:44 am: [Edit](#)

A clarification might be handy, though that should be expanded for all the rounded values that should be recomputed for each change. When I glanced through GURPS lite, I found about 10 different advantages that listed rounding of point costs. A warning to GMs to restrict the number of rounded advantages would be a prudent corollary. With low point cost campaigns (say 25 points), having a player gain 7 character points by playing rounding games could prove problematic.

By **David Lang (Dlang)** ON Wednesday, August 06, 2003 - 01:04 am: [Edit](#)

richard, such a character will be better initially, but will have a much harder time progressing.

not a factor if you run one-time games, but if you play a campaign it will matter

By **Richard Wells (Rwwells)** ON Wednesday, August 06, 2003 - 01:50 am: [Edit](#)

David: Only a detriment to the character if those advantages are ones that the character concept needs to improve. Many character concepts involve advantages that don't change so the point shaving remains in effect. Not a significant effect when using when using high point characters but a definite nuisance for lower point totals.

I have run GURPS for a few years and have been hit with some of these problems of Supers inspired modifiers creating point shaving rounding effects.

By **Alex Chobot (Alendrel)** ON Wednesday, August 06, 2003 - 12:08 pm: [Edit](#)

Actually, I've already done a nice break down of the Reputation stuff earlier, so it is gonna be in the Q&A section in MPA.

By **Matthew J. Francois (Francois42)** ON Wednesday, August 06, 2003 - 04:52 pm: [Edit](#)

Thanks Alex!

-Francois

By **Randy Buttram (Peregrine)** ON Tuesday, August 12, 2003 - 04:44 pm: [Edit](#)

This is more of a background question (I was referred here from SFB Q&A). What is the strategic speed (and range) of normal freighters (civilian and military engines)?

By **David Lang (Dlang)** ON Tuesday, August 12, 2003 - 04:57 pm: [Edit](#)

the speed is listed in GPD on page 128

freighters with military engines have about 50% more speed

as far as range goes, they can travel indefinitely as long as they can resupply every ~3000 parsecs. for out-and-back trips normal freighters have an effective range of ~1000 parsecs with military freighters getting ~1500 parsecs (warships and non-freighters can go ~3000 parsecs)

By **Randy Buttram (Peregrine)** ON Tuesday, August 12, 2003 - 05:57 pm: [Edit](#)

OK. Converting that to map hexes, that's a one-way range of 6 hexes from resupply point to resupply point.

My reason for asking is that I was wondering if a given freighter (or convoy of freighters) could 'wander the spacelanes' from port to port, or if, for some reason, a freighter was limited in its operational range.

By **David Lang (Dlang)** ON Tuesday, August 12, 2003 - 06:45 pm: [Edit](#)

in F&E a ship is 'in supply' (i.e. able to move as it wills) if it is within 6 hexes of a major planet/base. it is assumed that there are hard working freighters (military and other) keeping them supplied so that they don't have to go from base to base.

as long as you include a reasonably frequent need to get additional supplies from someplace (either a planet or another ship) you are free to wander as you will.

a ship that is 'out of supply' can still move (at half speed) indefinitely with the current rules. this would represent buying/finding supplies as you go (the orions are always willing to sell you supplies, if they don't decide to rob you of your cargo)

I know this isn't a very good

By **Gary Plana (Garyplana)** ON Tuesday, August 12, 2003 - 07:22 pm: [Edit](#)

"... if it is within 6 hexes of a **FRIENDLY** major planet/base."



What and where depends on your campaign and/or GM. Your mileage may vary.

By **Randy Buttram (Peregrine)** ON Tuesday, August 12, 2003 - 09:43 pm: [Edit](#)

I'm thinking of a campaign setting called The Convoy: a semi-permanent convoy of various freighters and related, with multi-ethnic crews, roaming the SFU. Kind of a 'below the radar' rag-tag fleet roaming space.

By **David Lang (Dlang)** ON Wednesday, August 13, 2003 - 02:38 am: [Edit](#)

remember that the 'minor' planets that show up on the map are probably ones

with significantly more industrial capability than earth currently has so there is a LOT of room for other colonies around that you service.

at 3 months per F&E hex you are not going to be traveling very far, but there is still plenty of room for your convoy to operate

By **Richard Wells (Rwwells)** ON Wednesday, August 13, 2003 - 03:16 am: [Edit](#)

An F&E hex is huge; far bigger than the entire known Traveller universe. My standard campaign can last for months and only uses 1% of the entire F&E hex. Plenty of room for anything you need. The SFU is too large to conduct a handy triangular trade with the Romulans and Klingons.

The problem I see is why would these entire group of freighters travel together for long distances. Certainly differences in cargoes would force freighters to go their own way. If you wish to encourage a PC freighter to follow a winding path, might I suggest an easy subsidized route. The Federation pays the freighter to stop at certain colonies along the way but with an easy schedule that permits the freighter to visit other interesting systems. Done right, the PCs will explore the universe, not try and sit on the perfect trading loop.

By **Randy Buttram (Peregrine)** ON Wednesday, August 13, 2003 - 05:44 pm: [Edit](#)

I'm thinking pseudo-Jindarians - a group of freighters and whatnot that travel together, picking up cargoes as they go. The core would be the family ships, where the children are raised, while the working freighters join and leave the main convoy as cargoes permit.

Of course, a semi-permanent grouping of ships such as this would also acquire 'hangers-on', other ships that travel with them temporarily in order to benefit from 'safety in numbers' (which is the theory behind convoying merchant ships in the first place).

By **Matthew J. Francois (Francois42)** ON Thursday, August 14, 2003 - 11:46 am: [Edit](#)

Can you specialize in non-science skills? For example, could a character specialize in Law (Trade) and get the bonus?

-Francois

By **Gary Plana (Garyplana)** ON Thursday, August 14, 2003 - 02:08 pm: [Edit](#)

Which bonus???

By **Richard Wells (Rwwells)** ON Thursday, August 14, 2003 - 03:39 pm: [Edit](#)

Gary: If the skill allows for optional specializations, the character gets a +5 on skill rolls in the specialization but -1 (or -2) to skill rolls not in the specialization for that skill. See sidebar BS 43. The rules on optional specialization are one of the worst defined sections of GURPS.

Law does seem to be one of the skills where a character could specialize. The

GURPS definition of the skill makes note of optional specializations for it. The answer is that you can create an optional specialization for any skill that does not require specialization if the GM permits it. In theory, you could have specializations like Acting(Kabuki) or Gambling(Poker) with the relevant bonus.

Side note: I tend to not permit these for non-science skills since it is too easy to work out specializations that cover every campaign usage that might occur. A +5 bonus should not be granted just because the player paid attention to the campaign concept.

By **Gary Plana (Garyplana)** ON Thursday, August 14, 2003 - 08:20 pm: [Edit](#)

Richard, I've never used the rules in that sidebar, sorry. They remind me of the weapon specialization rules in AD&D2, which I never used either.

I have no objection to specializations but the sidebar in question is way too short to cover the subject.

By **Robert Herneson (Rherneson)** ON Thursday, August 14, 2003 - 11:46 pm: [Edit](#)

Matthew, provided the GM agrees, I don't find any rule limiting the bonus to sciences.

For a more detailed application of 'specializations' I would suggest that you use the 'Maneuver' rules in Compendium I, p.162. I think I remember there being an article on SJ's site in the free archives of the Roleplayer about mental maneuvers (properly called 'methods' or 'procedures'), but I can't access that at the moment to make sure so I could be wrong about that.

I've used maneuvers for years as a GM and have found them a useful game tool.

RH

By **Richard Wells (Rwwells)** ON Friday, August 15, 2003 - 04:09 am: [Edit](#)

Kromm notes includes an example of using Law with a specialization. But that process transforms a character from having Law-15 to having Law-24 within the specialization and when in the character's home region. All other lawyers would have equally inflated skills. This does seem to be getting fairly silly and contests of skill will be won by whoever has the correct specialty.

By **Matthew J. Francois (Francois42)** ON Friday, August 15, 2003 - 09:45 am: [Edit](#)

Richard: Isn't that how lawyers win cases (the good ones, anyway)... by having the proper specialty. I mean, for a piddly case, it won't matter. But I'm not going to hire a International Buisness Lawyer to defend me in a first degree murder case.

Anyway, I'll allow it, mainly because I know the player and he:

- 1.) Hates metagaming*, and won't use it to his advantage.
- 2.) The specialty really makes sense for his character. He's a doctor, so he wanted to specialize his law into Medical law.

-Francois

*metagaming: A horrible event when players use knowledge of the "real world" to further their game world characters. For example, a player who says, "There has to be a switch to activate the bridge from this side of the chasm because the GM wouldn't bring us all the way down here for a dead end." is metagaming.

By **Robert Hernesson (Rhernesson)** ON Friday, August 15, 2003 - 11:03 am: [Edit](#)

Matthew, you've identified the key to a great character; a great player. I have a few that I game with that have charateds that could *really* unbalance things badly, but because they are great players and roleplay we've had some real fun.

RH

By **Steven E. Ehrbar (See)** ON Friday, August 15, 2003 - 12:22 pm: [Edit](#)

The Basic Set description of the Law skill specifically mentions that people with the Law skill usually specialize.

In other cases, a skill can get an optional specialty if:

- 1) a mandatory specialization is not required,
- 2) in the GM's opinion, the skill is broad enough to allow specializations, and
- 3) in the GM's opinion, the proposed specialization is narrow enough that the penalty to general uses reasonably offsets the bonus is a benefit in the narrow situation.

So, Leatherworking (saddles) or Klingon (invective) are perfectly fine specializations, even if they aren't science skills. Just don't allow, say, Broadsword (combat situations).

By **Frank DeMaris (Kemaris)** ON Friday, August 15, 2003 - 01:26 pm: [Edit](#)

Although something like Fencing (Sport Fencing) could be an interesting specialization for someone who is a olympic-class fencer but is so bound up in the rules of sport fencing that he doesn't use his weapon to its full effect in real combat.

By **Matthew J. Francois (Francois42)** ON Friday, August 15, 2003 - 04:20 pm: [Edit](#)

Frank:

This is sort of like what you're saying: In one of the GURPS books (I think it's Compendium I), they have a note that almost any combat skill can instead be learned as an "art" skill. So you can have Karate and Karate (Art). The "art" skill is used to impress people, but can't be used in actual combat. IIRC, a combat skill and its related "art" version default to each other at -4.

So, for example, Jackie Chan might have Karate (Art) at 24. But he's probably pretty good if he ever got in a real fight anyway, so his Karate is defaulted to 20. A skilled Ninja master might have Karate at 24, but would probably be pretty good if ever pressed into service for entertainment (provided he doesn't flip out and kill the audience, <http://www.realultimatepower.net>), so Karate (Art) will default to 20.

As a GM, I would probably make an exception for things like Fencing, Karate, Judo, etc. ("Combat" skills that are routinely done recreationally) So if two players wanted to practice Karate or Fence for fun, they'd use their "art" versions. Little to no damage would actually be done during the fight (critical hit only, or a critical fail on a defense roll), but they'd be "using" their skills that they've paid for (although probably at -4).

-Francois

By [michael john campbell \(Michaelcampbell\)](#) ON Wednesday, September 03, 2003 - 07:31 am: [Edit](#)

Can anyone tell me how long the fuse on a GPD handgrenade is?

By [Matthew J. Francois \(Francois42\)](#) ON Wednesday, September 03, 2003 - 09:53 am: [Edit](#)

IIRC (I don't have my books handy) it's variable: 1 to 5 (10?) turns.

So you can have it go boom immediately, or fake the enemy out (and have it thrown back at you, too).

-Francois

By [F. Douglas Wall \(Knarf\)](#) ON Thursday, September 04, 2003 - 02:38 am: [Edit](#)

Just don't let it go off in your hand ;)

By [michael john campbell \(Michaelcampbell\)](#) ON Saturday, September 06, 2003 - 09:04 pm: [Edit](#)

Quote:

Just don't let it go off in your hand ;)

Khiser Bill, this one's for you from all the boys in company B. Harry and Danny and Bertie and Reggie...yeah, even Reggie...he ain't too stuck-up once you get to know-**BOOM**...

It's amazing how many simpson fans there are out there.

By **Steve Cole (Stevecole)** ON Monday, September 08, 2003 - 10:24 am: [Edit](#)

Standard grenade fuze is 3 seconds. You can "cook" the grenade by holding it for a second and let the timer run down, but I'd consider that a skill. I've done it (with training grenades that don't hurt much more than a firecracker when they go off in your hand) but I can't say I like the idea. The fuzes are NOT that perfect and can run 2-5 seconds.

By **michael john campbell (Michaelcampbell)** ON Tuesday, September 09, 2003 - 11:35 pm: [Edit](#)

Perhaps a note in MPA or MPB or somesuch that older tech-level grenades have less then dependable fuses on their hand-grenades is in-order?!...but guess most people knew it was true of WWI grenades...but I'm not sure how many people know it of 1990s grenades.


Apparently professional basket-ball players have an innate sense of how long the shot clock is but it takes years of practise...I'd say knowing how long the one should or could "cook" the grenade takes a similar amount of practise under fairly realistic conditions...Man, that'd be a hard skill to obtain...even harder to obtain and have all ten fingers.

By **Matthew J. Francois (Francois42)** ON Wednesday, September 10, 2003 - 10:01 am: [Edit](#)

SVC: Wouldn't a high-tech grenade have an electronic, settable fuze? So "cooking" the grenade is no longer a tactic... just dial back the electronic fuze a bit first.

-Francois

By **Gary Plana (Garyplana)** ON Wednesday, September 10, 2003 - 10:25 am: [Edit](#)

Matthew: then every soldier would carry some kind of electronic jammer that would prevent enemy grenades from going off. Or else set them off about 100 yards away. 

No electronic fuses. Keep it simple.

By **Steve Cole (Stevecole)** ON Wednesday, September 10, 2003 - 11:06 am: [Edit](#)

I suspect that by GPD time there are reliable settable fuzes. I was answering what I thought was a question about 2003 grenades for background purposes.

By **Matthew J. Francois (Francois42)** ON Wednesday, September 10, 2003 - 12:45 pm: [Edit](#)

Gary: That sounds like a COOL piece of equipment. If it's not defined somewhere, you might want to do so and stick it into MPB! Maybe have it require some Electronics Operation rolls to find and match the frequencies. And forces would scramble their OWN grenades to make it harder on the anti-grenade devices.

-Francois

By **Robert Gilson (Bobcat)** ON Wednesday, September 10, 2003 - 02:31 pm: [Edit](#)

That does sound cool. ECM and ECCM for each side. Although both sides might switch to the old fashioned simple method just to get around that problem.

By **Randy Buttram (Peregrine)** ON Wednesday, September 10, 2003 - 02:57 pm: [Edit](#)

Nah, that's too simple. If they did that for ground ops, then they'd find a way to do it in space ops, and there goes the EW rules in SFB out the window...



By **Robert Snook (Verdick)** ON Wednesday, September 10, 2003 - 03:47 pm: [Edit](#)

Well, ship computers are vastly more complex and have many more safety protocols to go through than personal, hand-held units. That could be one way to avoid "taking it into space".

By **Gary Plana (Garyplana)** ON Wednesday, September 10, 2003 - 05:56 pm: [Edit](#)

The idea of a "fuse jammer" came up twelve years ago when we did PD1. IIRC, the bottom line was this: if I am a soldier, I am NOT going to want to carry a lethal explosive charge on MY body that the enemy can set off. And when I do want it to go off, I really DO want it to go off!

(FYI, the two guys who pointed this out to me were a Marine E5 and a retired SEAL; I learned very early to shut up and pay attention when they agreed on anything.)

So I agree with what SVC said -- mechanical or chemical fuses only.

By **Matthew J. Francois (Francois42)** ON Wednesday, September 10, 2003 - 06:16 pm: [Edit](#)

But Gary... that's so... low-tech.



-Francois

By **Donovan A Willett (Ravenhull)** ON Wednesday, September 10, 2003 - 09:52 pm: [Edit](#)

So's a nice hunk of hickory accross the back of the head, but hey, it works. That is something to think about when creating game tech, simple sometimes works a whole lot better than fancy.

Course, I do have something for things with little flashy lights ;}

By **Robert Hernesson (Rhernesson)** ON Wednesday, September 10, 2003 - 10:22 pm: [Edit](#)

Shielded circuitry. It's all the rage.

By **F. Douglas Wall (Knarf)** ON Thursday, September 11, 2003 - 03:53 am: [Edit](#)

Or at very least the grenade is such a simple device, no matter what doubletalk principle makes it blow up, there's nothing really to interfere with. Or maybe it's just tamperable when it's active (i.e. somebody pulled the pin or whatever), but it

takes 10 seconds to do and the fuse is set for 5.

By [michael john campbell \(Michaelcampbell\)](#) ON Thursday, September 11, 2003 - 10:18 am: [Edit](#)

Well I thought the conversation was twen-cen' stuff but on the subject of...

I don't see how a jammer could stop an electronic (rather than radio) detonation.

Sure an EMP pulse could melt the curcitra before the thing blows, but do you really want to "turn out the lights" on every tricorder, communicator and phaser in you fox-hole just to silence that handgrenade that landed near by!?!

By [Matthew J. Francois \(Francois42\)](#) ON Thursday, September 11, 2003 - 10:41 am: [Edit](#)

Quote:

Can anyone tell me how long the fuse on a GPD handgrenade is?

Quote:

Well I thought the conversation was twen-cen' stuff but on the subject of...

Aren't these mutually exclusive?

-Francois

By [Steve Cole \(Stevecole\)](#) ON Thursday, September 11, 2003 - 11:00 am: [Edit](#)

Francois: Conversations wander and the original gets lost. Does anyone stop to check the last dozen messages when posting to see if wandering-topic-syndrome has hit? No.

By [F. Douglas Wall \(Knarf\)](#) ON Friday, September 12, 2003 - 04:03 am: [Edit](#)

It's all pretty much free association, isn't it? But then, how many conversations have you been in where the topic stayed the same for more than 5 minutes?

By [Matthew J. Francois \(Francois42\)](#) ON Friday, September 12, 2003 - 10:29 am: [Edit](#)

None. But then again, why would an elephant ride a bicycle in the fist place? 😊

-Francois

By **Randy Buttram (Peregrine)** ON Friday, September 12, 2003 - 12:25 pm: [Edit](#)

I think so, Brain... but I don't think Britney Spears would kiss Madonna.

By **Kenneth Jones (Kludge)** ON Wednesday, September 17, 2003 - 05:51 pm: [Edit](#)

Help has there been any official decision on what TL the Tholian WC is.

With the trouble they had reproducing it. (After the Neo's arrival.) I would say that it's a TL 14 (at least at first). Since X1 is TL13 and even then they didn't produce very many of them.

By **Robert Hernesson (Rhernesson)** ON Wednesday, September 17, 2003 - 06:12 pm: [Edit](#)

There are lots of TL inconsistencies in the SFU. If it was done correctly, the method from Ultra Tech II would be used & different TLs would be set for each different race for different tech areas & then indexed by date.

A simple cross reference chart would work in this case, showing that Tholians were TL 12 in most areas (Warp tech, communications, beam weapons, etc...) from their arrival here, with some exceptions (Transporter tech at TL 16, Tractors at 15, Holographics at 11, ect...). Then at certain dates (in columns), TL advances would be noted.

In the Tholians case, the TL stagnation in ship related tech would be seen & then when the 312th arrived, all sorts of new TL advances in many areas would happen.

This is an advanced form of the TL rules and would be suited for the race books or MP? articles that cover each race.

RH

By **Richard Brown (Richardb)** ON Wednesday, September 17, 2003 - 07:00 pm: [Edit](#)

Just to muddy the waters a bit further, there is the possibility that some races have the capacity to do things technologically and for whatever reason don't. For example Klingons may have the knowhow to build Photon Torpedoes but they don't because they consider them too expensive or too prone to malfunction ect. Likewise making something equivalent to a Tholian Web may be well within the Federations technical abilities, they've simply never had reason to try.

By **Robert Hernesson (Rhernesson)** ON Wednesday, September 17, 2003 - 07:16 pm: [Edit](#)

Photorps, maybe, web, no. Web is tractor technology far beyond the Federations abilities.

But you are right, lots of factors go into whether a race develops a particular piece of equipment. This is why related techs can be reasonably grouped; Beam weapons, for example. It's not that the Klingons can't build phasers, but that for whatever reasons, economic, tactical, estetic, or whatever, they have decided not

to use phasers as their sidearm of choice. Its not a TL reason.

RH

By **Gary Plana (Garyplana)** ON Wednesday, September 17, 2003 - 07:25 pm: [Edit](#)

If it was TL14, the Tholians/Neo-Tholians would be totally unable to build webcasters after arrival in our galaxy.

I'd say they are TL13.

By **Steve Cole (Stevecole)** ON Wednesday, September 17, 2003 - 08:53 pm: [Edit](#)

The TLs are defined and nicely so and don't need any mucking around. There are inconsistencies when compared to GURPS but then GURPS is woefully inconsistent TLwise when compared to SFU. So the answer is, no, we won't be doing articles mucking with TLs in MPA or race books.

By **Robert Hernesson (Rhernesson)** ON Wednesday, September 17, 2003 - 09:20 pm: [Edit](#)

GURPS TLs work well for the GURPS system and are not inconsistent. Decisions were taken to have the SFU use a different system. That does not detract from GURPS, nor require changes in either system.

My remarks only offered a different way to use the TL system more effectively in line with GURPS. They did not detract from or criticize the SFU system nor demand change. That is not my prerogative.

RH

By **Kenneth Jones (Kludge)** ON Wednesday, September 17, 2003 - 11:07 pm: [Edit](#)

SVC Since you are around. Are Tholian WC's TL13 or TL14?

On reconsidering. I agree with Gary Plana that they are TL13(X1 Tech). Instead of my initial assumption that they are TL14.

By **Steve Cole (Stevecole)** ON Thursday, September 18, 2003 - 01:47 pm: [Edit](#)

I don't know why it matters what TL the WCs are. I wouldn't consider them X-tech by any means.

By **Kenneth Jones (Kludge)** ON Thursday, September 18, 2003 - 05:23 pm: [Edit](#)

Thanks Steve.

By **Gary Plana (Garyplana)** ON Thursday, September 18, 2003 - 05:38 pm: [Edit](#)

I said TL13 before as the Neo's arrived in this galaxy in Y178, which is well after everyone gained TL12. The Tholians got TL13 X-tech in Y183.

But ... if SVC says that WCs are not X-tech, then they have to be TL12. Final answer.

By **F. Douglas Wall (Knarf)** ON Friday, September 19, 2003 - 02:35 am: [Edit](#)

They're simply a TL12 technology that everyone else is about TL8 in.

By **Steve Cole (Stevecole)** ON Friday, September 19, 2003 - 10:54 am: [Edit](#)

I think you guys are grossly overusing TLs. In SFU, there is a lot of unique and limited technology. Gorns don't have drones; kzintis don't have plasma. That is a function of doctrine, choice, industry, military technology development, secrets, and other factors but it's definitely NOT something that needs to be explained by saying "Drones are TL12 but the Gorns are only TL6 in drone technology".

Same for gatlings, stasis, plasma carronades, F-14 fighters, and a zillion other things. It's not a difference in tech level that keeps these things in one race and out of the hands of another.

Which means that WCs are TL12 and that other races simply don't have that technology and WC-TL just isn't relevant to the other races.

By **Daniel Knudtson Thompson (Brezgonne)** ON Wednesday, October 29, 2003 - 07:47 pm: [Edit](#)

on an unrelated topic to what TL webcasters are (which, being the local THolian I don't see the point of arguing) I noticed something odd...

Now as I understand how armor works, a disruptor blast will not, in itself, penetrate any armor over DR 20.

Without the damage stacking the phasers do I don't see how dizzys are supposed to be effective?

On the flip side of the question it makes phasers look VERY overpowered.

I'm told there is a rule for damage blowing through a target. I haven't seen those rules but could someone explain how they relate to the two damage types for energy weapons in GPD?

I know disruptors do explosive/concussion damage and phasers can do impaling or exp. damage, but I dunno how that relates to the rules precisely.

By **Steve Cole (Stevecole)** ON Wednesday, October 29, 2003 - 10:41 pm: [Edit](#)

I don't understand those rules at all, but doesn't a disruptor hit this turn screw up your armor for all future turns?

By **Daniel Knudtson Thompson (Brezgonne)** ON Thursday, October 30, 2003 - 12:42 am: [Edit](#)

A good question. Particularly since I hadn't seen any mention of something like that in the GPD book. I'll admit to having dyslexia though so I could very well have read over that section and simply forgot it.

I would say though that it would make alot more sense for explosive damage to damage large sections of armor that for impaling.

ie; exp hits a largish area and imp only bores a small hole.

By **F. Douglas Wall (Knarf)** ON Thursday, October 30, 2003 - 03:00 am: [Edit](#)

The general rule is that any attack doing more than the character's HT in damage "blows through," so that the character will only take a maximum of their HT score in damage from one attack. If you are using the hit location rules from the GURPS Basic set, each extremity has its own threshold for "blowthrough."

While armor can reasonably take damage from an attack, this does not necessarily reduce its effectiveness. Just because an attack penetrated your right shoulder doesn't mean that your lower torso is any more vulnerable. There may be official rules regarding armor taking damage and eventually becoming useless, but I am unaware of them and would probably ignore them if I knew of them.

Daniel: As I read it, disruptors are very heavy duty stuff. A "holdout disruptor" does a minimum of 20 points of damage and a maximum of 120. I'd have to double check on rules regarding explosive damage, but anyone wearing any of the armors listed in GPD would probably take at least some damage from that. Getting into the pistol or rifle versions with their higher rates of fire (Thankfully the damage doesn't add up like a phaser) frightens me.

By **Daniel Knudtson Thompson (Brezgonne)** ON Thursday, October 30, 2003 - 04:07 am: [Edit](#)

FDW: Ack...yeah. Silly me. My brain was only taking 2*10.

The BASIC idea I was referring to still holds though. Disruptor damage, as I read it (since I can't find something like what SVC mentioned) is reduced for each hit you score on the target. Not to mention that it looks like the target gets to roll to dodge EACH shot individually.

So, with roughly average rolls, each bolt will do around 60-80 damage. With heavy combat armor that usually will do zero damage?

The return phaser fire however, since it all stacks up, will blast through the armor almost like it isn't even there.

Even if the phaser damage wasn't stacking they have settings that will accomplish the same thing in a single shot.

Not to sound like a trouble maker, particularly since I'm playing a Federation character on GPD Online, but can someone explain how one side being almost certain to damage/kill their target and the other side having to rely on dumb luck even if they hit is a balanced situation?

Please note I don't mean for this to sound like a complaint. I'm actually quite curious as to the actual balancing factors behind the choices. I'm also curious if the Klingons are getting some new energy weapons in their source book.

By **F. Douglas Wall (Knarf)** ON Thursday, October 30, 2003 - 01:34 pm: [Edit](#)

A character may defend against each disruptor blast individually, but sometimes those blast contain multiple shots. The disruptor pistol has a ROF of 3, meaning it can do up to 3 2d6x10 damage shots with one trigger pull. There is a chart in the GURPS Basic Set that determines how many shots in a burst will actually hit their target, but that was not reproduced in GPD. So against a disruptor pistol shot, a character may dodge once, but up to 3 "bullets" will hit him, each with their own chance to penetrate DR. Heavy combat armor has the best chance, but that means lugging around 66 pounds of armor. And if it doesn't stop all that damage, that character is in a world of hurt.

By **Gary Plana (Garyplana)** ON Thursday, October 30, 2003 - 01:56 pm: [Edit](#)

The "hits per burst" chart is in MPA, as is the entire Advanced Combat System. Shawn did a sweet job of pulling it together into one document (as it was spread over about ten different GURPS books).

By **Ken Humpherys (Pmthecat)** ON Thursday, October 30, 2003 - 02:30 pm: [Edit](#)

Phaser damage is much harder to stack than the basic rules show. The rules are trying to simulate the fact that the phaser is burning a very small hole through the armor and if you hold the beam on that point the DR will not be present to resist the later shots. There are manuevers that can prevent the beam weapon shots from stacking. One is a tumble or roll while moving. Actually any erratic manuver on your part will help to break up the shot.

By **Alex Chobot (Alendrel)** ON Thursday, October 30, 2003 - 02:43 pm: [Edit](#)

Actually, you dodge the entire phaser shot, all or nothing. You can't "break up" a burst from a weapon that uses the laser autofire rule. The manuever you describe would be an Acrobatic Dodge (make an Acrobatics roll as your dodge, if you succeed, you get a +1 to the Dodge, otherwise a -2).

By **Matthew Pulido (Talison)** ON Wednesday, December 03, 2003 - 06:03 pm: [Edit](#)

I think I asked a similar question before, but I honestly don't remember what the answer was (sorry).

Anyway, I was reading GURPS Klingons and I found something I don't quite get. The Klingon racial package has one level of Early Maturation. That means they reach maturity at the age of 9. Although I have seen some Gurps products (Fantasy Folk) use this as a guideline and have one level of Early Maturation represent maturity from 7-12 or so, depending on the race.

Reading the background on the military, they get out of secondary school at the age of 14 (Gurps Klingons pg 72). They then recieve their Officer commissions at 17, implying 3 more years of training.

Does this mean that:

A: Klingons are fully mature (Human at 18) at 9, but do not recieve the bulk of

their education and training till after this as part of their adult lives.

B: Klingons grow faster physically than humans, but mentally mature at the same rate as humans. This would make for large Klingon children still going to school after the age of 9.

C: Klingons reach maturity at 14 (concievable within past uses of Early Maturation) as they get out of Secondary school (similar to humans graduateing high school at around 18). Any officer training or advanced learning is then taken after that similar to most humans attending college or military training from the ages of 18-21+

D: Something I'm not thinking of.

E: I'm just thinking to hard about this.



My players are thinking about playing a Klingon group and most like to write character backgrounds detailing the basics of their character's childhoods.

I was also wondering what average Klingon height/weight ranges are compared to humans.

Thanks in advance.

By **Gary Plana (Garyplana)** On Wednesday, December 03, 2003 - 07:18 pm: [Edit](#)

Klingons are fully mature at nine years old, just as humans are fully mature at 18. Both mental and physical maturity progresses at the same rate, so you do NOT have children's minds in adult bodies (no matter what the Kzinti say about them



). As a result, Klingons may get a year or three head start on humans in entering school early, but you can still only learn so much so fast.

How many humans get an officer's commission at 17? **None!** IIRC in the real world, you have to be 17 or 18 to get into one of the Academies, so you graduate // get your commission at 21 or 22.

Klingons getting their commissions at 17 is, IMHO, very reasonable. I agree with GK.

Due to their ST+1 from their Racial Template, on average Klingons might be an inch taller and five pounds heavier than an average human; the extra five pounds is muscle.

By **Matthew Pulido (Talison)** On Wednesday, December 03, 2003 - 07:50 pm: [Edit](#)

Thanks, Gary. That pretty much was my option A. I wasn't really disputing GK,

just trying to interperate what it was saying. Just wanted to be sure.

Ok, all makes sence now. Just took me a bit



By **Gary Plana (Garyplana)** ON Wednesday, December 03, 2003 - 08:18 pm: [Edit](#)

No problem. Oh, and before I forget: when generating a character, his age determines how many points of Skills you can buy -- see GPD page 72, *Limit on Beginning Skills*. This puts Klingons at a disadvantage!

By **Matthew Pulido (Talison)** ON Wednesday, December 03, 2003 - 08:35 pm: [Edit](#)

WOW!. I knew that on the age/skill thing but never thought about it in relation to early maturation.

I assume all the Accademy Templates in GK are accurate to the proper ages of when a Klingon would graduate.

By **F. Douglas Wall (Knarf)** ON Friday, February 13, 2004 - 04:04 am: [Edit](#)

Actually, the Klingons have both Early Maturation and Short Lifespan. Since Short Lifespan compresses their entire aging process (time to maturity, etc), that would give them maturity at 9. Combined with Early Maturation, however, the average Klingon reaches the adulthood at 4. Why they put off their education for so long, I'll never know

By **F. Douglas Wall (Knarf)** ON Friday, February 13, 2004 - 04:15 am: [Edit](#)

Here's something that I've been wondering. The Federation Marshal and GIA templates in the main book have Military Rank 3, indicating that the characters are military officers. However, since there are no enlisted ranks in these services, wouldn't the basic rank be rank 0? While it can be argued that characters created on those templates are the equivalent of military officers, they are operating on an entirely separate ranking system, so while they may have the power of a military officer, they are still the grunts in their organization and should be Rank 0.

Speaking of advancement, Klingons evidently have more capable officers. Klingon military personnel are required to have certain skills at certain levels before they advance. Federation military advancement seems dependant solely on Seniority and Pro Rep. Am I missing something?

By **Mark Norman (Mnorman)** ON Friday, February 13, 2004 - 07:08 am: [Edit](#)

Knarf: It has been mentioned that the federation uses an up or out policy, where officers who do not develop the necessary skills are discharged, before they can reach the higher ranks, as oppose to the Klingons or Romulans who have dead-end ranks for those who are a good low-level officer, but would not make an effective higher officer. (this was in a discussion of the romulan ranking system in one of the captains logs)

In terms of GIA and marshalls ranks, an officers rank has an effect on how those in other services treat them, as well as how they fit into their chain of command. For instance, a GIA officer of rank 3 would be treated by a starfleet officer with the same respect as a federation marine officer of rank 3, not an enlisted soldier.

By **F. Douglas Wall (Knarf)** ON Tuesday, February 17, 2004 - 03:09 am: [Edit](#)

Mark: First off, I was referring to a table in GURPS Klingons listing skill level requirements for promotions. There is no such table in the GPD main book for Star Fleet characters. This is probably a small item that can be patched with an entry in MPB or GURPS Federation. I merely wished to point it out so that such a patch may occur.

Secondly, I was indicating that it made very little sense that a GIA or Marshall character wound up with a rather high Rank when there is nobody to hold the ranks below that. Within their organization, they are effectively GIA or Marshall Rank 0, no matter what their relationship with Star Fleet is. Just because a GIA agent must commandeer a Star Fleet ship does not mean that they hold the rank of Captain (MilRank 5). This could be more easily reflected via advantages like Legal Enforcement Powers and high Security Clearance. It was probably done so that all the templates could advance on the same Seniority Table. Unfortunately, this overvalued those templates by about 15 points.

By **Gary Plana (Garyplana)** ON Tuesday, February 17, 2004 - 12:27 pm: [Edit](#)

More likely, Marshal Erp realizes he needs a starship to chase the Orions to the Meep sector and contacts his boss, Deputy Chief Marshal Ryan.

Ryan contacts the Starfleet Liaison Officer at Sector HQ, who passes the request on to Star Fleet Command, which issues an order to the USS Fitzroy to go pick up Marshal Erp, who will brief you on the mission en route.

Something like that, anyhow ...

By **Matthew J. Francois (Francois42)** ON Tuesday, February 17, 2004 - 02:11 pm: [Edit](#)

Re: GIA Rank

I think you're confusing the term "rank." Rank in terms of the GURPS Advantage does NOT equal Rank in the military (or whatever). Instead, the grade is what translates, not the rank. If you look at the table that lists the various grades (Petty Officer 3, Captain, Marshall, etc.), it lists a corresponding "Rank" (GURPS) for each one... though it doesn't necessarily increase for each increase in the title.

Thus, there are no Rank 0, 1, or 2 Marshalls or GIA Agents, just as there are no Rank 0, 1, or 2 Star Fleet or Marine Officers (I don't have my book handy, but I'm pretty sure I'm close to the right numbers). A Rank 3 GIA Agent is still low on the totem pole in the GIA, but will have some power over a Rank 0 enlisted man. A

top-level enlisted man, however, might have a higher Rank than a low-level officer. (Think about the Chief-of-the-Boat on a U.S. Submarine.)

-Francois

By **F. Douglas Wall (Knarf)** on Wednesday, February 18, 2004 - 02:22 am: [Edit](#)

I'm well aware of the scale of the GURPS Rank Advantage.

In Star Fleet, Ranks 0, 1 and 2 are filled with enlisted people, so there is a use for putting officers on a higher level than that.

Even if a GIA agent has power relative to a Star Fleet officer, that doesn't make him a Star Fleet officer. They are different organizations. Therefore, they shouldn't operate on a Star Fleet scale. They should work from their own internal standard, which puts rookies at the bottom, not some odd place in the middle. My position is the GIA Rank is a separate thing from FedMarshall Rank, which is separate from Star Fleet Rank.

By **Robert Herneson (Rherneson)** on Wednesday, February 18, 2004 - 10:22 am: [Edit](#)

What you are talking about is chain of command, an issue that the rules don't (nor should) cover.

Chain of command is an entirely separate issue.

RH

By **Gary Plana (Garyplana)** on Wednesday, February 18, 2004 - 11:25 am: [Edit](#)

When I wrote GPD, I realized most of what you guys are arguing about. That is why I used the term "GRADE TITLES" on page 48, not "RANK TITLES". Use "Grade" to refer to a character being a Lieutenant or a Senior Marshall, and use "Rank" only to refer to the advantage, and your heads will hurt less.

This entire exercise is an attempt to get current-day stuff (E1, E7, etc) into a format compatible with the GURPS rules ... and the GURPS mindset as well. The concept that an E9 Master Chief Petty Officer gets promoted to an O1 Ensign (by buying one more level of Military Rank) is one of the very few things in the GURPS rules that I absolutely despise and hate. FYI in my original draft of GPD I included a disadvantage called "Enlisted" for just that reason. It got shot down, of course. **sigh**

Anyhow, no ruleset is ever perfect. This is one of the very very few areas where GURPS falls short. Live with it!

By **Nick G. Blank (Nickgb)** on Wednesday, February 18, 2004 - 06:30 pm: [Edit](#)

OK, so when you have ranged gunfire, and are using the "Hits in a Burst" table, you divide all the rounds in the burst into 4 round groups and roll an attack for every group.

Does the defender roll one defense roll for each group, or for each round in a group that hits?

So if you fire a four round group, and get two hits on the table, does the defender get two separate defense rolls, or just one? Or do you get one defense roll for the entire attack no matter how many "hits" there are from that one gun, or what? If multiple defense rolls, does this use up your various "dodge" moves and so on that you get each round on the one attack?

That part of the rules I just find confusing and no matter how many times I go over it I am not sure what is correct.

By **Gary Plana (Garyplana)** ON Wednesday, February 18, 2004 - 08:34 pm: [Edit](#)

The Advanced Combat System in MPA replaces the combat system in GPD. See *Dodging Automatic Fire* under DODGING, MPA page 103.

Make one Dodge roll for each group/burst of four (or less) rounds. If the Dodge roll is successful, no bullets in the group hit. If you miss the Dodge roll, roll on the table on MPA page 107 to see how many hits you take. For example, someone fires 10 rounds from an SMG, giving three groups of 4, 4, and 2 rounds. You make three Dodge rolls.

Note that if the attacker is out of your field of vision, you may not dodge at all. Wear armor, or a red shirt.

By **Nick G. Blank (Nickgb)** ON Thursday, February 19, 2004 - 10:15 am: [Edit](#)

Ah, so basically each attack roll by the attacker generates a defense roll by the defender. The thing that is confusing is the sentence in the burst section of the rules that says both PD and DR are applied to every bullet, but PD just occurs in the defense roll so it made me think you got a defense roll for every round. But every group makes more sense overall.

By **Gary Plana (Garyplana)** ON Thursday, February 19, 2004 - 03:30 pm: [Edit](#)

I didn't say "defense" roll, Nick. I said DODGE. And you can only dodge if you can see the bullet coming.

If the shooter is out of the victim's sight, no dodge is possible. That would include being shot at in darkness, or the shooter's just too far away, or the shooter is behind you.

By **F. Douglas Wall (Knarf)** ON Friday, February 20, 2004 - 01:59 am: [Edit](#)

The only valid defense against a phaser is dodging. There is no technology in the SFU that can block a beam weapon and parrying only works on close combat weapons. Also, unless you take special maneuvers, you only get a limited number of parries and blocks, but can dodge as many times as you like in a turn.

Also of interest. If your armor gives you any degree of PD, you can use that as a

defense roll, even if no Active Defense is available. If the PD is 3 or less, only a natural 3 will deflect an attack. PD 4-6 can be rolled as normal.

On the GIA/FedMarshall thing. Since one should not complain unless one has a solution to offer, I am offering a potential solution. I have devised an advancement table for the non-Star Fleet services that starts them at Rank 0.

Rank Grade Sen. Rep Status

0	GS1	0	0	0
0	GS2	10	0	0
1	GS3	30	+1	0
2	GS4	50	+1	1
3	GS5	70	+2	1
4	GS6	90	+2	1
5	GS7	110	+3	2
6	GS8	130	+3	2
7	GS9	150	+4	2
8	GS10	200	+4	2

They still require the same seniority and pro rep to advance as Star Fleet officers, but the Rank advantage and the free Status from Rank are modified. I put 2 grades at Rank 0 because I determine starting seniority on a 2d6 roll and I don't want a player to have to spend points based on luck of the dice. If you think the loose grade should be nearer the top, feel free to make the adjustment.

Also, an important point was addressed earlier and I don't think it was given due consideration. Klingons have both Short Lifespan and Early Maturation. With Short Lifespan, not only do they begin making aging rolls at age 35, they also achieve maturity at about 8 or 9. But combining that with Early Maturation brings a Klingon to adulthood at right around 4. I'm not sure if that was intended. If not, we might want to get it fixed.

By **Robert Hernesson (Rhernesson)** on Saturday, February 21, 2004 - 02:39 am: [Edit](#)

Doug, I brought the issue about Klingons up three times during the development process. I don't believe a fix is required or possible because the issue was understood and because Steve has said the racial packages are frozen. That being said, if you would rather have a different interpretation in your campaign of anything, that is the latitude of any GM.

RH

By **Chuck Strong (Raider)** on Saturday, February 21, 2004 - 02:44 pm: [Edit](#)

Hello Prime Directive Team

I don't know where to ask this question so I thought I'd ask here:

Is there a source document that has the names for ALL CAPITAL system planets for the main SFU races? For example: The Gorn Primary Capital is named GHDAR I, but in the F&E hex with it is an unnamed minor world that I cannot find any reference for within my SFU material.

The reason I asked is that I have created some large scale maps for use with F&E and I have included all the names for the planets from an earlier Captain's Log.

Thanks,
Chuck

By **Robert Hernesson (Rhernesson)** ON Saturday, February 21, 2004 - 06:12 pm: [Edit](#)

Chuck, what you are inquiring about is a system survey. It's a report that details out the basic data of a star system. It is something that needs done and probably is being worked on one system at a time by several folks.

Is the CL planet list different from the list on PD Core p. 124-127? I think it may be the same list published in CL, but a quick scan through my CLs didn't find it for me to check against.

As far as I know, there have been no system surveys made official and released.

RH

By **Chuck Strong (Raider)** ON Saturday, February 21, 2004 - 07:17 pm: [Edit](#)

Robert:

The CL article covered all on the on map systems, it did not cover the Capital secondary planet names nor the off-map planets.

By **Gary Plana (Garyplana)** ON Saturday, February 21, 2004 - 07:51 pm: [Edit](#)

The CL list was an early draft. There were a few minor corrections made to it, and the most recent draft was printed in GPD. But it does not include ALL of the planets.

I think what you want is the type of data that is in GK page 34+ (for the Klingons) and in MPA (for the Hydrans. Unfortunately, nothing like that has been done for any of the other races ... yet.

By **Steve Cole (Stevecole)** ON Saturday, February 21, 2004 - 10:27 pm: [Edit](#)

Better check GPD Chuck since I think we moved the Cygnan planet due to CL24.

By **Gary Plana (Garyplana)** ON Sunday, February 22, 2004 - 12:56 am: [Edit](#)

But we didn't move it into the Capital hex, which is 2908 for the Feds.

Or am I misunderstanding what Chuck asked?

By **Chuck Strong (Raider)** ON Sunday, February 22, 2004 - 01:18 pm: [Edit](#)

Gary:

I'm asking about unnamed capital system planets and unnamed off-map planets.

As to Cygnus: is it still the major planet in 2306 or did it move and if so where?

By **Steve Cole (Stevecole)** ON Sunday, February 22, 2004 - 03:10 pm: [Edit](#)

Chuck: check GPD. I sent you a copy two years ago.

By **Christopher E. Fant (Cfant)** ON Sunday, February 22, 2004 - 04:15 pm: [Edit](#)

Heh.....

By **Robert Herneson (Rherneson)** ON Sunday, February 22, 2004 - 07:24 pm: [Edit](#)

With the amount of stuff that Chuck is doing (go ahead, look around the board) it's no surprise if he didn't see something or remember it immediately.

By **Gary Plana (Garyplana)** ON Monday, February 23, 2004 - 12:51 am: [Edit](#)

Shresha-Cygnus **is** in 2306.

By **David Johnson (Djj)** ON Monday, February 23, 2004 - 01:02 am: [Edit](#)

Well as much as he has done for the entire game system, I would hope he gets a planet named after him -- maybe one of those unnamed Federation planets could be named 'Strongport' or something.

By **George M. Ebersole (George)** ON Wednesday, April 14, 2004 - 03:30 am: [Edit](#)

Nevermind.

By **Steve Cole (Stevecole)** ON Wednesday, April 14, 2004 - 09:35 am: [Edit](#)

Strongport. I like that.

By **Chuck Strong (Raider)** ON Wednesday, April 14, 2004 - 11:46 am: [Edit](#)

I'm honored by all the kind words -- thank you.

By **Chuck Strong (Raider)** ON Wednesday, April 14, 2004 - 12:01 pm: [Edit](#)

Steve/Gary:

Are we at a point now where we can finish naming the unnamed capital system planets and unnamed off-map planets? These are the final details I need to put on the large scale F&E map (all other known names from prior products are already on the map). However this effort needs to be coordinated with the G:PD team to insure SFU continuity.

Steve, would you like Gary and me to put together a list of capital system planets and unnamed off-map planets by race/hex and propose several names for your selection and approval?

I stand ready...

Chuck

By **Steve Cole (Stevecole)** ON Wednesday, April 14, 2004 - 05:17 pm: [Edit](#)

Put together a list of what is named and what isn't, although I bet you don't find all the published references. You can suggest a few names if you want but we'll have to see what actually happens. I am pretty sure the fed capital planets have names.

By **John Sickels (Johnsickels)** ON Thursday, April 15, 2004 - 03:38 pm: [Edit](#)

Gurps Romulans will establish the Romulan planet names.

By **Gary Plana (Garyplana)** ON Friday, April 16, 2004 - 09:44 pm: [Edit](#)

I've been away for two weeks, Chuck.

Feds all definitely have names. Ditto Romulans (waves to John). Otherwise, knock yourself out!

By **Chuck Strong (Raider)** ON Saturday, April 17, 2004 - 02:42 am: [Edit](#)

Does this include ALL the planets in the capitals? If so what are your source documents & page numbers?

I have the following:

Fed Hex 2908

C:EARTH; M:ALPHA-CENTAURI; m:LUNA: m:MARS

M:VULCAN; m:VULTRAX

M:RIGEL; M:??; m:?: m:?: m:?

M:ANDOR; M:??; m:?: m:?

Fed Off-map: no worlds

=====

Rom Hex 4613

C:ROMULUS; m:?

m:VESUVIUS; m:?: m:?

Rom Hex 4514

C:REMUS; m:?: m:?

m:TIBERIUS; m:?

Rom Off-map: no worlds

=====

Kzinti 1401

C:KZINTAI; m:?

M:KEEVARSH; m:?

M:VIELSALM; m:?: m:?

M:VRONKETT

Kzinti Off-map: Mmm

=====

Gorn

4402 GHDAR; m:?

4403 GEYDAR; m:?

4503 GIHDAHR; m:?

Gorn Off-map: mm

=====

Lyran Hex 0408

C:LYRANTAN m:?: m:?

VOLMARK; m:?

M:BOLMARK

FRAKMARK m:?: m:?

Lyran Off-map: MMmm

=====

ISC Hex 5910

C:VELTRASSA; M:?: m:?: m:?

KORLIVALA; M:?: m:?

ROVILLA; M:?: m:?: m:?

PROHOULA; M:?: m:?: m:?

ISC Off-map: Mmm

By **Loren Knight (Loren)** on Saturday, April 17, 2004 - 03:20 am: [Edit](#)

Regarding Sol System. minors included the Earth moon and Mars but surely one or two Jupiter moons are also minor inhabited planets.

Also, aren't there some reasonable candidates around Saturn? (It's late and I can't recall right now.)

By **David Johnson (Djj)** on Saturday, April 17, 2004 - 04:16 am: [Edit](#)

I think Chuck is looking only at those planets on the F&E map or charts.

By **Gary Plana (Garyplana)** on Saturday, April 17, 2004 - 09:10 am: [Edit](#)

Chuck: Mike West has the names of the Rigellian colonies, email him.

One of the Andorian colonies got grabbed up as the Brecon homeworld.

There was something to be done re the other minor, I'm going to have to look that up -- I do recall it was mentioned in an SH scenario, though.

By **Loren Knight (Loren)** on Saturday, April 17, 2004 - 10:27 am: [Edit](#)

Brecon...always thought that was sort of a funny name...if they had their own

ships...

If a Romulan attacks a Brecon ship and a Gorn ship in the morning...?

By **Chuck Strong (Raider)** ON Friday, April 23, 2004 - 11:14 pm: [Edit](#)

I'm going to move the conversation about planet naming to the General Discussions area...
