

# SFB TACTICS ARCHIVES

## 2007

Copyright © 2007, Amarillo Design Bureau, Inc.

=====

These are the archives of our Discus-BBS tactics discussion, posted during the calendar year 2007. We present these without editing or evaluation, and without any guarantee that the tactics expressed here are legal, practical, or effective.

=====

### GENERAL TACTICS

By Scott Jackson (Wittybanter) on Monday, January 15, 2007 - 12:54 pm: Edit

Some friends and myself are trying to work out a balanced scenario for a small scale base station assault. I could not find any scenarios on this (I only have a few captains logs). I was wondering that the usual BPV for something like this is? We have tried this with the station player getting 300 and the attacker with 400, no minefields or anything, and the station tends to lose.

Thanks

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Monday, January 15, 2007 - 01:59 pm: Edit

Scott, that doesn't surprise me. I'd suggest try going for even BPV. If you have a Base Station, add a total of units to bring their side's BPV up to the total of the attacking fleet.

I'd really suggest leaving out minefields unless you enjoy peeling onions. :-)

Oh, and depending on the year, have the BS buy a Power Augmentation Module and a pair of Hanger Modules with some fighters as part of its defense.

=====

By Scott Jackson (Wittybanter) on Monday, January 15, 2007 - 02:15 pm: Edit

Thanks Dale. The station did the best when it had a hangar full of fighters (still lost though, and fairly soundly). I have never even heard of a power augmentation module - i'll have to check that out. It just seems like the attacker should have more BPV because of the stations phaser 4's and such, but I suppose the stationary nature of the base must balance it out.

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Monday, January 15, 2007 - 07:25 pm: Edit

Scott, my pleasure - my honest opinion is that BPV works, so attacker vs. defender should be even. The PAM (Power Augmentation Module) is in Module R1 - it gives any base +6 APR & +6 BATT. Very useful!

=====

By michael john campbell (Michaelcampbell) on Monday, January 15, 2007 - 09:36 pm: Edit

SG3.0 is in the basic rule book.

The BPV of bases was dropped in the change over from commander's to captain's editions to reflect the fact that bases were over BPVed (IIUC).

That being the case, I'd say battles were meant to be of equal BPV if one wanted fair fight for both sides.

=====

By eric jimerson (Lord\_Error) on Monday, February 05, 2007 - 04:24 pm: Edit

What do you think, generally, of building your bases (BS and larger) on planets?

Advantages v disadvantages?

I see the extra shielding, effects of your enemy firing through an atmosphere and compressed arcs as a bonus, but the blind spot an obvious disadvantage.

All things being equal, would you rather have your bases on the ground or in orbit?

=====

By Richard Wells (Rwwells) on Monday, February 05, 2007 - 06:31 pm: Edit

Eric: One big disadvantage is that you can't dock most ships to bases on the planet limiting repairs greatly.

Bases in orbit would be my preference in most cases.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Tuesday, February 06, 2007 - 06:59 pm: Edit

Base on a big old airless asteroid would be my choice. You would have a blind spot (perhaps with a passel of mines and stuff there) but you would also have a bunch of facings that the bad guys couldn't shoot at in the "range 30 sniper" game.

You also lost a bunch of phasers and shield capacity though that are wasted guarding the facing of the asteroid though.

It almost make sense to have a big base (BS/ SB) designed for the purpose. Extra shields and weapons on the exposed faces. A passel of pods could just be tacked to the asteroid and you could just run passages/ transporters over to them...

Perhaps a bunch of (rock) armor ala the Jindos.

=====

By Martin Read (Amethyst\_Cat) on Thursday, February 08, 2007 - 12:26 pm: Edit

Mike: It seems to me that base-defence mines in a blind spot would be much less good at their job than base-defence mines positioned where the base's phaser-4s can make life exciting for the minesweeper captain.

=====

By Jeremy Gray (Gray) on Thursday, February 08, 2007 - 12:51 pm: Edit

Michael, you may want to check the rules on putting a BS/BATS/SB on a planet (I would give you the section/rule but I'm at work away from my rule books). A large base on a planet surface has its shields "doubled up" - 3 shields equal to twice the strength of the same base in orbit. Also, all of the weapons can fire through a nearly 180 degree arc (none are "blocked" by the planet).

I did a massive SSD showing a planet with a number of ground bases, including a BS, a few years ago and posted it on my website:

"AURELLIUS-III PLANETARY DEFENSES: This is an SSD for a yet to be completed Romulan Civil War mini-campaign (chronicling the adventures of the non-X-ships Rolandus used as decoys in his fail attempt to take Romulus). This is an airless planet in the Aurelius System (minor system in F&E hex 4313) circa Y186.

"The planet has six GCLs with one GCS each (see Module M) that must be seized by assault troops before they can enter the ground bases. The SSD is really huge and is intended to be printed on two sheets of paper (like a SB)."

Got the total BPV by just adding everything up (less the fighters and bombers of course). This thing would be a real bear to take down.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Thursday, February 08, 2007 - 05:37 pm: Edit

Thanks Jeremy, I don't have my books at work.

I WOULD like to see an "armored base" for use on planets. It just seems a natural with all that free rock just laying around...

=====

By Jim Davies (Mudfoot) on Saturday, February 17, 2007 - 04:29 pm: Edit

This is thread drift from R11 proposals. Jeff Wile, Peter Thoenen and I were discussing the merits or otherwise of monitors. I claim that some monitors suck. Mostly they suck wind, ie are painfully underpowered. Peter challenged me to SFBOL, he gets a monitor, I get a ship. To continue:

I'm not on SFBOL (tried it a few years ago, decided that I didn't have the time to waste on it and got hacked off with the interface. Besides, I had dial-up then, and am on the wrong side of the planet for most opponents). Too busy now to justify it.

I'm prepared to believe I would lose, because I'm deeply out of practice. But even that would depend on the ships, and a certain amount of luck. But because the monitor is so slow, it can't control the battle and so can't do anything better than force me to disengage. Now whilst that's its main use, it does not make it equal to the same BPV of starship.

With suitable other assets (packed fighters, PFs) that can take the battle to the opponent, they're OK. But otherwise, they just die.

Essentially, the monitor just crawls around the board at speed 0 or 4 (holding a WW) while the ship plays EW games, sabre dancing and launching seeker waves. Eventually the monitor runs out of weasels and can be mugged. Exact details vary by race.

=====

By Jeff Wile (Jswile) on Saturday, February 17, 2007 - 07:57 pm: Edit

Jim Davies:

Some material mistatements in your post:

1. Peter challenged you to equal BPV's battle in SFBOL, not 1 ship verses 1 monitor.
2. A simple 'No' to the challenge, would be sufficient. the list of excuses was just that, excuses.
3. I suspect that Peter's challenge was to offer you the opportunity to "put up or shut up". Pity, really, as I had hoped that either or both of you could have developed some insights to share with the discussion board.
4. Easy to have a derogatory opinion of something you have apparently little knowledge of.

As I understand it, Monitors can (if the tactical situation calls for it) reach a speed of 13 (6 points of warp, 1 point impulse energy, with a MC of 1/2) which is 3 times the "max" of 4 that you condescendingly offered the monitor.

Wild weasles aside, the Monitors have a significant direct fire capacity (and some have significant seaking weapons as well) enough that it can discourage enemy ships from closing the range to where seeking weapons can become an issue.

If your total experience is running monitors under the restrictions of wild weasles, I am not surprised that you lost.

=====

By Peter Thoenen (Eol) on Sunday, February 18, 2007 - 09:04 am: Edit

The point I was trying to make is I keep seeing massive S8 fleet's of Aux's and monitors in campaigns I play do to folk trying to get the most bang for their buck. I mostly blame this (the R11 tie in) on SFB's continue pushing of Aux variants and now racial specific monitors were suggested to make them more "fun". This whole thing started when I made the point that general units aren't suppose to be fun (look at the CPL) but serve a niche market of people that like to see every F&E ship with a SFB SSD's and SH support.

Remember this is about R11, not "strategic implications of F&E". On a pure SFB level (BPV v. BPV) we don't need fun aux units or million variants of.

On a tactics side, a equal BPV force of just monitors will always kill a equal BPV force of starships given uniformed average damage and equal skilled opponents (to reduce die roll luck and unequal tactics).

As for saber dancing, you don't play many large fleet actions do you. When was the last time you seen a full 12 ship S8 fleet running around at speed 30 once engagement (under range 16). At that point you crawl, move slow, and recharge weapons + play EW game.

Sure in a dual a starship on an open map can direct fire to death ANY plasma ship but this isn't limited to monitors and a DF monitor will beat it. You run around and high speed and my DF monitor will just kill you.

=====

By Jim Davies (Mudfoot) on Sunday, February 18, 2007 - 07:21 pm: Edit

Jeff - Quit whining and being petty.

Look at the power of a Monitor. It's like an unrefitted Fed DD - too many guns to use. The thing can hardly move when arming weapons. In an EW environment, it's screwed. Obviously (as I've repeatedly said) this depends on the ship, but even the more power-efficient ones (ie, those with seekers) can't maneuver enough to control a battle.

If the attacker has big plasma, the monitor either weasels, eats it or uses the planet as a damage sink (which is probably contrary to the victory conditions).

Peter - I think we'll have to disagree about whether the game, or the units in it, should be fun.

As for the other points:

a) monitors are disallowed from normal S8 patrol battles and don't belong in large fleet actions unless in very odd circumstances

b) Unless you have a lot of them, unsupported monitors won't kill anything that can move. Deter, damage and drive off, yes. But not kill.

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Sunday, February 18, 2007 - 07:44 pm: Edit

Quote:

It's like an unrefitted Fed DD - too many guns to use. The thing can hardly move when arming weapons.

-----

The monitor's movement problems have nothing to do with it's power. It only has 6 warp (max speed of 13, using an Impulse Engine). The 18 APR/AWR give it plenty of power for weapons.

=====

By Jeff Wile (Jswile) on Sunday, February 18, 2007 - 10:22 pm: Edit

Jim Davies:

It is not a power issue for the monitor, as Gary Bear aptly stated.

It really appears that you have no concept as to how a monitor is supposed to function in SFBs.

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Monday, February 19, 2007 - 08:13 am: Edit

Just because this has been an amusing conversation to follow and because I've never actually used a monitor, I thought I'd pipe in.

I'm looking at the Fed Monitor. 6 photons, 4 ph-1s, 8 ph-3, 2 G-racks, and 27 power (+ 8 btt) with a 0.5 move cost. Add the most common pallet (fighter, I assume) and you add 12 fighters. Overall, an impressive base-like unit, able to fight off pirate raids very effectively.

As far as a fleet-type combat unit, I have to agree that it comes up short. It simply lacks the power to use all of its weapons effectively in an EW environment and, while it has 8 batts to help with this, it lacks the legs to maintain those long term. Yes, it can fire 3 photons per turn while moving 12 with 6 EW all day long. It can overload a couple off batteries, but then must sacrifice something significant to recharge those batteries. Firing phasers, either the heavies for knife-fights or the defensives for seeker defense further reduces those capabilities.

Fighters aside (assuming they were already dead or it had the support pallet), I think I could take the Fed one with a D7C (using sabre dancing) and I think a Rom KE would kill one easily (chuck & duck). Both would be long battles, and not terribly fun to play but in both cases, you can force the MON to weasel, afterwhich it's best tactic is to stay at weaseling speed (unless he's a big fan of EDing).

Monitors also have issues against attrition units. That same Fed MON would have serious trouble against 2 squadrons of Klingon fighters. Even assuming it's own squadron cancels out one of the attacking ones, the Fed MON, especially, isn't configured well to take on AUs (the DISR ones do a bit better, but the lack of offensive phaser firepower is a weakness).

=====

By Jeff Wile (Jswile) on Monday, February 19, 2007 - 01:08 pm: Edit

Andy, couple of points in your analysis that you should (I think) take into account.

1. the Monitor (unless its happens to be on a very rare convoy escort mission) is most likely going to be guarding a planet until the planets PDU arrives/gets set up.

That means your sabre dance with the D7C is going to be within 5 hexes of the planet or you wont be able to hit the monitor at all (assuming it is using the planet and or the planets atmosphere) for cover.

2. your post seems to assume that the monitor will be in a duel situation with you in deep space, (atleast thats how I am reading it, If I am wrong, please accept my appology... just show me where, in you post you specified such tactical considerations as terrain etc.) in any event, that is not the mission that a Monitor is going to be assigned to, (in most cases). that a job for a cruiser or a DD or FF, not a MON.

3. are you sure advancing to within 5 hexes of the planet(assuming that the monitor is assigned to protect it) with a undamaged monitor with 6 photon torpedos (which you have no idea are overloaded or not), is a really good way to handle a monitor? Even with a Romulan KE, depending on the planet and ranges etc closing to 5 hexes in the face of 6 photons is not always a good idea.

I think you are making the same mistake Jim Davies made.

The monitor is designed a defense unit, not as a "general utility" starship.

yes it has the same kinds of systems that starships have, it also has serious limits as to what it can accomplish.

Killing a D7C or a King Eagle that happens to close to within 5 hexes is one thing a Monitor is good at.

=====

By Alan Trevor (Thyrm) on Monday, February 19, 2007 - 02:31 pm: Edit

One point about monitors that I don't think has been made yet is that they are cheap to build. I don't recall the exact EPV/BPV, but I believe it is something like 85/145 or close to that. That 145 BPV may be too high, though I don't think that's clear cut when used in its historic role. As Jeff points out, a monitor is intended as a defensive unit for the protection of stationary targets. A monitor that deters a pirate, or delays an enemy cruiser long enough for reinforcements to arrive has, in fact, done its job. But even if 145 BPV is too high, 85 is much closer to what that monitor actually costs the empire.

SFB is set up to buy units based on combat value, with a few "fiddles" such as scouts. But the monitor actually costs the empire about as much as a powerful frigate or weak destroyer. Hypothetically, suppose you were playing in a strategic campaign in which everything would be purchased at EPV. This puts you more in the position of an actual SFU empire. And even assuming deployment restrictions that basically require monitors to be used to defend fixed locations, at only 85 points it doesn't look like such a bad deal.

=====

By Jim Davies (Mudfoot) on Monday, February 19, 2007 - 05:04 pm: Edit

85/145 EPV/BPV is indeed correct. +15 for a normal pallet, +more for refits. This is reasonable in the right role, ie supporting other units.

But 145 BPV gets you a CC, and 160 gets you a CCH. They have almost the same heavy weapons, almost the same shields, much better phasers, much more power, more internals and better maneuverability. Ultimately, a battle against a monitor comes down to draining its batteries and phaser caps, then killing it. Unless there's a time limit, any decent ship can do this.

In equal EPV battles, the monitor will win unless the captain is a cretin or whiffs with 6 photons at R2 (it happens...). But equal BPV is going to be very different.

Jeff - I can't find anything that says that a ship landed on a planet gets the 5 hex limit like a ground base. R1.14 and P2.713 apply only to bases. You do get 2 points of ECM from ground clutter, though.

But even if the monitor is stuck on a planet such that I can't shoot it from >5 hexes, I don't have to. I can fly round to the other side of the planet and bombard it, land troops and otherwise cause havoc. I'll leave an admin shuttle 35 hexes away to keep an eye on you. When you take off, I'll adapt my tactics accordingly.

Actually, if you're parked on a planet, I can sit on the other side and pound you with ballistic plasma...though I can see this being declared illegal. I shall enquire.

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Monday, February 19, 2007 - 05:22 pm: Edit

The point is that the monitor is 85 Economic BPV +15 for the pallet. That's 100.

Or, for the same economic cost, you get a Destroyer.

Now which one wins?

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Monday, February 19, 2007 - 05:30 pm: Edit

Andy Palmer said:

-----

Quote:

Monitors also have issues against attrition units. That same Fed MON would have serious trouble against 2 squadrons of Klingon fighters. Even assuming it's own squadron cancels out one of the attacking ones, the Fed MON, especially, isn't configured well to take on AUs (the DISR ones do a bit better, but the lack of offensive phaser firepower is a weakness).

-----

Not many single ships, especially those not built as escorts, do well against a full squadron of fighters. Do you see a Fed CAR+ doing any better? Or worse, a DD/DW at the same economic cost as the Monitor?

The CA/DD/DW can run for it's life better, but that isn't an option if you're defending a fixed location (which is what a monitor is tasked to do).

=====

By Glenn Hoepfner (Ikabar) on Monday, February 19, 2007 - 06:22 pm: Edit

In a campaign many years ago, we had a player who was using "very questionable" economics and he was a bad player to boot.

He came in (and since our campaign rules left a loophole in the rules) with a fleet of 6 monitors. He also had a Klingon ally which escorted him into the battle zone to help retake a planet the Tholians had just siezed.

Turn 1, about impulse 10: All shields on all monitors were virtually stripped, internal damage on most ships.

Turn 1, about impulse 11: Klingon allies HET and cripple or severely damage all the monitors.

Turn 1, about impulse 13, game ends.

Note: The Tholians and Klingons had kept their alliance in secrecy and the Klingons had escorted the Monitors into an extremely dense minefield preset for the Klingons unhampered passage.

What does this have to do with anything? Nothing, but it just reminded me of the scenario.

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Monday, February 19, 2007 - 07:00 pm: Edit

Jeff. I'm afraid your understanding of how ships benefit from planets needs updating. The presense of a planet will have practically no impact on the battle, given the slow speed of the MON.

I do fully understand the mission parameters, but was replying in general to the open space discussion.

Gary. My point was that, for their BPV, Monitors perform worse than combat ships against AUs, due to their slow speed and

lack of phaser firepower. Speed helps with maneuvering, picking range brackets, maneuvering around seekers, etc. Phasers are a primary anti-fighter weapon.

=====  
By Jim Davies (Mudfoot) on Monday, February 19, 2007 - 07:24 pm: Edit

Gary - the CA/DD/DW can indeed run better. It hunts down the Aux CV that delivered the fighters, and kills it. Fighters die from lack of fuel. The planet takes a whole bunch of damage, but it's a draw. The alternative is to lose the monitor and (most of) the planet, vs killing some of the fighters.

The DD vs the Monitor (equal EPV) will almost always go in favour of the Monitor (ie, the DD runs away with some damage after doing light bombardment to the planet). But if the DD captain is smart, he kills the other assets (asteroid mining, moon bases) in that system which the Monitor can't protect. When the Monitor comes out to fight, the DD does an end-run around it, nails the planet and runs away laughing. DD for teh win!

=====  
By Jeff Wile (Jswile) on Monday, February 19, 2007 - 08:14 pm: Edit

Jim Davies. The Monitor can use the planet as protection by being behind the planet. (See rule P2.32 Blocking Fire). See Also rule P2.5 Effects of a Atmosphere on Combat.

I will point out that I did not specify that the Monitor was landed on the planet, you did.

It would be helpful if you responded to the actual information posted, rather than "making things up".

Andy, see same rules references as above. the monitor may use the planet to block line of sight.

if you wish to target small ground bases on the planet (as in rule R1.14)(assuming there are small ground bases present) you will need to close the range.

Also see rule D17.223 Blocked observation.

I submit that if the Monitor is on the other side of the planet, you will not be able to target the monitor.

If there are ground bases that you wish to destroy to force the monitor to engage, you will need to be able to target the ground bases directly. Seeking weapons (such as drones or plasma torpedos) will have a very short effective range, unless you wish only to inflict a general level of damage upon said planet.

The monitors mission is defensive.

the longer you screw around the planet trying for a shot at the monitor, the longer the reinforcements will have to catch you.

It is entirely possible that you might find your self trapped between the reinforcements and the defending monitor. a very bad tactical position to be in.

=====  
By Michael Lui (Michaellui) on Monday, February 19, 2007 - 08:41 pm: Edit

The monitors' missions may be defensive, but what the monitor can do depends on which defensive mission it is performing. If it has to protect the planet from any kind of bombardment it cannot use the planet as a shield. As a matter of fact, if it has to prevent anything except damage to itself, it really can't use the planet very much at all.

Under these circumstances the monitor can win the battle but lose the mission. Think about it. Why is that monitor there? If a monitors mission is defensive, what is it protecting? Can it complete its mission while hiding behind a planet? Okay, so the monitor can kill anything in its own EPV class that gets close to it, but will settle for driving whatever it is away. But if that enemy has completed his mission, then it's not being driven away, it's leaving, you have wasted all the monitors EPV for nothing, and your enemy is laughing all the way home.

=====  
By Jeff Wile (Jswile) on Monday, February 19, 2007 - 10:09 pm: Edit

Michael Lui:

It is dependent of the mission.

If the Klingon (or Romulans) mission is to kill the monitor, weapons fired into the planet do nothing to accomplish the mission (except empty the weapons used...) and again, firing a plasma torpedo at the planet when located close to a monitor (say a Federation model with 6 photons) is a quick way to get killed.

Secondly, if say, you were to take your Romulan King Eagle and start killing the inhabitants in some kind of sick genocide... the criminal act will nodoubt result in reprisals against your own citizens.

are you sure that starting a war of mutual annialation is a very smart thing to do?

Accidents happen (such as the Macarthur crashing into the Romulan Home World...) but what you are talking about is the cold blooded murder of innocent civilians.

I don't find that a funny subject.

=====  
By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Monday, February 19, 2007 - 11:39 pm: Edit

Jeff. Blocking line of sight? C'mon, Jeff. The Monitor can go a maximum of speed 13. Exactly how long do you think it will be able to keep that planet in between it and the enemy!?!? The enemy ship is more likely to be able to use the planet to block fire from the MON while closing to within range 5 of the planet to hit planetary assets.

Planetary Bombardments: it happens, happened many times in the General War. F&E even has rules for "devastating planets." See Module Y1 and what the Kzintis and Lyrans did to the Carnivons if you don't think genocide exists in the SFU.

=====  
By Michael Lui (Michaellui) on Tuesday, February 20, 2007 - 04:28 am: Edit

Quote:

It is dependent of the mission.

If the Klingon (or Romulans) mission is to kill the monitor, weapons fired into the planet do nothing to accomplish the mission (except empty the weapons used...) and again, firing a plasma torpedo at the planet when located close to a monitor (say a Federation model with 6 photons) is a quick way to get killed.

-----  
But what is the monitors mission? To hide? Why is that monitor there? They are never deployed to empty random planets for no reason whatsoever.

Quote:

Secondly, if say, you were to take your Romulan King Eagle and start killing the inhabitants in some kind of sick genocide... the criminal act will nodoubt result in reprisals against your own citizens.

Are you sure that starting a war of mutual annialation is a very smart thing to do?

Accidents happen (such as the Macarthur crashing into the Romulan Home World...) but what you are talking about is the cold blooded murder of innocent civilians.

I don't find that a funny subject.

-----  
Lets see, I take that King Eagle, launch an R at your monitor at range 10, sideslip the next impulse behind the planet so your monitor can't shoot at my ship, start fading out so you will never get that shot, and if you also fly behind that planet (full of those civilians you are protecting) to get away from that R torp, who is guilty of killing all of those innocent civilians? It will then be your fault, not mine, in your own court of law.

=====  
By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Tuesday, February 20, 2007 - 06:09 am: Edit

Quote:

I take that King Eagle, launch an R at your monitor ...you are protecting) to get away from that R torp, who is guilty of killing

all of those innocent civilians? It will then be your fault, not mine, in your own court of law.

-----  
Uh, No. You are still responsible since you launched the weapon. That's why it's considered a "massacre" when troops fire into a crowd when only one person is shooting at them. Additionally, how can you prove what the torp was targeted on? You could have been launching against the planet the whole time.

-----  
By Peter Thoenen (Eol) on Tuesday, February 20, 2007 - 09:26 am: Edit

I believe there as a Klink v. Fed SH also where the Klink was preventing the Fed from stopping an asteroid from slamming into a planet.

-----  
By Larry E. Ramey (Hydrajak) on Tuesday, February 20, 2007 - 10:26 am: Edit

"Secondly, if say, you were to take your Romulan King Eagle and start killing the inhabitants in some kind of sick genocide... the criminal act will nodoubt result in reprisals against your own citizens."

ROTFLMAO!!!!

Apparently no one in this thread has ever played F&E. Devistating a planet is S.O.P. Even the "peaceful" Feds do it.

Will it invite reprisals? Sure. Is it Criminal? Whatever. War is hell. If you don't beleive it, try reading about the campaign of the 8th Airforce or the fire bombing of Osaka/Tokyo. Ever since WWII civilians have been a valid strategic target. Its only murder if you can see their faces.

(Grunts would go to jail for actions that earn a flyboy a medal)

I mean come on.... The Hydrans are going to complain to exactly who when thier homeworld is bombarded? LYRANS EAT US FOR THE LOVE OF THE 3 GODS!!!

-----  
By Michael Lui (Michaellui) on Tuesday, February 20, 2007 - 02:59 pm: Edit

-----  
Quote:

Uh, No. You are still responsible since you launched the weapon. That's why it's considered a "massacre" when troops fire into a crowd when only one person is shooting at them.

-----  
But in this instance that person isn't in the crowd, I fire a "seeking" weapon at him, and then he runs behind the crowd to make the weapon hit someone in the crowd while I have no control over the weapon after it has been fired.

-----  
Quote:

Additionally, how can you prove what the torp was targeted on? You could have been launching against the planet the whole time.

-----  
I don't have to prove it. If it wasn't targetted at him he had no need to run behind the crowd. And why is he running behind the crowd when weapons start getting fired? He should be running away from the crowd to keep them safe.

And his example was of a Fed monitor, the Fed courts are like our American courts, they'll crucify their own people in uniform before they'll find the enemy guilty of anything.

-----  
Quote:

Apparently no one in this thread has ever played F&E. Devistating a planet is S.O.P. Even the "peaceful" Feds do it.

-----  
I do believe that quite a lot of us do, but as this is the SFB site, some people may not have and have no idea that that is how the game is played at the strategic level and we are trying to keep the discussion at the tactical level. And with the "revisionist" histories that polititions and other idiots wish to inflict on our educational system, quite a lot of people believe that you can kill the enemy in a city without hitting any civilians.

In my ROTC class in college, 20 years ago, the first day the instructor asked anyone who thought the military lost Vietnam to raise their hands. In a class of about 30, 6 raised their hands. Its probably gotten worse since then.

-----  
By Ted Fay (Catwhoatsphoto) on Tuesday, February 20, 2007 - 03:04 pm: Edit

The first casualty of war is truth.

-----  
By Jim Davies (Mudfoot) on Tuesday, February 20, 2007 - 03:21 pm: Edit

Jeff: Of course the monitor can hide behind the planet. So hide. I'll hit the planet. Can't you read?

"See Also rule P2.5 Effects of a Atmosphere on Combat." What do you claim I'm missing? It reduces the damage slightly, but so what?

Then you wrote this:

-----  
Quote:

3. are you sure advancing to within 5 hexes of the planet(assuming that the monitor is assigned to protect it) with a undamaged monitor with 6 photon torpedos (which you have no idea are overloaded or not), is a really good way to handle a monitor? Even with a Romulan KE, depending on the planet and ranges etc closing to 5 hexes in the face of 6 photons is not alway a good idea.

-----  
So what was that about? The only conceivable reason I could have for needing to close to within 5 hexes is to hit something on the planet, and the only thing either of us has mentioned is the monitor. So what exactly were you talking about?

-----  
By Michael Lui (Michaellui) on Tuesday, February 20, 2007 - 03:26 pm: Edit

Actually the first casualty of war is the men facing the enemy, the second casualty of war is the truth as the politicians/reporters lie about it. Who was that quote from anyway?

-----  
By Jeff Wile (Jswile) on Tuesday, February 20, 2007 - 03:58 pm: Edit

Andy Palmer posted: "Jeff. Blocking line of sight? C'mon, Jeff. The Monitor can go a maximum of speed 13. Exactly how long do you think it will be able to keep that planet in between it and the enemy!?!? The enemy ship is more likely to be able to use the planet to block fire from the MON while closing to within range 5 of the planet to hit planetary assets."

Andy, that is entirely dependent on the range your ship is from the planet/monitor.

If you are 30 hexes away, each 1 hex move by the monitor (in close orbit of the planet) means you (and your ship) would need to move 30 hexes(while maintaining the 30 hex range) to bring the monitor back into live of sight.

If you are only 15 hexes away, a 1 hex move by the monitor will result in you needing to move 15 hexes (again assuming that you wish to maintain the 15 hexes range).

The closer to the planet that you are, means that you have to make fewer moves to keep the monitor in line of sight.

of course, you could simply wait for the monitor to complete an orbit of the planet and "wait"... but again, that gives the reinforcements more time to arrive.

Time which you, (being the aggressor) can't afford.

And go ahead...coast your ship into range 5...with 6 overloaded photons, the planetary phaser 4 bases and the 2 squadrons of PDU fighters and the monitors squadron... I suspect that any single ship you bring to this particular party is going to find a warm reception!

(and again, being only 5 hexes away from both phaser 4's and 6 overloaded photons is another way to die a quick death.

-----  
By Michael Lui (Michaellui) on Tuesday, February 20, 2007 - 04:14 pm: Edit

So all of a sudden the planet has acquired a host of planetary defenses too?

Come-on Jeff, stop trying to change the scenario in the middle of the game when you're losing. If we start this game with 150 BPV each, you can't all of a sudden pop up another 500 BPV of bases and fighters. Stick to ONE thing would you.

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Tuesday, February 20, 2007 - 05:09 pm: Edit

Yeah, I gotta agree with Michael here. Jeff's not even in the same conversation at this point.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Tuesday, February 20, 2007 - 05:10 pm: Edit

Michael Lieu said: "the instructor asked anyone who thought the military lost Vietnam to raise their hands" I went to VMI about the same time and we had several instructors (ROTC and other) that were Vietnam veterans (plus all the senior Commandant/ Superintendent/ etc).

Some of them thought we had lost the War because in the end the North took over the south. The SF guys were especially cranked.

I read the account of the NVA commander (blank right now as to his name) and HE said that he never thought he could militarily defeat the USA. But he could make them sick of the place and leave.

The other common fallacy is that the Viet Cong defeated the South. FALSE. The NVA invaded the south with more tanks than the Germans used in Barbarossa, according to my God Father (retired AUS 4 star tanker). AND he said the North used them well.

=====

By Frank DeMaris (Kemaris) on Tuesday, February 20, 2007 - 08:31 pm: Edit

Michael Grafton: That would be Vo Nguyen Giap, IIRC.

=====

By Jeff Wile (Jswile) on Tuesday, February 20, 2007 - 08:49 pm: Edit

Michael Lui:

None of the defenses were specified.

For all you know you showed up 1 hex away from Kzintai with all weapons of the Star base, the PDU and the Home world Fleet firing upon you and your witless crew (witless because they tolerated you as the captain that got them into such an untenable situation).

Andy, Insults are not welcome.

=====

By Glenn Hoepfner (Ikabar) on Tuesday, February 20, 2007 - 10:21 pm: Edit

Jeff, I've been a silent observer on this conversation but I must agree with Michael Lui and Andy. And to call Michael a captain only a witless crew would follow is really not polite either.

=====

By Kerry E Mullan (Nomad17) on Tuesday, February 20, 2007 - 10:28 pm: Edit

Jeff,

Um if the truth is an insult then so be it. I mean if you state a tactical situation and suddenly note "Oh yeah about that other 10 ship BB lead fleet hiding one hex behind my monitor, well it has no bearing on how well my monitor will do in single ship combat."

Stop smoking the ganja and get back to the tactical discussion. Of course large numbers of added defenses will make a difference. The discussion was of a monitor being able to either deter, stalemate, or otherwise make it hard for an opposing ship in one on one combat. It is not that a monitor with a full fleet can outdo a single ship of the monitors BPV.

If the discussion for you amounts to "A monitor with superior allied forces can overcome a single ship" well congratulations you have shown 1200 bpv can destroy 100 bpv in a "fair fight". That proves a lot about the monitors capabilities...note it really doesn't.

The monitor itself can create a decent battle with a ship of equivalent BPV the problem being a few things though.

The monitor normally can only destroy an opponent who allows it or can do so over long periods of time-10+ turns of sabre dancing. Most opponents don't give you that time.

A monitor is great for keeping the opposing ship from hurting a planet badly, but it is only good in that stature for 4-6 turns. Of course this varies by tactical skills involved but all things being equal the monitor is sorely pressed after 3+ turns of combat.

It is great at a turn or 2 of good damage output before it dies though, and that is where ships have to be worried. As if the ship gets hurt badly enough to not be able to escape then it loses as well (by escape I am meaning reinforcements or disengagement).

Vietnam war.. hmm similar to Iraq in morality, how can you win a war if the population doesn't want to win? Yes we can militarily overpower most out there, but as we do not want to overtake the country (aka old Britain) winning isn't really a possibility.

=====

By Michael Lui (MichaelLui) on Tuesday, February 20, 2007 - 11:41 pm: Edit

MG

You went to VMI? I went to NMMI.

=====

By William E. Wood (Wxmanwill) on Wednesday, February 21, 2007 - 07:35 am: Edit

If the victory conditions don't specify that the defender has to prevent damage to the planet then it is unwise for the Romulan to waste plasma on a planet.

It's all about victory conditions in the scenario. It's SFB not F@E or the Real World Military string.

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Wednesday, February 21, 2007 - 09:46 am: Edit

Monitors are good for scaring/fighting off pirates. i.e., no pirate will risk getting within range of the MON in order to bag a freighter or two.

Put a MON against warships out to destroy shipping and/or capture the planet and you have a different scenario entirely; one in which the MON is not well suited except to possibly delay the offensive (which in and of itself might be enough, but when its not...)

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Wednesday, February 21, 2007 - 10:00 am: Edit

Us military school guys have to stick together.

=====

By Larry E. Ramey (Hydrajak) on Wednesday, February 21, 2007 - 10:41 am: Edit

I'm not sure why people think a monitor is crap.

6 heavy weapons means a monitor is good at long range. 12 fighters means its pretty scary up close.

Yes, and AuxCV vrs a monitor is likely to be a big win for the AuxCV unless there are few PDUs on the planet.

And so? A CVA usually kills a CV too. I'm confused as the the argument here.

AuxCVs are difficult to use on the offensive because they are so slow strategically. 3 hexes vrs 6 in F&E, cannot avoid being chased and forced into combat.

A Monitor is crap because a War Eagle can smite it? Nah, its just a War Eagle is REALLY REALLY good at killing slow things. 3 or 4 War Eagles can give a BATS a really hard time too. Does that mean BATS suck eggs? However if the War Eagle eats a set of prox photons (narrow slavo) after shooting the R torp into a WW, the Monitor can surely win.

A Monitor will CERTAINLY stop a Marnie invasion. FULL STOP. Look at your average Marine ship.... do you REALLY want to get within range 5 of a Monitor? (The SPH COULD do it, in about a 10 turn or more game) Oh, you brought some real

combat ships to chase off the monitor.... well last time I checked 3 ships beat 1 most days of the week.

The only reason I brought F&E planetary bombardment into this at all was a felt some saying "shooting civilians is a terrible war crime." Yeah, whatever. This is a StarTrek game, not the Political History thread where I can sling my opinions around and slag politicians and historians as a bunch of liberal liars (or the military as a bunch of Nazi murders) In F&E it is S.O.P. In StarTrek (TOS) the Klinks had no problem with it, the Roms did it, even the episode with the Gorns had the Gorns slaughtering a colony.

=====

By Steve Petrick (Petrick) on Wednesday, February 21, 2007 - 11:08 am: Edit

Okay. On request I have reviewed the conversation since the Monitor issue came up.

Jeff Wile:

You DID go overboard suggesting that Michael Liu was a "witless captain". You need to apologize for that scurious statement and consider your words with greater care. Whether you imagine that to be the case or not, it is not proper to post derogatory comments about others.

Further, as others have noted, you have chosen to change the scenario in mid discussion, and you should recognize that. If you wanted to add planetary defenses to the discussion, you should have noted that it was a change. You yourself noted at the start of the discussion that the Monitor was "just there until the PDU arrives and is set up" (not an exact quote, but that is what you said). Suddenly adding a unit you yourself acknowledged was not there is a bad debate tactic.

As to the rest of you, there is a fundamental mis-understanding of what a Monitor is supposed to do.

In SFB there is no way anyone can keep a weapon from hitting a planet. Put a ship with a single phaser-1 at 50 hexes range from a planet, and while it make take it at very long time, it can eventually devastate the planet (the phaser-1 will on average score a point of damage every six turns towards devastation). The problem is always a matter of the time to do it. Obviously the closer you can get to the planet, the faster you can inflict damage. (The same phaser-1 at one hex range will score at worst three points of damage every turn, at best seven points of damage every turn, and an average of four and a half points of damage a turn.) The Monitor cannot keep you from firing your phaser at the planet, it can keep you from getting in close until help arrives.

Monitors are not intended to "fight in the line of battle". They are not dueling ships (although I will concede that I did once try to bring one to a "points battle" just to see how it would fly . . . but my local group would not let me). It might be amusing to conduct a deep space duel between two fully equiped Monitors (either two Monitors with General Pallets, or two Monitors with fighter pallets, or two monitors with space control pallets).

In any case, the upshot is that the Monitor puts a clock on the enemy. The enemy may want to damage critical infrastructure on the planet (as opposed to simple general destruction). To accomplish that, and to do it before reinforcements arrive, he will have to deal with the Monitor. The Monitor will not be there if the planet does not have something important enough to justify the enemy sending a ship to raid the planet. If the Enemy Ship chooses to attack the Monitor, then he is not damaging the planet and time is bought for help to arrive. If the enemy chooses to ignore the monitor, then he his attacking from such a range that his ability to damage the planet is extremely reduced, and again help is on the way.

Jeff Wile is not wrong in saying that seeking weapons might be detoured into hitting the planet. And a valid point can be made that maybe the enemy's intent is "general damage". But if the plasma was launched from ten hexes range then it is impacting at 15 hexes range and the damage has been reduced. The plasma did not do as much damage as it could have done had it been launched at five hexes range. Further, while in the history of SFB I have no doubt that some seeking weapon

somewhere was decoyed into a planet and actually hit something that was truly vital, planets are big things and a plasma-R impacting in the Alps is not going to immediately reduce the production of ships in Kiel. The planet as a whole will survive the incident and recover.

=====

By Loren Knight (Loren) on Wednesday, February 21, 2007 - 12:06 pm: Edit

Well, the resulting flood might be a problem to some.

=====

By Jeff Wile (Jswile) on Wednesday, February 21, 2007 - 08:36 pm: Edit

Michael lui:

I am sorry that you are a witless Captain.

=====

By Glenn Hoepfner (Ikabar) on Wednesday, February 21, 2007 - 09:39 pm: Edit

Well, that was insincere.

=====

By Steve Petrick (Petrick) on Thursday, February 22, 2007 - 10:31 am: Edit

Jeff Wile:

I guess you do not realize how serious this is.

Three choices.

- 1.) Apologize and control yourself.
- 2.) Be banned from this topic and control yourself in future to avoid being banned from other topics.
- 3.) Be banned from the board.

I will be sorry to see you go, but the choice is entirely yours. If you are not able to comprehend your own inability to conduct yourself with decorum, to grasp that people can disagree with you and be right, perhaps you should seek professional counseling to control your temper.

But you are not in a position that allows you to act like a stubborn and willful child. You have zero right to hurl perjoratives on other people, simply because they disagree with you or have caught you trying to change the basis of a debate.

=====

By Steve Cole (Stevecole) on Thursday, February 22, 2007 - 11:05 am: Edit

How many of Jeff's CapLog articles will be deleted before Jeff makes a sincere apology?

Seriously, Jeff, you're WAY out of line and can apologize or I will never print any of your articles or other submissions, EVER.

=====

By Benoit Rheaume (Bneus) on Thursday, February 22, 2007 - 12:55 pm: Edit

Well I always thought Monitors existed because of economic reasons other than military reasons.

Large Warp engines are expensive and take time to build, also Dilitium Crystal those engines use are scare and far between. Main hulls ,life support systems, and weapon system are relatively cheap and fast to build.

So Monitors are kinda the max a freighterish hull can go! and are the best you can have before the shipyards finish that shiny new cruiser you ordered to defend your world.

BTW guys its just a game, if you cant agree to the outcome of a fight. then play SFB over it and test your arguments

Have fun, PLay with Honor!

=====

By Steve Petrick (Petrick) on Thursday, February 22, 2007 - 02:06 pm: Edit

Benoit Rheaume:

Well the logic of that breaks down based on the limited numbers of monitors built compared to even frigates. If Monitors were truly that cheap, every planet would have one, minor planets (important enough to be on the Federation and Empire map) would have two or more, Major Planets would have more than that, and the Captial Planets would have fleets of them.

There is a limit on them beyond simple economics that would appear to make them easy subs for frigates.

=====

By Michael Lui (MichaelLui) on Thursday, February 22, 2007 - 02:51 pm: Edit  
Hydrajak

Quote:

6 heavy weapons means a monitor is good at long range. 12 fighters means its pretty scary up close.

Yes, an AuxCV vs a monitor is likely to be a big win for the AuxCV

-----  
Actually an AuxCVA would be likely a big win for the AuxCVA. An AuxCV vs a monitor would be an even fight of 12 fighters vs 12 fighters with the monitor tilting the balance and then trying to kill the AuxCV (which should be at long range and have a good chance of running away).

=====

By Larry E. Ramey (Hydrajak) on Thursday, February 22, 2007 - 03:44 pm: Edit  
Lui,

Yes. I was thinking Large Aux CV from F&E or AuxCVA from SFB. I don't think an Aux anything would have ANY trouble running from a Monitor. Those things are slugs!

=====

By Jeff Wile (Jswile) on Thursday, February 22, 2007 - 04:18 pm: Edit  
Michael Lui:

I appologize for my remarks.

in future, I shall try to control myself.

SPP and SPP:

Is this sufficient, or do you require further clarifying statements?

=====

By Richard Sherman (Rich) on Thursday, February 22, 2007 - 06:40 pm: Edit

Wow. SPP has cloned himself, and forced out SVC.

Holy Crap!

It's a coup!

Battlestations!

(Hmmm...or should I say, "Kai, the Empire?")

Oh, and Jeff? Do or do not...there is no try.

[Just trying to be funny. My apologies to anyone if my attempt at diffusing humor falls flat...]

=====

By Glenn Hoepfner (Ikabar) on Thursday, February 22, 2007 - 07:24 pm: Edit

Richard, of the last two posts, yours does not fall flat.

But I trully do hate that Yoda quote. It's one of those catch phrases I've been annoyed with from the beginning.

=====

By Benoit Rheume (Bneus) on Friday, February 23, 2007 - 09:13 am: Edit

Here is a clarification of my thoughts on the reasons of the existence of the MON.

They are close to the firepower of a DN , they dont take away any Shipyard capability, So they are the best a minor planet can ask for on a "SHORT" notice.

The problem with them is, they must cost a wallop in maintenance and they're crew must always be green or close. I wouldnt see the Federation putting prime starfleets cadets on that boat..most likely a couple training officers plus local civilians quickly trained in pushing the right buttons.

After the war is over, and the pirates caught, you put that thing back in Mothball, and the civilians go back to farming or mining.

=====

By Steve Petrick (Petrick) on Friday, February 23, 2007 - 07:01 pm: Edit

Benoit Rheume:

In all seriousness, the problem is probably simply that there are slow. It is very hard to pull a Monitor from its duty at a planet to send it to a shipyard for repair due to its slow speed, and they are generally deployed where there are no repair assets to hand. Most warships can hit high warp to get back to a repair facility, and their place is easily taken by another ship while they are repaired. It does not work that way with Monitors. This helps make them good for defending a fixed point (like a planet), where they will not stress their engines much moving from point to point patrolling a sector. It allows the warships to patrol sectors and run to other areas of danger without keeping them tied directly to a specific planet.

Both have their uses, and both are worth building for their specific use. Neither is likely to have the worst crew assigned to them. In all seriousness, youare as likely to find starfleet cadets on Monitors as any other boat simply because you want to make sure the upper tiers of your fleet are filled with people who have a broad experience.

In short, I might be a cruiser captain, but Larry Ramey might be my Exec and be able to fill me in on Carrier ops when that FFV is assigned to support a task force I have been assigned to command. Because Larry was assigned to a CVB as a cadet, or at some other point in his career.

Richard Sherman might be my Tactical Officer, and perhaps he did a tour on a Monitor at one point, and since we are going to be beefing up the defense of a planet that happens to have a Monitor, he can give me direct advice on his experience of what Monitors can and cannot do.

And so on.

Even with the war over, Monitors would not be placed in Mothballs, but would continue to do their job. The Orions are never going to go away, and some planet is always going to be hitting the point where it is now very much worth defending, but no one wants to assign a heavy cruiser to guard it, and the PDU that will be assigned to defend it is still being organized and will not be ready for a year, or was diverted to another mission/planet.

Monitors serve as he stop gap when defenses are not as good as they should be, or as the augmentation when a fixed point is seen as needing more defense than it has right now. There is always going to be a job somewhere for the Monitor, even if a given Monitor is "between missions" at some point.

=====

By Richard Sherman (Rich) on Friday, February 23, 2007 - 08:11 pm: Edit

SPP,

All good points, and well said.

Except for one thing.

I "can't" be your tactical officer. You're a Klingon fascist, remember?

Or have you finally learned the error of your ways, and have come to understand that Star Fleet is the finest space navy in the galaxy, and the United Federation of Planets is the finest place in the galaxy to live?

=====

By Steve Petrick (Petrick) on Monday, February 26, 2007 - 10:31 am: Edit

Richard Sherman:

Last time I looked, Federation officers did not say "Kai the Empire".

Perhaps your time as a deep cover agent inside the Federation is still affecting you.

Maybe a few hours in the booth will clear your thoughts.

I have fondness for Tholian speech as the method of "adjustment".

In your case, however, I think the 24 hour all Anna Nicole all the time channel should do it.

...

Why do I feel I should insert maniacal laughter at this point?

Probably an effect of the limited amount of exposure I have had to the Anna Nicole channel while flipping channels?

=====

By Richard Sherman (Rich) on Monday, February 26, 2007 - 01:53 pm: Edit

Anna Nicole? Who's that?

And yes, my cave is quite well-stocked, thank you very much...

=====

By Loren Knight (Loren) on Monday, February 26, 2007 - 03:02 pm: Edit

Maybe there should be a tactic call the Anna. Not sure what it would be but it would have to do with some sort of deception.

I've always found it interesting how when she was in court she spoke clearly, concisely and wouldn't be misled by the opposition easily.

Yet everywhere else she was a total blithering ditz.

=====

By Steve Petrick (Petrick) on Monday, February 26, 2007 - 04:02 pm: Edit

Loren Knight:

I think everyone else is looking at you in absolute wonder, as I cannot imagine anyone having taken the time to listen to that case, or to have listened to Anna Nicole Smith enough to make that distinction.

Lieutenant Sherman, call sickbay and have them send a few brawny lads with restraints for Lieutenant Knight.

=====

By Scott Tenhoff (Scottt) on Monday, February 26, 2007 - 04:13 pm: Edit

Yeah, I'll summarize the "Anna" Tactic.

You have a Captain flying a D6 X-Mauler and presenting the pretty face (and what-not).

It launches a single shuttlecraft on Turn 17 (?) Twenty turns later it launches a 2nd shuttlecraft. The 1st shuttlecraft then self-destructs 5 impulses later.

The Boom then launches 5 impulses after that (t37i10) and self-destructs. The Ass-hull (pun-intended for H.K.Stern) then picks up the last shuttlecraft and disengages with 375 power stacked up in it's batteries.

=====

By Loren Knight (Loren) on Monday, February 26, 2007 - 04:35 pm: Edit

SPP: It was long ago and I was at my In-Laws who were watching it. It was a matter of politeness that I sat and watched SOME of it. I took note then. I have to also admit having seen a few minutes of a few episodes of the VH1 Anna series... hence my facination in the contrast of the two sides of her.

I also have to admit that she is more financially successful than I and I should be better of than I am so I do have to at least respect that she played a good game there for a while that paid off better than anything I've attempted yet. Of course, I'm doing pretty well staying alive so...

=====

By Loren Knight (Loren) on Monday, February 26, 2007 - 04:37 pm: Edit

Scott,

yeah, that'll do.

LOL

=====

By Richard Sherman (Rich) on Monday, February 26, 2007 - 05:18 pm: Edit

My wife was actually "addicted" to watching that train-wreck of a show on "E."

For her sake, I believe the appropriate quote here would be:

"Repulsive, yet strangely compelling."

My friend Chris would have a different comedic quote that applies to AN-S, but it is quite vulgar (and more than a bit misogynistic) and cannot be printed here. Any wanting to know can just e-mail me...

As to the D6MX "IKV Kanna Kicole-Kith"...so pleased it's in the DSF instead of Star Fleet. Makes me breathe a sigh of relief.

[Sigh.]

Take that, Ketrick!

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Sunday, May 27, 2007 - 12:15 am: Edit

Having just defended a Gorn planet with a BS (PAM, 2x HBM, 12x G-8), 2 shipyards (from the CDH), and 5 DefSats... against an Andro MIS and 3x COB, I have some questions... primarily about the placement of bases around a planet.

If you have a planet in the scenario, and a base, where is the best place to place the base? I had the BS orbiting at range-2, along with the Shipyards, and had the DefSats in their "usual formation".

However, during the battle, it was fairly easy for my opponent to "screen" his forces from my base by getting behind the planet and staying there. He eventually came out, and was driven off, but...

I guess I'm looking for input on the "best" place to put a base in a system with a planet?

=====

By Jim Davies (Mudfoot) on Sunday, May 27, 2007 - 06:02 pm: Edit

Assuming that you don't have any other assets (GBP4s, vulnerable civilians, GCLs, etc) on the planet, you might as well go as far away as you can. The attacker, by definition, has the mobility so can choose to hide or not.

Of course the defsats do to some extent count as a planet-based asset, and for some reason that escapes me, they have to be in close orbit. Which suggests that defsats are only worth buying if you have to defend the planet rather than a base.

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Sunday, May 27, 2007 - 08:30 pm: Edit

Jim: Since DefSats can only be placed in orbit of a planet, not a base (or in empty space), yeah, they're only useful for defending planets.

Of course ideally you'd have some GBP4s, but not every situation is idea.

I think a radius-3 orbit of the world might be best. I went with radius-2 to try to keep the base and yards together and under close cover of the DefSats.

=====

By eric jimerson (Lord\_Errock) on Monday, June 18, 2007 - 03:43 pm: Edit

Convoy escorts:

In a campaign, I have been forming my freighters into convoys for operating near the bordrs and for supporting forays into uncharted territory -- as one might expect. Usually 2 F-L and 2-3 F-S

In our campaign, warships are 50% faster than freighters and freighter based ships (speed 6 v speed 4) and it seems a waste of capability to team up warships with freighter convoys.

In the past, and I dont know that this campaign will be different, the most common warships were DDs and DWs with a few CWs and CAs here and there.

I am toying with the idea of building Large Aux Cruisers (R8) for convoy escorts. They're cheap, they move the same speed as the freighers, and 2-3 per convoy should do well enough given he threats they will likely face. They're also SC4 which will free up the SC3 shipyards for cruisers.

What do you think?

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Monday, June 18, 2007 - 03:51 pm: Edit

In my opinion, an excellent idea and it's a "historical" use for these ships (see rulle (S8.51): *...Auxiliaries can be used if the force is defending a fixed installation, FRD, or convoy, or is attacking a fixed installation.*).

=====

By Joseph Riggs (Junior) on Monday, June 18, 2007 - 03:53 pm: Edit

So you'll have convoys of 8 ships, 3 of which will be Aux Cruisers? Seems like an awful lot of escort ships per convoy.

What about something less drastic? Maybe using Armed Freighters to carry your freight? Or slipping Q-Ships into all of your convoys?

=====

By Eric Jimerson (Lord\_Errock) on Monday, June 18, 2007 - 04:01 pm: Edit

Doesn't have to be three - that's just the number I put out there. 1 or 2 is certainly a possibility depending on availability and location and level of threat.

The real question revolves around the idea of the use of the aux cruisers for escorts - good or bad or ugly?

IMHO, it doesn't make sense to tie down a number of 'fast' fleet units (DD, DW, etc) to escort a convoy when a 'slow' units with roughly equal combat power is available.

I'm also considering building NG ships (I'm a Fed) for the same role as they are also 'slow' units.

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Monday, June 18, 2007 - 04:38 pm: Edit

GCA's/GDD's are a good choice too, as they have photons (and many p-1's).

You might want to check out the GCV (GCA carrier); it can carry F-16's!

=====

By Craig Tenhoff (Cktenhoff) on Monday, June 18, 2007 - 07:05 pm: Edit

I think the trouble with using 'slow' units as escorts is that the Raider will be able to easily withdraw from combat. Good for the Convoy, but possibly not good for you campaign wises, since you've lost an opportunity to eliminate an opponents ship.

=====

By Jon Berry (Laz\_Longsmith) on Tuesday, June 19, 2007 - 12:02 am: Edit

Not sure if this is the right spot, but; in general, how do base assaults evolve as the GW tech progresses?

Beyond stuff like Maulers, I'm looking for a general sense of how these sorts of things play out from early through late GW, and even into X-tech/Andros.

I'm not looking for details, just broad strokes.

I ask because I'm developing something for a future proposal, and want the information for pre-development purposes.

--

Jon Berry

=====

By William T Wilson (Sheap) on Tuesday, June 19, 2007 - 06:35 am: Edit

Depends on the region.

In the west, the obvious thing is that drones get faster, and carriers and fighters become more common, so really the dynamic changes from "close and hose" to "drone bombardment". In the east, they get sabots, but the effect is not as dramatic as it is with drones.

EW gets thicker, which works against the base, which doesn't get many upgrades to its own EW situation. Early in the war, a base is a formidable EW platform; later on, it's sort of mediocre.

On the other hand, you generally stop seeing base stations a couple of years into the war, and start seeing more battle stations and sector bases. Attacking ships get bigger too, so this is sort of a wash, it just makes the battles a bit more violent. But, battle stations, despite having more bulk and power than base stations, have a fairly modest firepower increase. So, again, things get a little tougher on the base.

The main advantage bases get later in the war is that they will almost always have PFs and bombers defending them. The attackers can bring PFs, but can't usually use bombers, and bringing PFs requires them to have a PFT (even if it's not included in the battle force, they still have to HAVE it, strategically) whereas the base can just tack PFs on with a simple module.

Andros are different, their bases are sort of wimpy and without seeking weapons, they are disadvantaged on the attack as well.

=====

By Larry E. Ramey (Hydrajak) on Tuesday, June 19, 2007 - 10:00 am: Edit

AuxCV are FANTASTIC convoy escorts... assuming they don't get gacked at WS-I. Depends on your campaign rules. They will keep raiders away for a long time, hopefully till reinforcements show up.

I'm not so impressed with AuxCAs. They do ok I guess.

=====

By Eric Jimerson (Lord\_Errock) on Thursday, June 21, 2007 - 08:14 am: Edit

I think the trouble with using 'slow' units as escorts is that the Raider will be able to easily withdraw from combat. Good for the Convoy, but possibly not good for you campaign wises, since you've lost an opportunity to eliminate an opponents ship.

-----

In our campaign rules, its easy for ships to avoid combat, so long as they are as fast (or faster) than the ships chasing them. A warship (sp6) raiding a convoy would be able to get away from a warship (sp6) protecting a convoy because as same-speed ships can always evade.

So, nominally, you're right, but in our campaign and in this context, a 'slow'(sp4) ship and a 'fast'(sp6) ship are the same.

=====

## FEDERATION TACTICS

By Jeremy Gray (Gray) on Wednesday, January 03, 2007 - 09:01 am: Edit

Dale McKee and I are about to play a patrol scenario as part of our ongoing Admiral's Game. We added these random encounters to give us a break from larger fleet battles. The first one my Feds draw? ... (T7S1.0) Intercept! ... Andros

The scenario will be played with drastically reduced forces:

FFG Arleigh Burke

FFL+ Yi Sun Sin

vs

COB DeNiro

VIP Pacino

The year is Y172.

Both sides are going to be limited to 10% CO's options. Aside from the smaller force, the year, and the reduced options, the scenario will be played as written (the subsequent mini-campaign games will not be played). Some added victory conditions for the purpose of our campaign: The Patrol player earns 10 RPs for every ship that does not escape, the Andro player gains 10 RPs for every ship that escapes. Doesn't sound like much, but we have fairly tight production budgets, so 10 extra BPV can mean a lot.

At first glance, this feels like a straight forward battle for the Feds, as the Andros start out with a speed limit and there are no displacement devices to worry about. Any thoughts on what my pair of frigates can expect? What are prospects for killing or capturing one or both Andros without getting my own ships crippled? Keep in mind that Dale only loses 10 RPs per ship if he loses one (these are not "his" ships, he just controls them for this scenario) while I have actual ships out of my fleet as stake.

=====

By Loren Knight (Loren) on Wednesday, January 03, 2007 - 11:31 am: Edit

I think your Frigates are in trouble if you don't dance well. The Andros are certainly capable of dancing fast but if they give you a good OL shot take it! Otherwise they will take you pea-shooting and shunt it to the rear and shake it off while their pea-shooting will eventually wear away your shields and your ships.

A patient Andro can be even more dangerous than a patient Romulan.

I'd consider narrow salvos since small bits of damage will be shunted around. But roll a one on regular photons and you turn the whole scenario around. Its the kind of call that can only be made in game though. You can really only plan on considering it... IMHO.

=====

By Richard Sherman (Rich) on Wednesday, January 03, 2007 - 12:14 pm: Edit

Forget about a capture attempt. Not going to happen. Even if PA panels are full, a bank of even 1 active PA panel blocks transporter actions. Only if an entire bank is deactivated or destroyed (without the ship also somehow NOT being destroyed) could you get marines onboard.

If you've got a WS and speed advantage to start, make the most of the first two turns. Especially with those plasmas and the smattering of medium speed drones you have. After that, he's going to have the advantage with 3 TRL's and the "approach-and-fade" tactic so common with smaller Andros.

On the other hand, Dale's got virtually nothing to lose by suiciding forces against you. If he loses both ships, but kills (or perhaps just cripples? Don't know what your repair costs are like) one of yours, he wins. If it looks like that's his game, you may have to try to hold your seeking weapons as defensive "moving terrain" to deter on overrun attempt. The good news about that is that you CAN do that; 6 P1 and 2 photons can compete with 8 P2 and 3 TRL, especially at ranges less than 6. Bottomline, if you have a significant WS and speed advantage to start, by being aggressive, you may wholly take away or at least delay his potential attempts at overrun, and leave him with only one effective tactic (approach-and-fade). If that's the case, it may be more of a drawn-out battle because the only ranges where he can establish definitive weapons superiority is range 3 or closer, or ranges 9-12.

About the best news you've got really is that he can't kill either of your ships with both of his in just one pass, but you CAN kill one of his with both of yours...

Related to this, you've got ships that a fast movers...almost as good as his. Keep your speed up and the pressure on (even if that means not using full overloads in the photons after your first shot).

Another minor piece of good news is that his force is only going to have 3 TBs, at most. 1 less could be a bit of help to you.

Try to keep your turn mode satisfied (turn at times he's not positioned to take advantage), and turn shields away, or expect him to board you (or send in 4 commando H&Rs on one ship).

Buy extra BP, and post guards. You won't need commandoes yourself, and keep 3 BP unassigned initially to repel boarding actions.

Unless you're in position to literally blow up the VIP in one (or two) impulses, shoot the COB.

=====

By Kerry E Mullan (Nomad17) on Wednesday, January 03, 2007 - 12:45 pm: Edit

Sorry maybe I am clueless here but not kill in one pass?

At R3 he does like 50 damage minus tbombs to a frigate that means its done for the fight.

Most likely scenario: initial turn andro maintains spd 15 and starts getting position. T2 you both run at each other. If playing with EW the andro most likely has you at a shift of one- if he goes erratic it goes to a shift of 2(probably giving him a shift of 1 as well)- although erratics probably won't occur before R5.

As range reaches r8 Tbombs come out to make your movement choices harder(don't know if they're real or not but 10 or 20 pts is a big deal to a frigate). You will have to choose to turn or take em. Andro wants shot from 5 in with TRs or closer with P2's. You will need to try to make great choices in what to do here. Turning off means giving a free pass to him on a rear shield which could hurt.

Note depending on using tbombs or the anti-plasmas the plasmas may be less than useful.

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Wednesday, January 03, 2007 - 03:34 pm: Edit

In the interest of keeping the discussion useful, let me point out a few things about the scenario setup:

Both forces begin facing "C", with the Feds 30+ hexes 'behind' the Andros. The map 'floats'.

The Andros are 'stowing cargo' and cannot exceed speed-20 until they get a running die total (per ship) over 12; they roll 1d6 per ship at the beginning of each turn. Each ship is tallied seperately and can speed up on its own merits, irregardless of its cohort.

As the Romulan Admiral, it's been said I don't like Fed Frigates. Not true! They're crunchy and taste good with jam. Killing them is always nice, as the little buggers seem to breed like flies. ;-)

That said, the Andro victory conditions award me RPs based on the Andros disengaging via acceleration, while the Feds get points for each ship he prevents from leaving.

Of course, Jeremy has only a short term gain to consider (gaining RPs by preventing my disengagement), whereas I can gain in the short term (by gaining RPs by disengaging) or the long term (by killing his FFs). An exception would be his capturing an Andro ship, but that may be difficult as noted above.

=====

By Loren Knight (Loren) on Wednesday, January 03, 2007 - 03:55 pm: Edit

As range reaches r8 Tbombs come out to make your movement choices harder...

Not while he's still erratic.

=====

By Richard Sherman (Rich) on Wednesday, January 03, 2007 - 04:54 pm: Edit

If the Feds are 30 hexes behind, and the Andro can't exceed speed 20 until a running die total of 13+, then it's largely up to luck.

The Fed tactic is limited to pushing to maximum speed (30 or 31) to get -10 hexes per turn closure.

Thus, if an individual Andro ship takes more than 3 turns (you said you roll at the beginning of the turn, presumably before EA), it's GOING TO DIE.

It might be able to help itself a little with EW and a PA mine or two instead of a TB, but as I said before, the 2 Fed frigates have enough DF firepower to junk one of them at close range.

At 3 turns or less to stow, the Andros could choose to disengage, and there's not a whole heck of alot the Fed can do about it. (End of turn 1 range 20 hexes; end of turn 2 range 10 hexes; begin turn 3-Andro rolls to total 13+...Fed can't close anymore...Andro disengages)

The only remaining question is if Dale is going to go for the short-term victory by disengaging the Andros, or forego scenario victory altogether to junk a Fed frigate or two...

=====

By Richard Sherman (Rich) on Wednesday, January 03, 2007 - 05:05 pm: Edit

Kerry:

Sheer damage output is the point. While you're correct in pointing out that the Andro can get a "mission kill," I am specifically referring to a "hard kill" (as in ship destruction).

From just a scenario perspective, that might not make much difference to you and me, but in Dale's and Jeremy's campaign, it's a significant difference (although how easy it is to conduct significant repairs, I don't know...I have to imagine it's more cost effective than building a whole new ship).

With the meager amount of internal boxes on the small Andro ships, once they exceed the damage threshold of the 4 PA panels on either ship, the Andro will be quickly destroyed.

This of course assumes a close range shot on both sides, average luck, and the successful use of either plasma torp impact or plasma bolts. (I'm not including any drone impact...that would be a bonus...and bloody unlikely in any

event...) It also assumes the neither force gets the other center-lined...

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Wednesday, January 03, 2007 - 05:17 pm: Edit

To clarify the question on campaign repairs, there is no EP cost. The cost is, if the damage exceeds self-repair, i.e., the ship is "crippled", the ship has to go back for an overhaul, removing it from the active fleet for one strategic turn.

Thus there is a big difference between blowing up a ship and having it coast off the map with 1 box remaining, in our campaign.

=====

By Kerry E Mullan (Nomad17) on Wednesday, January 03, 2007 - 05:25 pm: Edit

Right so 40 damage is the key to causing problems.

Note that with the 2 detailed ships there is what 2 photons, 2 PL Fs, and 6 P1's plus 4 p3's? Maybe I am mistaking the given ships then?

So outside of r2 the fed can only get ints if he rolls good or hits with both photons(only if they are Full OL'd). So tell me when at r8 2 tbombs get placed 3 hexes in front of the feds that the feds can gaurantee ints?

I think the andy has a better than even chance to blow a ship or more. The spd restriction may add some difficulty to mauevering but even spd 20 can allow the andro to take plasma on different screens than fed DF.

=====

By Richard Sherman (Rich) on Wednesday, January 03, 2007 - 05:43 pm: Edit

Kerry:

You are now devolving the conversation into individual tactical considerations that are largely player driven - as opposed to dictated by the scenario set up. As such, they're highly variable. Will the Andro use his TB in such a way? What might he be sacrificing in doing so? How with the Fed react? What does he gain? What does he lose? Where will the plasmas hit? If the Andro maneuvers to take plasma on the rear PA panels, what does this maneuver sacrifice? Can the Fed exploit it? How will the Fed use his drones? Did the Andro take any PA mines? How effective will Andro H&R raids be? How much speed does the Andro need in order to not engage in a disadvantaged position? Etc., etc., etc., ad nauseum.

Too many variables to have a meaningful discussion beyond the dictates of the scenario.

We'll have to agree to disagree that you believe the Andros in this situation are significantly advantaged, and I believe the Fed can achieve some measure of victory IF the Andros roll poorly on stowage and/or the Feds successfully employ seeking weapons as "damage multipliers" and "movement restrictors."

=====

By Jeremy Gray (Gray) on Wednesday, January 03, 2007 - 07:08 pm: Edit

Not that anything can be changed in the game we are actually going to play, but do you guys think the Feds would be better served in this battle if the FFL+ was an FFG instead?

I've built three FFLs in the campaign (out of a total of 17 FF hulls), with one killed in combat so far. I still plan to build 4 more FFs before production switches to the DW. What's the general opinion of the FFL? Worth another build? Keep in mind I'm fighting the Romulans, but might see all kinds of other races in these Patrol games. The frigates will be seeing less front line combat in a few campaign turns when the DWs and a handful of converted FFs start taking over fleet duties.

=====

By Tim Longacre (Timl) on Wednesday, January 03, 2007 - 07:46 pm: Edit

Quote:

do you guys think the Feds would be better served in this battle if the FFL+ was an FFG instead?

-----

Much. 2 plasma-F torps are not much of a threat to 2 SatShips if they stay together as they have 8 P-2s that can generate 33.33 points of damage on average at R1. They also have the option of 2 PA mines which will outright obliterate an F-torp. This is especially true since they have a longer reload time than Photons and TRs.

As noted earlier, they can arrange to take seeking weapons on rear panels and DF on the front, so you may end up only feeding them instead of crippling/destroying them.

Finally, the FFG has a drone rack (I believe) so you can create a swarm of drones that can be far more difficult to deal with than Plasmas.

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Wednesday, January 03, 2007 - 07:57 pm: Edit

Dammit Jim, I'm a Romulan, not an Andro...

Errr, what I mean is, where can I find the rules on these aforementioned "PA Mines"?

=====

By Tim Longacre (Timl) on Wednesday, January 03, 2007 - 08:16 pm: Edit

Rule M10.0 in Module C3.

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Wednesday, January 03, 2007 - 09:55 pm: Edit

The Andros have a huge tactical edge. On turns 1-2, the Feds are forced to go maximum speed and can't even afford to take pot shots. The Andros have two options, based upon how well they roll on turns 1-2. If they roll 9+ on the first 2 turns, they keep running. If not, they prepare to turn and "fight" - all they need to do is turn the front panels toward the Feds, put out T-bombs to prevent close range and zip by them (as in all likelihood, they will break 12 with their fourth roll). Firing weapons at range 3 will just be a plus, as it will slow one of the Frigates.

=====

By Jeremy Gray (Gray) on Wednesday, January 03, 2007 - 10:45 pm: Edit

Just one note on the FFL: The + refit gives it a G-rack. In effect, and FFL+ is an FFG with PI-Fs instead of photons, and a APR instead of an AWR.

I built the Yi Sun Sin with the plus refit, but I have since built the Rommel and decided to not bother with the plus refit at the time. I was a little short on points, and found the mix of plasma and speed-20 drones hard to use in coordination.

=====

By Glenn Hoepfner (Ikabar) on Wednesday, January 03, 2007 - 11:53 pm: Edit

Richard: You are seriously hurting my feelings. do i need to PBEM you with an andro to punish you for being so mean?

=====

By Kerry E Mullan (Nomad17) on Thursday, January 04, 2007 - 11:23 am: Edit

I agree that the FFL in this scenario is a poor choice. In gneral against fast movers it will be a poor choice.

Against rommie opponents it can work a little better, as it allows for greater speed of the FF, but it still will probably be a "threat only" ship ie it does a lot of plasma pulling and does very little effective fighting. At best trying to land plasma at R10+ due to avoiding most of the roms long range plasma. Although bolting from range can give some effect it is inferior to just having photons.

Personally as I play the feds in a R12 proxathon model against rommie(after the initial turn close and alpha at R30 or 25 if able to reach it) the FFG fits my tactical doctrine much better.

In the andro case I still see the andros as advantaged here. This of course is taking into account that the fed will win the scenario, but will take a great deal of damage in doing so.

=====

By Richard Sherman (Rich) on Thursday, January 04, 2007 - 01:02 pm: Edit

I also agree that, overall, another FFG would be better in this scenario than the FFL+. Due to the possibility of bolting combined with it's speed, the FFL can be made to work (at least for the initial pass), but it's harder, and with less expected damage output. The thing that can make the FFL+ a little bit better if it has to repeatedly engage during arming turns is if it has carronades.

Now, if you had one of those DW or FFB...

Or...with fast drones, an FFD+ could be entertaining...

Glenn: Sigh. Just when oh when are your poor Andros going to learn? DON'T MESS WITH A FED (especially when there's more than 2 of us...)!!

=====

By Greg Ernest (Grege) on Thursday, January 04, 2007 - 01:21 pm: Edit

If you really want to attempt to capture one of the Andros, you could try to force docking...

I would still consider taking a plasma armed Fed, if they are F-torps. They would start the game held and you could try to narrow-salvo bolt them at R10 against the rear panels while the Andros are running. Sure, it's just a luck thing, but so are photons...

=====

By Glenn Hoepfner (Ikabar) on Thursday, January 04, 2007 - 02:44 pm: Edit

Greg,

Even in the worst of situations, I can't imagine an Andro being captured, ever. Too many ways for it to destroy itself.

=====

By Michael Lui (Michaellui) on Thursday, January 04, 2007 - 02:52 pm: Edit

And dropping your shields for docking when it's trying to blow itself up is never a good idea.

=====

By Jeremy Gray (Gray) on Thursday, January 04, 2007 - 06:20 pm: Edit

No docking...don't see it happening.

We'll start playing this battle on SFBOL around 10pm EST tonight for anyone interested in stopping by.

=====

By Chad Carew (Blackhawkkckc) on Thursday, January 04, 2007 - 07:30 pm: Edit

Oh! oh! i will!

=====

By Jeremy Gray (Gray) on Friday, January 05, 2007 - 01:32 am: Edit

Battle report from the game tonight.

The frigates Arleigh Burke and Yi Sun Sin managed to track down and kill an Andromedan Cobra codenamed DeNiro, while a Viper, now codenamed Pacino, managed to escape.

The key moment of the battle occurred near the end of turn 2. The COB, which had rolled two 6s and would complete stowing its cargo before turn 3 commenced, executed a HET to bring its TRLs to bear on the FFL+ Yi Sun Sin, chasing from close astern. Most of the direct fire weapons on the Federation ships had already been emptied into the rear panels of the Cobra, and the Arleigh Burke had turned off due to heavy shield damage, but the two Plasma-Fs from the FFL+ proved telling. The Yi Sun Sin absorbed the shot from the COB, then launched its torpedoes (one from a damaged launcher) at point blank range.

At the start of the next turn, the FFL+ plotted speed zero and put all available power into a tractor attempt. The COB commenced erratic maneuvers and plotted high speed, but heavy use of ECM and erratic maneuvers had deprived the COB of some of its battery capacity and the tractor attempt succeeded (at 11 points and die roll of 1). Plasma and drone impacts overcame the remaining PA panel capacity, and the Arleigh Burke executed an HET to bring its phasers to bear on the wounded COB. Two phaser-1s and a Ph-3 finished off the Cobra.

The Viper continued to open the range as the battle continued, opening the range to 15 by the middle of turn 3. With the Yi Sun Sin at all stop and the Arleigh Burke completely drained of battery power, weapon charges, and speed by its attack on the Cobra, the Federation ships could not close the range and gave up the chase.

It was a really fun and fast game. Dale and I are admittedly pretty raw when it comes to games with Andros, so its entirely possible the outcome of this battle could be different if we got some more practice. But it turns out we broke even in terms of campaign gain (10 extra points each) and had fun playing something smaller than a squadron battle lasting two months.

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Friday, January 05, 2007 - 01:53 am: Edit

The Cobra HET'd back in because its rear panels were full, and had both ships just kept running, the VIPER would not have gotten away. I figured the Cobra could shoot and then run away at high speed. Had that worked, both ships had a good chance at escape. Didn't plan for the FFL to go speed-0 and anchor me. With all the battery power I'd spent keeping the ECM levels through the roof, I couldn't break the anchor.

In terms of victory conditions, it makes no difference which of the Andros died and which got away. Since there was one of each, it was a tie - and we each get 10 EPs added to our bank. Fun fight, but as tough on the Andros as it was on the Feds. My first time playing Andros on SFBOL, and only the third time I've flown them at all. Thanks to "Hydran" for helping with the intricacies of Hydran damage allocation on SFBOL!

=====

By Chad Carew (Blackhawkkckc) on Friday, January 05, 2007 - 02:54 am: Edit

<--- Hydranmenace  
Anytime!

=====

By Kerry E Mullan (Nomad17) on Friday, January 05, 2007 - 10:36 am: Edit

Not that this would have made much of a difference, but EW rolls were made for seeking weapon impact and all were full damage with a shift of 2?

Yeah as the Andro closing to within r2 is pure folly, unless you have no seekers out there. Note as well common andro tricks as they have large battery capacitors. Not charging trs or phasers til point of use unless there is power available.

Note to sound an ass here, but a lot of the prior discussions were with the understanding that the player was familiar with andy systems. It has a steep learning curve to use all the nuances that are there. This shows true in how many tourneys felt the andro was just OK before until Paul Scott played it and showed that being played properly makes it a true bear of a ship.

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Friday, January 05, 2007 - 01:55 pm: Edit

Kerry, it depends on how you define "familiar". I've read all the Andy rules - several times - and reviewed them before the game. I've also flown them twice before, so I have some familiarity. They are just not my 'race of choice' or someone I fly regularly.

As for the EW issue, in fact, at the point of impact, I had no EW. I had a high speed plotted with EM, and 10 Battery Power left to bump up ECM if needed. At least, I did until I had to burn it all trying to fight off an anchor (unsuccessfully). (That same anchor negated my EM)

I hadn't really planned to close to range-2>, but one way or the other, I had to do something or the Viper was toast - it simply couldn't outrun the Feds at speed-20. Had he not anchored me, I would have outran his seekers and been in the clear, escaping with both ships.

I just didn't expect Jeremy to drop the FFL to speed-0 and go for a 12-point anchor.

As it was, the anchor doomed the Cobra, but allowed the Viper to escape. Since I get EPs per ship that escapes - no matter which - it came out as a draw, which was fine with me. Had the Cobra not HET'd in, it would have been the Cobra that escaped and the Viper that died; in this scenario, no difference.

=====

By Michael Lui (MichaelLui) on Friday, January 05, 2007 - 02:44 pm: Edit

Did you not declare EM on impulse 32 the previous turn and make him roll to hit your Cobra with his tractor (EW shift from EM)?

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Friday, January 05, 2007 - 03:01 pm: Edit

Michael. He mentioned a die roll of 1 when describing the tractor action.

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Friday, January 05, 2007 - 03:58 pm: Edit

Michael: Yes I did and he rolled a "1" to grab me.

=====

By Jeremy Gray (Gray) on Friday, January 05, 2007 - 05:22 pm: Edit

The dice, not normally my friends, really helped me here. The combination of turn 2 fire and the plasma impacts simply loaded up the COBs panels. Had the anchor not worked, the drones and phasers that scored the real blows on the COB would have never reached their target. The COB would have easily sailed away at high speed with neither Fed able to catch him, and the whole furball around the COB let the VIP open the range. I think Dale played it reasonably well, and got within a single die roll of escaping with both ships. I just got lucky.

=====

By Michael Lui (MichaelLui) on Sunday, January 07, 2007 - 08:23 am: Edit

Sorry, that "die roll of 1" slipped by me.

=====

By Greg Ernest (Grege) on Monday, January 08, 2007 - 10:17 am: Edit

Did the Cobra have any power left in it's TR Beams? Couldn't these be used for negative tractor (or am I mis-remembering something)?

=====

By Glenn Hoepfner (Ikabar) on Monday, January 08, 2007 - 04:07 pm: Edit

Greg, you are remembering correctly.

=====

By Jeremy Gray (Gray) on Monday, January 08, 2007 - 10:53 pm: Edit

Greg, to be honest, I'm not sure what Dale had in TRs (they had just been fired on the previous turn, and he had a high speed plotted, so they may have been empty). I do know the FFL+ won the auction with an 11 point tractor, and still had 1 point of tractor unused plus 2 batteries available. It literally paid house keeping and dumped everything else into an anchor attempt.

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Monday, January 08, 2007 - 11:45 pm: Edit

Guys, the TRLs were empty. I had fired them on the previous turn and did not anticipate being around to fire them two turns later. I figured if something came up and I'd want to fire them, I figured I'd have battery power to dump into the TRLs...

So, nice thought, but no dice - I was up on that rule. If I'd had power in the TRLs, I'd have used 'em. ;-)

=====

By Greg Ernest (Grege) on Tuesday, January 09, 2007 - 09:16 am: Edit

Thanks for confirming that cobwebs had not completely blocked out my old brain. Fighting with/against the Andros has been a long-term study with some old college buddies and me, even since we left school all those years ago...

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Friday, February 16, 2007 - 05:56 pm: Edit

F-111s; What do you put in the bay?

=====

By Alan Trevor (Thyrm) on Friday, February 16, 2007 - 06:10 pm: Edit

Gary;

It depends on too many factors for simple answer. Who am I fighting? Scenario time limit? Victory conditions? Floating or fixed map? Carrier on board (i.e. ability to reload fighters) or independent strike? Etc.

=====

By Richard Sherman (Rich) on Friday, February 16, 2007 - 06:14 pm: Edit

Alan's right...too many variables.

But if you're just talking general loadouts, I like either:

3 type-III drones (special warheads or otherwise)

or, if that's too expensive (cost or availability)

1 type-III and 1 type IV

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Friday, February 16, 2007 - 06:18 pm: Edit

Yes, I was just looking for general-purpose ideas and assuming that the carrier was available.

=====

By Ted Fay (Catwhoeatsphoto) on Friday, February 16, 2007 - 06:33 pm: Edit

T-Bomb baby. That and a drone.

=====

By Richard Sherman (Rich) on Friday, February 16, 2007 - 06:51 pm: Edit

T-bombs can have some uses, especially against Romulans, but since you have to take them from the ship's stores, their use is very limited.

=====

By Alan Trevor (Thyrm) on Friday, February 16, 2007 - 09:26 pm: Edit

Personally, I'm rather partial to one fighter pod and either two drones, one Type-IV, or a T-bomb. If I expect the primary threat to be from direct fire weapons, the pod is likely to be an EW pod. If I expect the primary threat to be drones or plasma-D or plasma-K, the pod may well be a chaff pod. If I expect to face a bunch of enemy fighters, Romulan ships, or massive enemy drone firepower, at least two of my F-111s probably have T-bombs along with the pod, the remaining fighters having drones. If I'm facing a non-Romulan, non-Kzinti opponent who I don't expect to deploy fighters, I'm more likely to have all the F-111s carry additional drones along with the chosen pod.

=====

By Alan Trevor (Thyrm) on Friday, February 16, 2007 - 09:32 pm: Edit

Another time when I may carry T-bombs is when I expect the enemy to deploy Interceptors or PFs without the shield refit.

=====

By Trent Telenko (Ttelenko) on Sunday, February 18, 2007 - 09:22 pm: Edit

Consider for a moment putting four of the the F111s drones in the bay and moving AADs from the AAD-6 to launch rails.

Two type I and two dogfight drones in the bay means the F111 can put our five AAD shots in a single impulse using its ADD-6 launcher and its drone firing rate.

In a fleet situation, a squadron of F111 who blitzes a fleet or remote controlled fighter squadron sized drone wave with 30 ADD shots is nothing to be sneezed at.

Note that this cost nothing in terms of F111 BPV costs. The same basic load out is used. Only how it is loaded is different.

=====

By Michael John Campbell (MichaelCampbell) on Monday, March 05, 2007 - 09:22 pm: Edit

New Question

The Klingons enter the territory of a neutral zone civilisation and attempt to hold it against the Federation to prove to that people group that they should do all their trade with the Klingons due to Klingon superior firepower.

The Federation, fearful of losing trade sends a heavy cruiser out to that area of space to prove that the Klingons aren't the only power in the universe.

You have a Federation CA with a Legendary Weapons Officer.

The Klingons have a D7 with a Legendary Weapons officer.

The year is Y140 and each ship has commander's option items upto 15 BPV worth with which to buy commander's option items including drone speeds.

The map is floating and EW is in play.

Starting speeds are MAX for both vessels, both vessels are at WS-III and the starting range is 50 hexes.

As captain of the Fed CA, what is your battle plan?

Also how is your battle plan affected by both vessels have Legendary Weapons Officers??

=====

By Jeremy Gray (Gray) on Tuesday, March 06, 2007 - 02:18 am: Edit

As captain of the Fed CA, what is your battle plan?

Shot the Klingon. Often. The LWO is a nice bonus and lets me take pot shots with narrow salvoed standards. Other wise, this is the oldest duel in the history of SFB.

=====

By William E. Wood (Wxmanwill) on Tuesday, March 06, 2007 - 03:17 am: Edit

Extra BPs are nice to have versus a Klingon. A LWO lets you use prox photons and chip away for a few turns. Y140 means slow drones, no UIM or DERFACS. Most folks don't play with narrow salvos. I'd expect speeds to be pretty high... 20 or so. If the Klingon wants to use ECM drones he'll have to stay slow and risk getting run over. I think T-bombs and extra BPs are the wise use of 15 BPV.

=====

By Jeremy Gray (Gray) on Tuesday, March 06, 2007 - 08:23 am: Edit

The added shift from a LWO can actually make narrow salvos with standard torps worth while. You have a 1 in 3 chance of striking the Klingon with 32 points of damage, which can be pretty significant. The floating map gives the Fed room to run after taking the shot. I normally would not advocate narrow salvos in most situations (particularly duels), but I've found the extra shift from a LWO or outstanding crew can make a significant difference.

Certainly not the only way to go about it, but too often I've fired a volley of long range torps only to have one or two hit, and then have most of that bounced by reinforcement.

=====

By Ted Fay (Catwhoeatsphoto) on Tuesday, March 06, 2007 - 09:55 am: Edit

Arm full overloads. Take the Klinks' range 15 shot on a side shield and then charge in at high speed. Once he turns to give battle again hit him at range 8 with 4 overloads and maxed ECCM. At 1-4 to hit you will probably hit with three. Including phasers you will score possibly mission killing internals.

I wouldn't play the long range duel with the Klink - with his LWO the disrupters will be telling. However, if you do then I would go with Jeremy's plan - narrow salvo standards at range 30, turn off, rearm, and then come back in.

=====

By Kevin M. McCollum (Kevinmccollum) on Tuesday, March 06, 2007 - 11:02 am: Edit

remember, that CA only has a total of 34 power while that D7 has 39. the D7 is going to have speed advantage. overloading and charging on a floating map isn't going to get you very far against any competent Klingon adversary

=====

By Ed Crutchfield (Librarian101) on Tuesday, March 06, 2007 - 01:23 pm: Edit

I like the overloads myself. The Klingon is going to take a range 15 shot and turn away, when he does I will get a range 15 shot on his rear shield which is only 13. 6P1 with a WO will result in 6 points of damage, so while he does 6 to 8 on my front over 3 turns I am doing the same to his rear, because if doesn't give me his rear then I will get to range 8 for OLs. In 3 turns he is still working on my front shield, in the same period I start doing internals on his rear. It boils down to a battle of position. stay on his rear after the first turn and force him to comeback to me. At any range inside 25 the P1 will do slightly less than the disruptor, but the disruptors will be firing at 24 to 30 point shield, the Fed will be firing at the 13 point rear shield.

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Tuesday, March 06, 2007 - 01:36 pm: Edit

Personally, I'd go with the Narrow-Salvoed standards in some kind of retrograde or ballet-type maneuver (depending on what the Klingon did). On a 1-2, you punch a shield and score a handful of internals. If you miss, you just veer off. Sure the Klink may eventually close the range, but you can start shooting at range-30 and then turn off (or retrograde). That gives you plenty of chances to punch in his front shields before he can achieve range-15.

=====

By Michael Lui (MichaelLui) on Tuesday, March 06, 2007 - 02:00 pm: Edit

Librarian

Read Kevin's post. It takes 8 power to hold overloads and 4 for housekeeping. That means that the Fed has 22 power left over. The Klingon, after firing his disruptors and showing you his rear shield, has 26 after 4 for HK and powering 9 P-2s which are all in arc in the back. If he puts the extra power into his rear shield you will be doing 2 points a turn.

And by chasing him, you are allowing him to actually use his drones and may have to use some of your phasers to kill one or two. You may also run over one of his T-bombs if you're not careful.

You also forgot to account for what that range 15 shot may have done to you. 15 points on your front shield is about average for 4 disruptors and 5 P-2s. And then another 4 from the rear phasers. That starts you off at a 11 point front shield to his 13 point rear shield.

If you're going to have overloads you MUST get within range 8 before he has a chance to run. Otherwise you have lost the battle.

=====

By Ed Crutchfield (Librarian101) on Tuesday, March 06, 2007 - 04:41 pm: Edit

Mike thanks for the information, since I did read his post, means you pursue at speed 20. If he fires his P2, it just slows him down also. when he turns back on the second or third turn is when you catch him.,

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Tuesday, March 06, 2007 - 04:46 pm: Edit

If you aren't going to use the Fed CRUNCH power, you are playing the Klingons game.

Plus the Klingon has drones which can be fairly effective close in (the Kzinti anchor) if he plays his cards right...

=====

By Larry E. Ramey (Hydrajak) on Tuesday, March 06, 2007 - 05:25 pm: Edit

4 Narrow Salvo (std) Photons are pretty crunchy. If it hits, that is 32. Whatever shield you hit is gone. Nothing the Klink can do at R15 will equal that. You won't always hit.... statistically the Klink will do more damage.... but since it comes in small chunks the Fed can use all 3 forward shields. The Klink tends to get nothing, nothing, then a 32 point gift.

Just don't let the Klink get R8 the turn AFTER you do this.

The LWO makes narrow salvo shots at R15 doable.... not great, but doable.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Tuesday, March 06, 2007 - 06:26 pm: Edit

But, given that a FED has to then out run the Klink to reload... What is the chance that the fed gets 1) a shot at the number 1, 2) a position to fire photons that does not require a het to get away and 3) sufficient space to avoid the Klink getting onto his rear for a number turns?

=====

By Ed Crutchfield (Librarian101) on Tuesday, March 06, 2007 - 07:41 pm: Edit

Both ships have there points, I would expect that both will look more like PFs at the end of the battle than cruisers. One might remember page 58 of the master rule book.

=====

By Michael Lui (Michaellui) on Tuesday, March 06, 2007 - 08:01 pm: Edit

Librarian

My point was that even charging all 9 of his P-2s he has more power than the Fed has after the Fed holds his overloads. The Fed can go a maximum of 22 holding overloads and NOT charging P-1s. The Klingon can still go 26 after charging all 9 phasers; or 22 (same speed as the Fed) and put reinforcement into his rear shield or EW.

Quote:

The LWO makes narrow salvo shots are R15 doable.... not great, but doable.

Yes but the Photon range bracket is the same between 13 and 30. You might as well NS the photons at 30 since they will not get any better until range 12. And if you hit, follow it up with the P-1s, if not veer off and reload. Make the Klingon spend his extra power catching you since you can't catch him unless he wants you to. And you probably don't want to catch him if he wants you to.

=====

By Kevin M. McCollum (Kevinmccollum) on Tuesday, March 06, 2007 - 10:34 pm: Edit

The Klingon wants the fed to overload and charge him. that is the perfect scenario for him. Not only can the Klingon run at 22 and load his phasers, he has enough power for EW to counter the fed LWO. The feds best bet is keep loading normal photons (if he loads prox, he can't use reserve warp to overload if the Klingon turns on him) and power his own EW to give him even shots at the Klingon. the Klingon should purchase a couple of type V drones in case he has to fight close in and maybe purchase 4 extra type VI for the deceptive SP (4xVI and 2xV). no matter what, should be a fun fight. No MRS or ADD.

=====

By Ed Crutchfield (Librarian101) on Tuesday, March 06, 2007 - 11:41 pm: Edit

One of the key ingredients in the engagement is who uses mid-turn speed changes at the right time. The Fed can actually at the beginning of a turn use a 27/20/12 to move 13 out of the first 16 impulses. that might come as a real surprise to a Klingon who decides to only do 22. That is based on only using 20 points of power for mvmt.

=====

By Michael Lui (Michaellui) on Wednesday, March 07, 2007 - 12:51 am: Edit

So you don't think the Klingon will do everything he can to stay out of OL range? Your plot depends on starting the turn at range 10 and the Klingon not using RWP for an unplotted Mid-Turn Speed Change. If you start that close to the Klingon, he believes you have overloads, and you're off his rear shield, his speed will start at 26 to open the range and can use his RWP/RIP to increase that to 31 if necessary. And that is if he doesn't use a move plot of 31/22 to move 15 in the first 16 impulses.

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Wednesday, March 07, 2007 - 05:31 am: Edit

Quote:

the Klingon should purchase a couple of type V drones in case he has to fight close in and maybe purchase 4 extra type VI for the deceptive SP (4xVI and 2xV)...

Type-VIs? I find it a very... dubious ...practice to purchase "reload" drones that your drone launchers (2xF-Racks) can't legally use.

=====

By Kevin M. McCollum (Kevinmccollum) on Wednesday, March 07, 2007 - 07:49 am: Edit

Dubios? true. Illegal? I don't think so. then again, I find the use of commanders options to be dubious. I prefer games where the force points include everything. you want t-bombs, MRS, etc? that is part of your force points.

=====

By Larry E. Ramey (Hydrajak) on Wednesday, March 07, 2007 - 10:16 am: Edit

Lui,

If I am firing at R15, it is on a Klink rear shield, otherwise I will happily drive to R2 or so. (and drop batteries into overloads) My point is that while the klink will produce more damage consistantly that the fed, the shock effect of 4 photons is something very serious to consider. The klinks damage will be spread all over. The klink pretty much can't do internals in 1 shot outside of R3. (Without broadcasting "I'm OVERLOADED!" ) Its pretty hard to hide 16 points into overloads.

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Wednesday, March 07, 2007 - 08:50 pm: Edit

Fed doesn't HAVE to OL his torps 100% you know.

Even 10-point OL's will smash up a Klink real good, combined with the p-1's.

And he'll be moving faster, as well.

=====

By michael john campbell (Michaelcampbell) on Thursday, March 08, 2007 - 07:56 pm: Edit

Hmmmm....a Vanilla Fed CA Vs Klingon D7 battle, only faster.

I really should have put the battle under the clock somehow.

=====

By Paul Edwards (Pablomatic) on Saturday, March 17, 2007 - 01:25 am: Edit

A: What do SWAC shuttles do?

B: Will someone explain to me why the "Third Way" is sometimes said to make the feds weak 'cause no PFs.

=====

By Richard Wells (Rwwells) on Saturday, March 17, 2007 - 02:08 am: Edit

SWACs do lots of things. See (J9) for the full list; it is quite lengthy.

Besides having fairly good defensive weapons (gatling phaser and ADD rack), some of what the SWAC can do include:

lending EW to either carrier or fighter squadron from further away than the MRS can

operating special sensors (controlling up to 12 drones or breaking lock ons are the principal combat uses)

Going wild: Seeking weapons within 15 hexes go after the SWAC. Friendly and enemy seeking weapons are all affected except for some specific types (like dogfight drones). This is the game breaking trick for SWACs.

SWACs are insanely pricey but if all the special rules can be pulled off, they are well worth the expense. Study the relevant rules section carefully before attempting use. My simple description excludes some potential difficulties and some additional abilities for the SWAC.

=====

By Martin Read (Amethyst\_Cat) on Saturday, March 17, 2007 - 08:36 am: Edit

Paul: Fast Patrol Ships are unambiguously more powerful in combat than heavy fighters. They have shields, they have shield reinforcement, they can't be death-dragged, and they have more weapons, and because a PF is basically a very small ship, it can do some of the jobs a ship can do but a fighter can't.

Also, the Federation do not have "casual heavy fighter" mechlink refits, whereas other empires do have "casual PF" mechlink refits.

The no-PFs doctrine, of course, has strategic effects not depicted in SFB.

=====

By Jeremy Gray (Gray) on Saturday, March 17, 2007 - 10:02 am: Edit

One up side of using heavy fighters vs PF is cost. A PF flotilla can get really expensive, but fighters are pretty inexpensive by comparison. The F-111 and A-20 are certainly not the equal of PFs, but they are some of the best heavy fighters out there.

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Saturday, March 17, 2007 - 12:38 pm: Edit

The general consensus is that PF's are better tactically, but weak strategically (they cost more), while fighters are the reverse.

Then J2 arrived and broke the game.

With 'fast' heavy fighters, 'fast' SUPERheavy fighters (AKA bombers) plus megapacks, PF's are only SLIGHTLY better tactically.

Of course, Interceptors, as written, are a better buy than PF's anyway.

=====

By Jeff Laikind (J\_Laikind) on Saturday, March 17, 2007 - 09:57 pm: Edit

"The Third Way" is from F&E. Under the S8 rules, and F&E rules, all races are limited to three squadrons/flotillas of attrition units (fighters/PFs). The Federation is allowed to bring four squadrons of fighters as an exception instead of deploying PFs.

In SFB, I don't know how many people will actually run that many fighters in a single scenario.

=====

By Michael Lui (Michaellui) on Monday, March 19, 2007 - 02:52 am: Edit

Hydrans.

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Monday, March 19, 2007 - 08:47 am: Edit

If you're bringing fighters, you're committed to tactics to use them. At that point, it's best to bring as many as you can. Why do anything by half-measures?

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Monday, March 19, 2007 - 09:22 am: Edit

You CAN deploy Fed Fighters as Scatter Packs. i.e., launch waves of drones at long range to supplement the fleet's firepower.

=====

By Alan Trevor (Thyrm) on Monday, March 19, 2007 - 11:14 am: Edit

Mike Strain,

I'm afraid I've got to disagree with you. PFs are still significantly better in most situations than Megafighters or Fast Heavy Megafighters. And with a couple of limited exceptions bombers are a defensive-only system. You can't use them for the strategic offensive.

Not sure what you mean about Interceptors being better than PFs. If you mean better in a strict sense I think you're completely wrong. But if you mean more cost effective, i.e. a better BPV buy, I think it's dependant on the specific race. Some races have very cost-effective Interceptors but some don't.

=====

By Jim Davies (Mudfoot) on Monday, March 19, 2007 - 06:43 pm: Edit

BPV-wise, the trade is about 11 interceptors against 6 normal PFs, or 14.5 ints against a PF squadron. That's a lot of interceptors, which usually means that it's not an option, because you're not going to drag a PFT into the battle just to tow some Ints. OTOH, using your spare BPV on some casual Ints is fine.

But this discussion belongs in Attrition Ship Tactics.

=====

By Alan Trevor (Thyrm) on Monday, March 19, 2007 - 11:53 pm: Edit

Jim Davies,

Well, I still disagree because you are not differentiating by race. At a rough ratio of 2 to 1, Interceptors generally have more firepower than equivalent BPV of PFs. But for some races 2 Interceptors have a lot more firepower than 1 PF and for some races (Tholians or Gorns, for example) they only have slightly more. And Interceptors are not nearly as good as PFs at playing the EW game. That PF EW superiority combined with only a slight inferiority in weapons makes the PFs of some races a much better bet, at least to my way of thinking.

=====

By michael john campbell (Michaelcampbell) on Sunday, March 25, 2007 - 10:08 am: Edit

New Question

The Klingons plan to attack a Federation arms manufacturing planet but to do so they must pass through the front.

They chose to sneak through an asteroid feild that straddles the front line.

Unfortunately the Federation foresaw this possibility and placed some of her older vessels on station within the Asteroid feild.

The map is Fixed, the year is Y181 and EW is in play. Use standard asteroid feild set up.

Use modified victory conditions. Any vessel that disengages is considered destroyed.

The Klingons are within five hexes of 0101, all facing C, WS-II, Speed 8. The Klingons may spend upto 20% of each ship's BPV on commander's option items. The Klingons have; a C7, D7D, D7K and two D5Ks.

The Fedration are within five hexes of 4230, all facing F, WS-II, speed 6. The Federation may spend upto 10% of the BPV of each vessel on commander's option items for that vessel. The Federation have; a CCA+, a CARa+, two CLa+s, a DD+ and an FFG.

As fleet captain of the Federation vessels, what is your battle plan?

How does your rather obsolete fleet affect your battle plan over the use of a more modern fleet?

=====

By Ted Fay (Catwhoatsphoto) on Sunday, March 25, 2007 - 10:28 am: Edit

The asteroid field will negate partially one of the advanced ships' advantages - speed. Load half ADDs in your G racks for use against the fast drones and half with type IF for use at close range and to have enough for SPs. Drones are likely to be launched at close range due to the effect of asteroids on the drones, so no point in going all ADDs.

Again, the asteroids will make long range combat difficult due to the ECM effect of asteroid hexes. Overload your photons and power high ECM for the approach, keeping asteroid hexes between you and the Klingons, to ward against the range 15 strike. Without a scout you can guarantee a shift fairly easily.

When you get to close range, switch to maximum ECCM and fire when no asteroid hexes are between you and the klinks. Kill or mission kill the D5's first, as they have nearly the firepower of the cruisers but can't take the same punishment.

On the photon cycle turn, try to increase your speed, go to high ECM, and again try to keep asteroids between you and the Klinks.

Rinse, repeat.

Keep all your ships in one hex. While explosions might be a problem, the asteroids will be an ECM problem if you separate your ships. Concentrated phasers, tractors, and ADDs will also greatly help against fast drones.

Oh, and always, pray your photons hit.

=====

By Jeremy Gray (Gray) on Sunday, March 25, 2007 - 10:41 am: Edit

Also, use tractors to grab drones and save on phaser shots. You can shed the tractor drone by dragging them through the asteroid hexes. You have a healthy Ph-1 advantage over the Klingons that can be telling at close range if you don't have it negated in drone defense.

WWs may not be a bad option either if the Klingons try to swamp you with a big drone wave. The Feds are already going to be at sort of a slow speed anyway, so the low speed may not be to big of a penalty.

Ted hit the nail on the head. The asteroids negate the Klingon speed and maneuverability advantage. Firing disruptors at medium range will likely be impossible, forcing the Klingons into a short range cat and mouse game with ships that outgun them in close. I like the Feds in this one.

=====

By Reid Hupach (Gwbison) on Sunday, March 25, 2007 - 02:15 pm: Edit

Do a slow withdraw, seeding the field with T-bombs in clear hexes for a little suprise, once the boneheads have taken a few mine hits they will be much more carefull.

=====

By Jim Davies (Mudfoot) on Sunday, March 25, 2007 - 03:30 pm: Edit

Quote:

The Klingons...must pass through the front... Any vessel that disengages is considered destroyed.

Something of a contradiction here. Can the Klinks win by disengaging from the 42xx side? If so, it makes the Feds' job rather more difficult.

=====

By michael john campbell (Michaelcampbell) on Sunday, March 25, 2007 - 07:00 pm: Edit

J.D.:

No, the theory is that jumping to disengagement speed inside an asteroid feild would destroy the whichever vessel tried it.

Disengaging along the 42XX would change the dynamic of the battle it would give the Klingons an easy out. Maybe if the Feds were to set up within 2 hexes of 1010 and were at WS-III and a starting speed of 12...it'd result in a quick battle as the Klingons desperately race for the asteroid feild edge.

I'd expect the Klingons to try to take out the CLa+s but since there's little one can do to stop that except hold them backs which I wouldn't want to do, I guess they'd just have to take a pounding.

=====

By William T Wilson (Sheap) on Tuesday, March 27, 2007 - 06:43 pm: Edit

To thread-jack a bit...

The F-111 is a good unit, with a megapack it's about as good as a PF. Unfortunately the Federation has almost no ships that can carry it.

Even notwithstanding the lack of "casual F-111s," unless defending a base or planet, it's a real challenge to get them to the fight.

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Tuesday, March 27, 2007 - 10:42 pm: Edit

Um, Sheap....the Feds built tons of NVH F-111 'tenders'.....

=====

By Alan Trevor (Thyrm) on Wednesday, March 28, 2007 - 09:07 am: Edit

William T. Wilson,

I disagree somewhat with your premise that an F-111M is "about as good as a PF". But it depends on the rules you use. Personally I prefer floating map, and I think that penalizes fighters more than PFs in open space battles. On a fixed map, or a battle centered around a slow or stationary object such as a convoy or base, I do tend to agree about F-111Ms. But floating map, with no convoy/base/planet/etc. to "compress the fight", PFs are better.

=====

By Richard Sherman (Rich) on Wednesday, March 28, 2007 - 01:12 pm: Edit

My opinion is concurrent with Alan's. The real problem is that, to win, an F111M squadron has to get drone hits. If a PF flotilla has unrestricted freedom to maneuver, it becomes a problem for the F111's because of the PF's DF firepower advantage at all ranges outside of 2.

Also note that it's likely that a PF flotilla will have a significant EW edge.

The A20FM can also mitigate the DF advantage, but will run out of drones quicker.

=====

By Bennett Eugene Snyder (Planner) on Saturday, May 26, 2007 - 02:18 pm: Edit

I was wondering if anyone has ever attempted to apply the Thatch Weave to starship combat. It would seem useful in this environment, when Federation ships have to deal with opponents that have a superior turn mode and don't want to risk a breakdown by using a HET.

Best explanation of the Thatch Weave is in the June 2007 issue of Naval History.

=====

By Jim Davies (Mudfoot) on Saturday, May 26, 2007 - 04:08 pm: Edit

...I have to say it's scarcely the best explanation for me if it requires that I buy a magazine I've never seen nor heard of.

And searching for "thatch weave" in naval-history.net doesn't find anything. It seems to be a P-40 tactic used against Zeros and named after an officer called Thatch, but that's it.

Care to elucidate?

=====

By George Duffy (Sentinal) on Saturday, May 26, 2007 - 07:48 pm: Edit

The "Thatch weave" is when two planes fly a criss-cross pattern to prevent enemy planes from getting behind either one of them without incurring the wrath of the other.

a better description could be found here:

Thatch Weave

B^)

=====

By William T Wilson (Sheap) on Saturday, May 26, 2007 - 07:49 pm: Edit

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Thach\\_Weave](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Thach_Weave)

The idea is that fighters make 180 degree turns back and forth so they take turns covering each other. Whenever an enemy fighter tries to attack one, they find themselves being attacked by the other. It's like line dancing for air combat.

It's useful when fighters with better firepower (American) need to defend themselves against fighters with better maneuver (Japanese). It forces the maneuver oriented fighters to expose themselves to the heavy firepower of someone if they want to do anything.

It sounds like a good idea, the main problem I see is that once the Federation defender fires at one of the attackers, he has to reload, whereas fighters do not have to do this. So attackers can create a weak point in the formation easily without having to actually defeat anyone.

That doesn't mean I don't think it will work, I'm just not SURE it will work

BTW: The correct term is Thach, not Thatch, which is what goes on your roof.

=====

By George Duffy (Sentinal) on Saturday, May 26, 2007 - 08:18 pm: Edit

Yeah... what Will said.

=====

By Bennett Eugene Snyder (Planner) on Sunday, May 27, 2007 - 12:08 am: Edit

Couldn't remember whether there was a t before the ch or not. Didn't sound right without it. Idea was that the Fed ships would be in the two element position similar to that of the Wildcats at Midway. Felt the Klingons, if going for an oblique attack, would try for the #3 or 4 shield. By sideslipping each element toward each other (say a CA+R and an FFG in one element and a BCF, G or J and an FFG in the other), then turning into each other the one group could fire a sufficient amount of photons to do some damage. The element being obliqued would use some power to provide extra shielding to those shields through specific reinforcement. Was thinking that the ships being targeted could fire their rear facing weapons and drones to tie up opposing phasers or add to the other element's alpha strike. It also depends on how many ships are in the opposing force. Was thinking of this as an alternative to the retrograde, and wondered if it had ever been suggested.

=====

By Bennett Eugene Snyder (Planner) on Sunday, May 27, 2007 - 12:10 am: Edit

If anything, maybe the fighters could use it against PFs.

=====

By Jeremy Gray (Gray) on Sunday, May 27, 2007 - 08:23 am: Edit

I have tried using a Thach Weave with Fed ships, but the poor turn modes of Fed ships usually make it too difficult to use. Also, the Thach Weave made it difficult for Japanese fighters to sustain a steady firing opportunity on the US planes. In SFB, you really don't need a stable "sight picture" - you can fire pretty much when ever you want. So one half of the weave will get shot when the two groups are at the apex of their turns (and when they are farthest apart). In fighter combat, planes were least vulnerable in the hard turns.

A variation I have seen work (a little) is sort of like a static Thach Weave. A Fed squadron is being pursued and breaks up into two groups, 5-8 hexes apart. When the attacker commits to one group, the other turns in to get "on his six" for a photon shot. Against plasma it doesn't really work (the guy who turns in gets shot in the face with plasma) but against a direct fire race with limited seeking weapons, it can be a useful (if extremely risky) tactic.

=====

By Mike Curtis (Nashvillen) on Sunday, May 27, 2007 - 10:28 am: Edit

I have used a defensive Thach Weave with Klingons in defense of large waves of Kzinti Drones to get the target of the drones further behind the other ships to keep the add range optimal for the other ships longer.

=====

By Joe Stevenson (Alligator) on Sunday, May 27, 2007 - 11:12 am: Edit

"The "Thatch weave" is when two planes fly a criss-cross pattern to prevent enemy planes from getting behind either one of them without incurring the wrath of the other. "

It's pretty intersting how it developed (I've heard of it before).

As someone else said, in WWII, the Japanese fighters had much better maneuvering capbility tht the fighters the US had early in the war. However, the US fighters had better climb and dive rates (bigger engines), so the best they could do was to climb away. Tehy'd then turn and dive on the Japanese fighters (Zekes and Zeros). It worked best when the US had numnerical superiority

=====

By Robert Russell Lender-Lundak (Rusman) on Sunday, June 17, 2007 - 06:17 pm: Edit

I have a battle I am in the middle of playing and would welcome any suggestions.

My forces are:

=====

x1 Fed Battlestation  
x1 Fed Dreadnaught (the original not the DN+)  
x2 Fed OCD Old Light Drone cruisers (With Med-Speed drones)  
x1 Fed YTG Early tug  
x1 Fed COR Corvette (beefed up Police Cutter from CL#24)  
x1 Fed PFF (beefed up Police Cutter from CL#24)  
x1 Shark Hunter CW  
x1 ISC CA (converted with photons replacing the forward Torps)

=====

Opponents forces are:

=====

x1 Andro Imposer  
x1 Andro Intruder  
x1 Mamba  
x2 Cobra  
x1 Eel  
x1 Jumokian DD (Sensors in the Options, Pinnacle Packs unknown)

=====

Playing field is a Gas Giant with:

- A moon in orbit one hex out from atmosphere
- Class M planet two hexes out from atmosphere
- A moon in orbit three hexes out from atmosphere
- A moon in orbit four hexes out from atmosphere

All orbiting moons and the planet are near one side of the Gas Giant.

My Battle Station is in orbit around the Class M planet. It has two Cargo Pods docked to the A positions for damage absorption.

We are currently in the middle of turn 7 and will continue tomorrow.

My two cutters have sustained about 15 internals each and the Mamba and one cobra have full PA's

Anyone have any good ideas?

I would add that after this battle he will be following up with another attack with two Conquistadors (Satelites unknown) and an FRA CA. Therefore loosing ships is very undesirable as opposed to simply "Driving him off" at any cost.

=====

By William T Wilson (Sheap) on Monday, June 18, 2007 - 06:34 pm: Edit

My only idea is that you should play less loony battles

=====

By Robert Russell Lender-Lundak (Rusman) on Tuesday, June 19, 2007 - 12:05 am: Edit

???Loony??

Well this is a planet battle in the middle of a big campaign we are in.

If you are referring to the Gas Giant with all the moons, we have a planetary generation chart that we roll on to determine what the type of planet is whenever we first visit a new planet on the main map.

It just so happens that this is the rarest of the possible rolls that made this planet this way.

Most of them are typical Class-M planets woth a moon or two.

=====

By William T Wilson (Sheap) on Tuesday, June 19, 2007 - 06:27 am: Edit

Yeah it is pretty loony. You mixed ships from three different eras, three different "regions", tech sloshed (though not in a horrendously bad way as such things go), and gave the Andromedans allies.

I'm, like, not trying to be a big jerk here, but I saw you didn't get any responses and I figured, well, probably nobody really even wants to think about this battle

And your terrain is also strange, although not so strange as to really screw things up. It's totally plausible that a gas giant

could have a bunch of moons, some of which are "class M" although they are a bit close to the planet.

=====

By Tim Longacre (Timl) on Tuesday, June 19, 2007 - 11:05 am: Edit

Rusman, no offense to your force, but it seems you got the short end of the stick in this battle. The reason being that the Andro force has high speed and firepower on its side, as well as decent EW support which will hurt your photons if used properly.

As I typically play Andro, I can tell you several things to watch out for and/or do to help you survive:

1) Stay at least 7 hexes away from the planets, the gas giant in particular, as being DisDeved into will kill you. See #3 below, though.

2) Keep your fleet speed around 16. This will allow you to react fairly quickly to any "sudden changes" thrown at you by the Andro.

3) "Circle the base" would be a good doctrine to follow. That way you will get mutual support on both sides of your force (mobile and stationary). This will have the unfortunate effect of putting into deaths way via Disdev, though.

As far as possibly winning, do NOT keep feeding the Andros piecemeal. Pick a target and cripple it as quickly as possible, rinse, and repeat. Use drones as mobile terrain, and to finish off any stragglers.

Other than that, good luck. You'll need it.

=====

By Jeremy Gray (Gray) on Tuesday, June 19, 2007 - 12:13 pm: Edit

Rusman,

How many photons does the converted ISC CA have? Did it retain the PPD? What about the rear F-torps?

Tim's comments are all pretty much on target. Watch the 'break' ranges on the Andro TRs: 18 and 12. At range 18, he could be looking to mass fire all his TRs and turn away, stating outside your effective Ph-4 range.

I'm assuming your BATS has no PAM. If that's the case, hold your Ph-4s until you have a good shot that will 'count'. Don't waste them on shots outside range 17. Use the majority of the BATS' power on special sensors, and consider OEW against the two big Andros at range 15. If he comes to range 12, especially late in the turn, be ready to light him up with everything you have.

The Y-tug is pretty much useless to you as a warship. Dock it to the base and use it to push some additional power into the sensors. Watch the rules on this...it is limited by the DAM CON rating, but it can help. You might want to have WWs ready on any ships that are going to be sitting at really slow speeds or stopped. combined with OEW and a little powered ECCM, you maybe able to take a lot of the teeth out of his TRs at intermediate ranges.

You may want to keep your DN, ISC CA, and SH CW pretty mobile. There are all pretty fast, and represent your best shot at getting a good hard OL shot on him.

Man, being stuck close to all those planets is ugly. Chances for Andro DisDev silliness is high.

=====

By George Duffy (Sentinal) on Tuesday, June 19, 2007 - 12:14 pm: Edit

Since your in the middle of the game and I don't know your positioning at the moment. The only suggestion I could think off hand is use the YTG aggressively.

What I mean is have it close with the nearest ship, grab/hold it and drag/- it back towards the Battlestation and/or the rest of your ships. Where whomever gets to beat it senseless. This tactic works best if done to a ship that would have little if any power available to fight off your tractor. You may be able to get away with it once or if your lucky twice.

If you go for one of the SC3 ships and hold it long enough to damage it's hanger(s), you just might just be able to force them

brake off and run. (Don't know what a Jumokian DD is but I'm thinking of a small PFT)

GOOD LUCK

B^)

=====

By Richard Wells (Rwwells) on Tuesday, June 19, 2007 - 01:55 pm: Edit

I would start by planning the disengagement and basing all other tactics on what can be done before having to withdraw. The base will fall; maybe, with luck, the Feds can pull out a draw.

Keep a good speed; concentrate fire; at the critical point, charge towards the Andros, get off one good volley, and turn away to escape covered by a mass of drones.

=====

By Robert Russell Lender-Lundak (Rusman) on Tuesday, June 19, 2007 - 04:06 pm: Edit

Well we haven't wound up continuing the battle yet as my friend is on vacation for two weeks.

Thanks to all who posted...

1:

Well, Firstly, we used the Romulan conversion rules for converting the ISC CA to Fed Tech. Thus it has the PPD & S-Torps changed to 6 Photons. The F-Torps are drones (Slow speed in the racks)

The slow drones make this ship dependent on it's Photons. It has basically been converted to an underpowered Battlecruiser. (Yes I know it's a battle barge. Please no comments on it being silly) I realize in retrospect after looking at the ISC to Lyran "Anarchist" rules that it probably has too many photons & drones but we let it go anyway.

2:

My BATS, has no modules at all. Just two docked Cargo Pods (pulled from the tug) that are docked to the A-Positions, for extra damage absorption.

3:

In this campaign, we have rules for "Absorbing" the very small fleets of some "minor races". I have already "Absorbed" the three Shark Hunter ships and this was the biggest of the three. All special abilities of it are non functional though. no Wire-Guided torps, No Chaff, no Bomb Throwers.

So basically is is a typical plasma War Cruiser with phasers and four G-Torps.

3:

The Andro Allied Jumokian DD is a small pirate DD from the Magananic Cloud races. It is the area that the Andro's conquered before they invaded the Federation, Klingo's and other "Alpha" areas. It is basically similar to an Alpha destroyer scout and can hold "Pinnacle Packs" These are similar to the Romulan Skyhawk modules. I do not yet know what packs (if any) he has on the ship. It is woefully underpowered as scouts go. So much so that he has been moving it for free by docking it to the intruder and displacing around.

4:

It is true that the Y-Tug is next to useless. and it is far more valuable to me for its strategic abilities in the campaign. Therefore I started flying it away as soon as he approached so I am free to disengage it any time it is in danger.

5:

I am indeed aware that close proximity to the planets can be risky due to the Dis-Devs. This is unfortunate as it forces me to keep a greater distance from my Battlestation than I would like.

6:

I certainly have more raw firepower than he does but with such a hodge-podge assemblage of ships, maintaining a steady fleetwide speed is harder than normal.

7:

the Cobra that I loaded up on it's forward PA's was indeed done by a range 12 shot from the BATS. I was holding out for a while to use it's sensors. An opportunity to unload on a Cobra and score internals was too much to pass up. I breached its forward PA's and scored 4 internals. It is running to the other

side of the Gas Giant along with the Mamba (with full forward PA's).

8:

The Imposer, Eel and other Cobra are still approaching from around the Gas Giant. The Imposer has used most TR's and both Dis-Devs.

9:

The Intruder and docked Jumokian DD are slowing paddling on the far side of the Gas Giant. I am approaching both with the Shark Hunter CW (dangerously close to the Gas Giant however as the Intruder has both Dis-Devs ready.

10:

This is the first time I've ever really used the Fed CLD (Old Light Drone Cruisers) and it has taught me that they really can only barely move and still chew on their Sensors.

11:

I should add one more important fact....

The Intruder has a poor crew.

12:

As to "Planning the disengagement".

I have already considered that but unfortunately, giving up this planet will give him an economic boost in the campaign (and loose one I have), and I will also concede a strategically important planet which on this map, serves as a perfect assault launching point to my border planets AND his.

This, combined with the fact that his empire is already making more income per turn than I am makes this battle (and the follow up one) a critical one to win.

Ugh...

=====

By Burt Quaid (Burt) on Friday, July 13, 2007 - 12:41 pm: Edit  
Can someone tell me where I might find an example load out of a squadron of F-111s or a NVH carrier group. The year does not matter as much to me as determining number of special drones and costs due to the internal bay.

burt

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Friday, July 13, 2007 - 12:50 pm: Edit

How different would this be than the same calculations for a F14 squadron?

Not trying to be smart, just trying to figure out what the specific point is.

=====

By Burt Quaid (Burt) on Monday, July 30, 2007 - 04:40 pm: Edit

I'm trying to determin a legit load out for the F-111 squadron in a patrol scenario. The text says that the internal bay is not used in calculating special drones or BPV. I know you can load any drones including type IIIMW and even T-bombs into it I'm just not sure what is allowed to be loaded into it (or its spots on the ready rack) at the start of a game. I was hoping someone would know of a place say Captain's Log where this was done already.

burt

=====

By Michael Lui (Michaellui) on Wednesday, August 01, 2007 - 02:53 am: Edit

If they are in the scenario as an independent squadron you can load them however you want as long as you have the BPV for it and you don't violate any other rules (like putting a Type III on a Type I rail). If the CV itself is in the scenario you have to load it "legally" and then unload/load it to change what the fighter is carrying. A legal load is pretending that the fighter is a drone rack with a lot of spaces and loading percentages accordingly.

=====

By Michael Powers (Mtpowers) on Wednesday, August 01, 2007 - 09:50 am: Edit

Burt: Why is this here? We have "Rules Questions" forum.

=====

By Robert Russell Lender-Lundak (Rusman) on Saturday, August 04, 2007 - 02:05 am: Edit

Then again, his query is not a "Rules Question" either.

Perhaps the query ought to be posted in another thread but this one seems as good as any I think.

Unfortunately I really can't comment on a generalized template for basic load outs of the F-111's. I would first look through your captains logs to see if there might be an article that would help. I personally have used a couple of the "Battle Force" entries to help in some of my ideas for drone load outs.

=====

By Michael Powers (Mtpowers) on Thursday, November 08, 2007 - 07:33 pm: Edit

Here's a thought, inspired by this discussion:

In a Patrol Scenario, an independent fighter squadron can be loaded with whatever its fighters can carry. So the Feds could buy an ADW group (DW carrier with 3xF-111) and also buy an independent F-111 squadron. The independent squadron buys T-bombs for its bays, and bam; it's a minelayer in a Patrol Scenario! And, since you also bought an F-111 carrier, you have something with F-111 ready racks that can support the fighters. The only drawback is that the carrier can't directly lend EW to the independent squadron; that can be alleviated by configuring one of the F-111 as an EWF.

=====

By William T Wilson (Sheap) on Thursday, November 08, 2007 - 08:18 pm: Edit

Well, what you've really hit on here is that most carriers have more fighter-servicing ability than they do fighters, especially after the fight begins and some fighters get destroyed. If you've got fighters that are actually good, it's probably a better buy to take an independent squadron of whatever type your carrier can service, and that allows you to have more fighters than your carrier can carry. It also allows you to get around drone percentage limits. F-111's are one of the types of fighters that are good at this, but lots of races have fighters that this could be useful with.

Which frankly is a really good idea and I wish I'd thought of it. You should post it as a term paper.

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Thursday, November 08, 2007 - 09:32 pm: Edit

Michael Powers. See (J4.466).

=====

## KLINGON TACTICS

By William J Gauthier (Emperorvortia) on Thursday, February 08, 2007 - 03:50 pm: Edit

Beginner Question: What's the best way for Klingons or Kzinti to deal with Big Plasma Races? What's the most effective method to keep them from closing with you and dropping the Gorn Anchor?

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Thursday, February 08, 2007 - 03:52 pm: Edit

Going fast and allocating a couple points to tractor so you can't be (easily) tractored outside of Range 1.

=====

By Ted Fay (Catwhoatsphoto) on Thursday, February 08, 2007 - 04:01 pm: Edit

William,

You can also use drone waves (beefed up with scatter packs) to discourage pursuit.

Also, consider turning on the opponent with an HET if he uses all of his phasers on your drones. If you have disrupters and phasers available to fire you can often out produce him in terms of damage - even if he hits you with all torps. Also, he will then be vulnerable for two turns while he rearms plasma. Watch your timing on this tactic, though, as he can also launch plasma and then turn off - putting you from the frying pan and into the fire.

=====

By Todd Jolley (Tjolley) on Thursday, February 08, 2007 - 04:07 pm: Edit

Use your vastly superior turn modes (against the Gorns anyway) and your usually very good firing arcs to keep the range open and speed up to pound away at them turn after turn.

Launch drones and scatter packs.

Force them to use their phasers against seekers and not you. Don't ever close closer than 8 and keep your speed up at 24 or more. This will allow you to fire OL's (well a few anyway) and run out a plasma, if launched, until the end of the current turn where you can either bump your speed up to 32 to run it out, or take other actions.

=====

By Larry E. Ramey (Hydrajak) on Thursday, February 08, 2007 - 04:20 pm: Edit

Is this tourney or "real" sfb?  
Is this duel or squadron action?

=====

By David Crew (Catwholeaps) on Thursday, February 08, 2007 - 06:39 pm: Edit

...and the big one - fixed or floating map?

=====

By William J Gauthier (Emperorvortia) on Thursday, February 08, 2007 - 08:37 pm: Edit

Floating Map, definitely. Duel and Squadron.

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Thursday, February 08, 2007 - 09:13 pm: Edit

That doesn't sound like a "Beginner" situation.

=====

By William J Gauthier (Emperorvortia) on Thursday, February 08, 2007 - 09:32 pm: Edit

Moderately Beginner. I've played SFB about 10-12 times. Most of the players in our group (also beginners) are pretty afraid to play the Kzinti and the Klingons because they feel they have no "bite". I want to be able to prove them wrong.

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Thursday, February 08, 2007 - 09:51 pm: Edit

ROFL!  
As long as you're in Y167+ (Medium Speed Drones), the Kzinti and Klingons are definite contenders.

Get to Y180+ (Fast Speed Drones) and FEAR them!

=====

By Troy J. Latta (Saaur) on Thursday, February 08, 2007 - 10:05 pm: Edit

Especially those damnable cats.  
-Troy the Gorn

=====

By David Crew (Catwholeaps) on Friday, February 09, 2007 - 03:02 am: Edit

Ah - floating map. For a specific example - take a Gorn HDD+ vs Klingon D5. This is tailored to show the strengths of the Klingon.

The general idea - graze range 15 and fire as many disruptors as you can power each turn. Use your very wide expanded disruptor arcs to do this. You MAY only be powering 3 disruptors a turn as you might be running away at speed 30 and the D5 can only power 3 disruptors at that speed. Your drones are window dressing - lob them at the Gorn occasionally to see if he is stupid enough to hit them. What they WILL do is cost the Gorn a few hexes, and enable you to open the range slightly.

Keep pounding on his #1 shield until he gives up and goes home in frustration. If you are closer than range 15, you are too close and need to open the range.

You can play this solo if you like - make the Gorn HDD+ a speed 30 seeking weapon who will evade drones. Give your D5 a full drone loadout of speed 20 type I's (for simplicity).

That will give you the basics. The key to winning this matchup for the Klingon is patience. The Gorn does have various other

options than 'run full tilt at the Klingon', but the Klingon has counters (which are an exercise to the reader).

In general, on a floating map, Klingons beat Gorns.

=====

By Richard Sherman (Rich) on Friday, February 09, 2007 - 10:41 am: Edit

David,

While everything you said to our new player is true, consider that William stated he wanted to provide to other players that D&D ships have "bite."

Teaching him a tactic designed to force a reasonably intelligent (read: breathing) opponent to just disengage after losing the #1 shield isn't what I think he was after.

So let's try this as a more specific question for William from our learned tacticians:

"On a floating map, how can a Klingon cause significant or crippling damage, or destruction, to a comparable Gorn opponent in a decisive, game-winning, way? Your answer should include specific tactics on maneuver, maintaining the initiative (including not getting anchored), drone deployment, standard AND overload disruptor usage, and counter-plasma techniques."

The specific ships involved are irrelevant but, if necessary to define to make your answer work, should be comparable (like David's example).

Anybody who posts any version of "buy and read the Tactics Manual" gets an "F" (although - yes, I'll say it - William, you should really do that in addition to reading here...).

=====

By William E. Wood (Wxmanwill) on Friday, February 09, 2007 - 06:57 pm: Edit

William,

Klingons have a wonderful bite. You just have to dance with your opponent. :-)

You might hear folks use the term "Sabre dance." It's the basic style of fighting that Klingon ships are optimized for. Your big damage producers will be Phaser-1s and standard disrupters.

Think of yourself as a Mongol horseman. You can sling arrows at moderate range all day against an armored knight... as long as the knight doesn't get close and hack you down.

So, the discerning Klingon wants to hang out in the 9-15 hex range bracket. Against a bolt-inclined Gorn or Rom I try to stay out of range 10. Anyway, you need to go 20+ (optimize your turn mode) to stay as fast or faster than your opponent. You can use mid-turn speed changes to sprint ahead and a brief slow-down to turn and fire. Your wing Phas-1s (assume K-refit) are important. Also, DERFACS outside of 15 hexes and UIM (buy lots of modules) increase the damage potential of your disrupters. The D-5 is particularly suited to the sabre dance with generous disrupter firing arcs.

If your opponent bolts his torps then you can dive into range 8 or less and dish up some overloaded disrupters. Timed near the end of a turn, you can get two complete disrupter alpha strikes while your phasers hit him over a couple of impulses to mizia his torps and phasers. You would use drones to absorb phasors otherwise directed at your ship. Potentially, you could drop a scatter pack to discourage pursuit or perform your own anchor.

Try to fight plasma on an open map or in a fight using more than one map. You don't want to get cornered and be required to fly through 100 points of plasma to escape.

Just my thoughts but never discount a Klingon ship as mostly toothless.

=====

By Kerry E Mullan (Nomad17) on Friday, February 09, 2007 - 08:56 pm: Edit

Klingon bite best with spd 32 drones.

Um make a fleet with D5Ks for 114 pts per and one flagship for CR, a C7 is best. So lets say you are playing a 750 pt game.

5 D5s, D7K flagship plus drone spd upgrades.

Have 1 ECM drone per ship.

Run at spd 20 all day and reach best range. 15 is optimal. Alpha every bearing weapon(except p3's) into one ship. Turn away and run at spd 20 with ECM drone out making any return fire obsolete.

Throw out other drones at random to make any closure hazardous(obviously not targetting the ship you are firing at). Scatters as well by ballisticing them away from you.

With common 750 pt fleet its a steady 60 pts of damage to one ship.

With D5's arcs you can maintain distance pretty easily. After 3-5 turns most players say OK you win next battle.

After 3-5 turns you may need to only load 3 disrupters making spd 24 to help manueverability against those not quitting.

With full fleets it gets to the 1 impulse rule aka Kli fleet hits r15 to fed CC and mission kills it to like 4 warp remaining.

=====

By Scott Jackson (Wittybanter) on Thursday, March 01, 2007 - 04:37 pm: Edit

There was a captain's log a long time back that had the rousing tale of a Klingon player winning at Origins. That was a solid read on playing Klingons and winning on a fixed map. Anyone recall what issue that was? 20 something?

On a map that floats forever a Klingon won't lose often, but both players may die of boredom. Learning how to face someone in a more fixed setting is important (many scenarios and campaigns won't let you run forever).

It takes a Gorn 3 turns to rearm properly while you rearm every turn. You need to suck plasma out of him - I suggest mid turn speed changes (go 15, fire dizzies, speed up to 26+ on impulse 8). Don't be afraid to take some plasma damage on a shield. If you want to fight the Gorn closer, plot 4/14 speeds so you can use a weasel if need be. The scatterpack should be used on an overloaded disrupter pass to soak phasers. Stuff an armored drone or 2 in the scatterpack to make it unknown what he needs to shoot at.

It's all in how you dance his plasmas. Generally keep speed up and fire disrupters and you can fight at range 15 or less. If he is low on plasma, you completely outgun him for a turn or two. Close, launch drones, and do 2 turns of overloaded disrupter/phaser damage. Bitey goodness.

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Thursday, March 01, 2007 - 05:02 pm: Edit

I guess I'm the only Klingon that thinks a vanilla D7 has a chance at defeating a vanilla Fed CA anymore. In Y150. With slow drones.

Hint: Use your transporters, dammit!

=====

By Alan Trevor (Thyrm) on Thursday, March 01, 2007 - 05:15 pm: Edit

Mike Strain;

Huh? Lots of people think a vanilla D7 has a chance against a vanilla CA.

=====

By michael john campbell (Michaelcampbell) on Thursday, March 01, 2007 - 10:13 pm: Edit

Lots and lots and lots.

The D7 has some real advantages in Y150 over the Fed CA.

Seekers are twice as fast as his ( type V drones Vs SS).

Seeking weapon control is double his (6 instead of 3).

You have 7 Ph-2s you can fire in a oblique ( and you have 9 ph-2s in total ) whereas he'll be able to fire 4 Ph-1s of his mere six.

The Disruptors and Photons have near parity and most people say disruptors are the better of the two. But at least you don't have to pay warp power to arm your disruptors. And ECM affects Photons more severely than disruptors.

Plus the D7 has more tractors and more transporters. And a better turn mode...much better.

=====

By Ezekiel Price Carpenter-Hyland (Admiral\_Zekedak) on Monday, March 12, 2007 - 05:45 pm: Edit

As we are on the topic of Y150ish battles, I've just started playing the 4-Powers War a-la Economy of Force. This is a Klingo-Hydran version starting in Y158 (subsequent rounds advance by 1 year). Map is fixed for 3 turns, after which disengagement is allowed even if no internals are scored on opposing ships.

Our first battle was a D6 & E4 vs. KN & LN (4xST-1). Keeping the E4 back a few hexes was an obvious strategy and served well for battle pass fire support and sudden charges. However, working out 8-speed drone tactics was a real challenge. Scatter packs were a clear waste of drones. Hydran ships never slowed below 15 (except for a brief fighter docking) an easily shot everything down with P-Gs & fighters when doing fly-bys. My only drone hit came from a range-1 launch on a crippled stinger. I cheered more for that one than a 5 of 6 disrupter score!

The next battle is again a D6 & E4 combo, but this time against a single DG with presumably 3xST-1s. Commander's options are unknown, except for me (nada). I expect a hard fight as payback for round 1. Victory, unless the DG is loaded with options, can be achieved by forcing the DG to disengage crippled (50+% damage) so long as only the D6 is crippled or just the E4 is lost.

My plan is to draw his approach and hellbore fire after unloading at range (hopefully on St-1s to allow drone kills). This will be followed by "The Hook" in hopes of getting a double shot on the rear/flank. I'll then turn away, bring fresh shields around and try to hook again at closer range. I do not expect any single pass to be decisive as reserve St-1s, RA P-Gs and R/L hellbore arcs may force me to keep the range open. Win or lose, this tactic should preserve our cruisers for use next year.

OK, now it's your turn to come up with a winning strategy...

=====

By Paul Edwards (Pablomatic) on Thursday, March 15, 2007 - 04:20 pm: Edit

New questions for fellow Klingons. Please.

I haven't played SFB in almost 20 years, but if I can get SFBOL working (having problems installing on my IMac) I just may take it up again. Played an admiral's campaign once as the klinks v. feds. Played a fair amount of patrols back then too. Love campaigns--like to have some background and use for all systems/ships instead of meaningless battles.

I never had access to other people's ideas on tactics before finding this forum (read the tactics manual back then though). I'm curious about a few things. These questions all relate to tactics I believe. Maybe read all the questions and then answer #6 as it subsumes them all.

1. I remember preferring the C9 to the C8. I don't have SSDs right now, but it has Ph-1s v. the C8s extra ph-3s is it? Why do people seem to prefer the C8?

2. Why on earth would anyone take a D7A or D5A (where the SFG replaces forward phasers)? I put the SFG on my C9 in the campaign I played. C9A is the ultimate command ship IMO.

3. Does anyone else hate to use scatterpacks? Can't remember if there's a rule that lets you recover them after they pop? I hated wasting shuttles. Saved 'em for crash landing marines or ph3s. Yes, I have to admit that my drone swarms never seemed to be quite enough to cause him to shoot more than ADDs and ph-3s, and this was a problem. I did successfully use drones to discourage pursuit and sabre dance though.

3a. Does anyone else like the drones that shoot ph-2s? You can set the range and even if he labs he doesn't know at what range it will shoot. Right? Those and ECM were my favorites.

4. I found that Klingons are especially good, and especially bad in a fleet environment. Low per turn damage is not an issue with multiple ships. In duels the opponent can more easily spread damage to different shields but in fleets this isn't an issue as you'll blast one ship per turn through their shields. The disadvantage, that really plagued me, was that every measly little fed ship can toss it's proxies at range 30 while

retrograding, while my little ships couldn't even shoot heavy weapons at that range. Never used klingon fighters. I know klingon carriers are weak, what are the actual fighters like? Never used PFs either. How about those for the klinks?

5. My standard fleet formation was a line of ships two hexes apart, flying oblique to the enemy fleet. Didn't like even 10 pt's of explosion damage. In a fleet environment ships will blow up. Every single last weapon can't fire down the hexspine this way, but by picking a couple of targets most could shoot. When I was playing I never had access to seeing other people's tactics, it was just my opponent and I inventing tactics as we went. I would LOVE to hear some veteran Klingons talk about real fleet tactics that actually work--not theory--especially formations. I've read what there is on this board, but it's not clear to me that there's consensus. I hope it's not all ships stacked in the same hex because that's boring to me. What about squadron formations?

6. What Klingon fleets have some of you all ever taken in the admiral's game, or in real campaigns, against who, and how did your ship mixes and fleet tactics turn out v. the opponents? What squadrons did you use to perform what missions (main battle, raiding, patrol, v. pirates, etc.)? Basically I want people's whole Klingon game plans for campaigns, especially "historical" type ones (no swarms of B10s). Would love to hear about the D7N too. Never got to play it, but I'm fascinated. What's the story on it?

Lot's of questions, but if any of you love to ramble...Thanks in advance.

=====

By Martin Read (Amethyst\_Cat) on Thursday, March 15, 2007 - 04:45 pm: Edit

Paul Edwards:

The C8 has six drone racks; the C9 has four drone racks and two cargo boxes.

The C8 has two ph-2 on each wingtip (which are upgraded to ph-1 in the K-refit); the C9 only has one ph-1 on each wingtip, and does not have a refit to install a second ph-1 on each wingtip (except by being converted into a C8).

The C8 has one ph-2 and two ph-3 in the "waist" position on each side; the C9 has two ph-2 in the "waist" position on each side.

Thus, the C8 has more firepower, a bigger phaser capacitor, a higher drone launch rate, and better point defence than the C9. This is why the Klingons sold a C9 to the Romulans instead of a C8, and why they turned most of the C9s into C8s when the Federation started using fighters. (Some of the C9s got turned into C9A stasis dreadnoughts instead.)

=====

By Michael Lui (MichaelLui) on Thursday, March 15, 2007 - 05:09 pm: Edit

Quote:

New questions for fellow Klingons. Please.

If you limit the responses to only your fellow Klingons you will miss a lot of good stuff. Knowing what your enemies can do to your plans helps a lot.

Your allies can help you train and refine your tactics, but only your enemies will show you where you are weak.

=====

By Paul Edwards (Pablomatic) on Thursday, March 15, 2007 - 05:11 pm: Edit

K doesn't have to be only klingons who respond. I just want to hear what everyone has to say. How do you run your fleets in campaigns Michael?

=====

By Paul Edwards (Pablomatic) on Thursday, March 15, 2007 - 05:12 pm: Edit

I guess you're right about the C8 Martin. Mine was a C9A. Is there a C8A?

=====

By Alan Trevor (Thyrm) on Thursday, March 15, 2007 - 05:15 pm: Edit

No such thing as a C8A. Klingon carriers are weak?

=====

By Paul Edwards (Pablomatic) on Thursday, March 15, 2007 - 05:17 pm: Edit

Alan: Aren't klingon carriers weak? They are in F&E.

=====

By Paul Edwards (Pablomatic) on Thursday, March 15, 2007 - 05:18 pm: Edit

My original post was based on my own very limited experience. Feel free to disagree or point out that I'm completely wrong, but please explain yourself.

=====

By Jeremy Gray (Gray) on Thursday, March 15, 2007 - 05:19 pm: Edit

Paul, I'll take a crack at these. I'm playing the Feds vs the Roms in an Admirals Game on SFBOL right now, but I've played the Klingons in two campaigns and they remain my favorite race outside the Tourney (where I love the Hydran)

1. I remember preferring the C9 to the C8. I don't have SSDs right now, but it has Ph-1s v. the C8s extra ph-3s is it? Why do people seem to prefer the C8?

I believe the C8 is preferred by most because of what it becomes after the K refit. The base C8 has more Ph-2s rather than fewer Ph-1s on the C9, but when they get all their refits, the C9 ends up with more drones AND more Ph-1s. Personally, I prefer the C9 before the K refit is readily available - the Klingons have so few Ph-1s in the Y160-Y175 period - The C9 can become a gold mine.

2. Why on earth would anyone take a D7A or D5A (where the SFG replaces forward phasers)? I put the SFG on my C9 in the campaign I played. C9A is the ultimate command ship IMO.

I think there are two reasons. In a campaign, one of them is cost. In my campaigns, a DN was hard to come by because of cost, but I really wanted SFGs. D7 and D5 hulls were readily available, so that's where by SFG went initially.

The other reason is specialization. SFG ships have to get so close and then stop to work. As a result, they get tons of "love" from the enemy and often get "popped" on their first use in a campaign. Keeping SFGs off the big ships allows them to stand off while the cheap, replaceable ships take the pounding. Final comment on SFG ships. I actually prefer the D7A to the D5A before fast drones. It integrates well into a Klingon cruiser force using sabre dance tactics (but not powering the SFG), then it can race in at the right time to do the dirty work with the SFG (leaving the disrs unarmed). The D5A is still attractive thought because the drones don't require power, allowing the ship to make maximum use of all its weapons at close or long range, while always having power available for the SFG.

3. Does anyone else hate to use scatterpacks? Can't remember if there's a rule that lets you recover them after they pop? I hated wasting shuttles. Saved 'em for crash landing marines or ph3s. Yes, I have to admit that my drone swarms never seemed to be quite enough to cause him to shoot more than ADDs and ph-3s, and this was a problem. I did successfully use drones to discourage pursuit and sabre dance though.

You can recover spent scatterpacks by tractor - it can be key in long battles with the small shuttle bays the Klinks have. But as for drones, I think hit the nail on the head - Klingons drones are best used to discourage pursuit while sabre dancing. Once you get speed 32s, it can be a different story.

3a. Does anyone else like the drones that shoot ph-2s? You can set the range and even if he lags he doesn't know at what range it will shoot. Right? Those and ECM were my favorites.

I love Swordfish with Ph-2s. They are hard to come by due to availability, but they can be money against guys who use ADDs heavily in drone defense. Against guys who rely on ph-3s, go with Type-IV drones with a half or even a full space of armor instead of a warhead. Smaller boom, but watching a guy gasp when two ph-3s do not kill a drone is always awesome.

ECM drones are a key part of operating the Klingons against races like the Feds. Most Klingons scouts are inferior (except the D6S), so it can be hard to come up with much EW coverage. ECM drones take the strain off in the ECM department and buy the scouts flexibility.

4. I found that Klingons are especially good, and especially bad in a fleet environment. Low per turn damage is not an issue with multiple ships. In duels the opponent can more easily spread damage to different shields but in fleets this isn't an issue as you'll blast one ship per turn through their shields. The disadvantage, that really plagued me, was that every measly little fed ship can toss it's proxies at range 30 while retrograding, while my little ships couldn't even shoot heavy weapons at that range. Never used klingon fighters. I know klingon carriers are weak, what are the actual fighters like? Never used PFs either. How about those for the klinks?

Exactly right. My Klingons were awesome in squadron or larger engagements. Run into a Fed FFG with a F5...your in for a tough fight. Forget it in anything smaller. Tough to get around it - it is a Klingon trait. Skillful play can help alot, but it is no guarantee against a Fed jackpot.

5. My standard fleet formation was a line of ships two hexes apart, flying oblique to the enemy fleet. Didn't like even 10 pt's of explosion damage. In a fleet environment ships will blow up. Every single last weapon can't fire down the hexspine this way, but by picking a couple of targets most could shoot. When I was playing I never had access to seeing other people's tactics, it was just my opponent and I inventing tactics as we went. I would LOVE to hear some veteran Klingons talk about real fleet tactics that actually work--not theory--especially formations. I've read what there is on this board, but it's not clear to me that there's consensus. I hope it's not all ships stacked in the same hex because that's boring to me. What about squadron formations?

I tend to superstack my cruisers, and use the disruptors to concentrate on a single target each turn. Damage will force you to split up some, but the danger of getting popped out at range 15 or greater is small in a cruiser. Smaller ships I don't keep so concentrates, using them as sort of skirmishers in bigger engagements. They need to get closer anyway to be effective with there weapons, and if an opponent gets to greedy and overkills a F5, I pounce before his weapons can cycle. But the Klingons really are one of those races tht lends themself well to superstacking. I don't necessarily like it, but I will not deny how well it works.

6. What Klingon fleets have some of you all ever taken in the admiral's game, or in real campaigns, against who, and how did your ship mixes and fleet tactics turn out v. the opponents'? What squadrons did you use to perform what missions (main battle, raiding, patrol, v. pirates, etc.)? Basically I want people's whole Klingon game plans for campaigns, especially "historical" type ones (no swarms of B10s). Would love to hear about the D7N too. Never got to play it, but I'm fascinated. What's the story on it?

Campaign fleets, if not controlled by some sort of production limit get dominated by the D5. They are simply the best bang for the buck in the game. The result after a while can be a sort of cheeze-fleet dominated by nothing by D5s. Check out the Fleet Manifest at the bottom of this Campaign Page. This campaign has been over for a while now, but I, and later George Ebersole, ran the the Klingons. Some of the smaller, less sexy ships were part of the Klingon fleet at start, but the D5 was dominant as time wore on. The campaign maps will show you how some of the squadrons and fleets were organized.

Cheers,  
Jeremy

=====

By Jeremy Gray (Gray) on Thursday, March 15, 2007 - 05:32 pm: Edit

As for Klingon carriers, I think the carriers themselves are sweet (especially the D7V and D5V, the D6V is not a bd

cruiser-carrier, but 10 fighters is sort of gimpy). The problem is most of the escorts are so-so, and the fighters before the Z-Y are sort of dogs. Take a Klingon carrier up against a Hydran with Stingers in the early Y-170s and hold on to your hat. Make sure all your pilots write letters home before they take off. Carrier groups are a big investment as a whole, and until the Klingons get better fighters and drones, there carrier groups are not a good buy for the BPV. And the escorts really never get much better.

=====

By Alan Trevor (Thyrm) on Thursday, March 15, 2007 - 05:40 pm: Edit

Paul,

I completely concur with Jeremy on the C8 vs. C9 issue. With medium speed drones and pre-K-refit I like the C9 better. But a "late war" C8K with fast drones is simply better than the C9K, also with fast drones. By the way, there is also now a C-10 Heavy Dreadnought, in case you haven't picked up the Dreadnoughts at War Module yet. Heavy dreadnoughts have approximately the same relationship to DNs as CCs have to CAs. And as with the latter case, the specific amount of improvement varies from race to race.

Regarding Klingon carriers, some are weak but ships like the C8V, C7V, and D7V can certainly stand up to their counterparts from other races.

Klingon fighters are good but not spectacular. They don't really have anything in the class of the Fed F-14 or F-15. But the Z-Y, the top of the line Klingon single-space fighter is a bit better than the Kzinti TADS or the Federation F-18, which is the best fighter the Feds can build in large numbers.

Klingon PFs are neither great nor terrible. I would personally rate them as a bit below average, though not hopelessly so. For my money the real "posterior-kicking" PFs are the Tholian and Gorn. And comparisons of PFs, like so many other things, are subject to the specific situation under which they will be used. PFs as a class are so good that in some scenarios even below average PFs may be the most cost-effective thing you can buy, especially if playing with EW rules.

=====

By Paul Edwards (Pablomatic) on Thursday, March 15, 2007 - 05:51 pm: Edit

Thanks for the responses, keep 'em coming. Jeremy, you play in the SFB area club? Think I played against an andromedan from your group once at a tourney many years ago. Talking to him I learned that you guys actually play large scale campaigns. Cool. How about talking about the D7N guys. What makes it special, given a campaign? Are the klinks the only race to have a dedicated diplomatic cruiser? Does it have any special abilities? Also, how do penal ships work in a SFB campaign? I want every ship to have a use.

=====

By Ezekiel Price Carpenter-Hyland (Admiral\_Zekedak) on Thursday, March 15, 2007 - 06:21 pm: Edit

The D7N has very important uses, one of them being elimination of political rivals.

"So, who will we assigned that diplomatic mission in Tholian space to...?"

=====

By Paul Edwards (Pablomatic) on Thursday, March 15, 2007 - 06:25 pm: Edit

How does the D7N eliminate political rivals better than a standard warship? What is the (single?) fighter used for? I suppose it automatically contains a diplomat, but couldn't the feds send a CA with a diplomat?

=====

By Paul Edwards (Pablomatic) on Thursday, March 15, 2007 - 06:31 pm: Edit

Wait, I think you mean "eliminating political rivals" to be putting klingon rivals on a D&N and sending them off to get killed? Surely they're more useful than that? I have never read the discription of this ship. Is that how they're used?

=====

By Martin Read (Amethyst\_Cat) on Thursday, March 15, 2007 - 06:47 pm: Edit

The fighter on a Klingon diplomatic cruiser is used to escort the ambassador / admiral / inspector-general's admin shuttle. When PFs become available, diplomatic cruisers get a PF mech-link refit and start carrying a G1N (in which the diplomat will ride instead of using an admin shuttle), and a standard G1 as an additional escort on top of the fighter (which is always of the best sort available in the current year).

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Thursday, March 15, 2007 - 07:56 pm: Edit

Going from memory, I believe the D7N also sports an all-ethnic-Klingon crew, and is therefore not subject to Mutiny.

=====

By Martin Read (Amethyst\_Cat) on Thursday, March 15, 2007 - 08:22 pm: Edit

Dale: Yep. It still has security stations, though, to protect the VIPs from uncouth foreigners attempting to commit vulgar assaults on their person

=====

By Paul Edwards (Pablomatic) on Thursday, March 15, 2007 - 09:25 pm: Edit

Awesome on the D7N. With security stations but an ethnic crew, you should get bonuses to marine combat without the chance of mutiny. Cool. I want one. How do Penal ships work in SFB?

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Friday, March 16, 2007 - 12:20 am: Edit

If you use the Poor Crew rules.....somewhat erratically.

=====

By Michael Lui (Michaellui) on Friday, March 16, 2007 - 07:46 am: Edit

If you take a penal ship, you must always dedicate guards to your security stations. If the SS are destroyed the ship automatically mutinies, no die roll needed.

Quote:

Alan: Aren't Klingon carriers weak? They are in F&E.

I don't know what you're talking about here. The C8V is easily comparable to all the other races CVAs except for the Fed (and the new IC). The escorts are also easily comparable to all the other races escorts except for the Hydrans (since they have all of those hybrid fighters). And in the case of the smaller CVs, the Klingons still have decent CVs in comparison to their opponents, again except for the Feds. I will admit that some of their starting CVs aren't that good, but once the 170s start they have excellent CVs they can make.

=====

By Paul Edwards (Pablomatic) on Friday, March 16, 2007 - 01:18 pm: Edit

"I will admit that some of their starting CVs aren't that good, but once the 170s start they have excellent CVs they can make."

I speak from very limited F&E experience and I never had the module that brings in fighters in SFB, so I'm mainly going by what I've heard others say. Only ever got through the first turn or two of F&E, pre F&E2K, and it was my impression that the Coalition was outclassed in the CV department (low compot).

=====

By Paul Edwards (Pablomatic) on Friday, March 16, 2007 - 01:20 pm: Edit

So, does anybody take Klingon penal ships in SFB? They have special abilities in F&E; is a low BPV their only attraction in SFB?

=====

By Jeremy Gray (Gray) on Friday, March 16, 2007 - 02:10 pm: Edit

If given the choice, I think most would avoid the Penal ships in SFB. Low BPV is attractive, but their poor crews (and all the problems that come with them) can be a real detractor.

Normally, if a campaign wants to encourage their use, there will be some other sort of incentive to use them, or even a forced use of them.

If your campaign forces the use of poor crews, there is a real incentive to use penal ships for them. They do a decent job of helping you deal with the limitations of poor crews (and help control costs).

Bottom line...might see them in a campaign, probably not in your typical BPV-based pick up game.

=====

By Richard Sherman (Rich) on Friday, March 16, 2007 - 02:50 pm: Edit

Klingon carriers actually have some unique strengths and weaknesses:

The D6V, one of the first carriers, gets a little shorted by having only 10 fighters. But, it is one of the few carriers that the Klingons have that can carry assault fighters. Also, with twin ADD racks in the wings, it has decent defense against enemy drone and fighter strikes.

The CVT, while also being shorted on fighters, also has the strategic disadvantage of using up a precious tug for the mission. It's also a bit slower than most other ships. It's advantage? It's like taking down a brahma bull. Very tough ship.

The F5V...hey, the Klingons get an escort carrier early! While fragile, this is a cool little ship that retains nearly all of its firepower. It's weakness? Well, not only is it fragile, it's vulnerable to seeking weapons without the help of her fighters or escorts. More tractors would be nice. It's late-war cousin, the FWV, is the better ship.

C8V, a great CVA. The only real glaring weakness I can think of is its cost when compared to one of its primary antagonists, the Fed CVA. Generally, CVAs are expensive and, therefore, vulnerable to comparably large enemy formations. If you've got a scout, protect this ship!

D7V. A pretty good all-around strike carrier, more than capable of standing in the battle line with other cruisers, and with full squadron of fighters to boot. The Hydran-style launch tubes, while fewer in number, are nevertheless a nice advantage. It's phaser suite is nice with the K refit, with both boom and wing phasers as P1. It basically has the same weaknesses as the F5V, just on a bit larger scale.

D5V, a good all-around war carrier. It's main advantage is that it's cheaper than the D7V, but can perform about 90%-95% as well. No real disadvantages not already mentioned for the D7V/F5V, other than to say for me, personally, I find this design to be a little boring.

E4V, an outstanding escort carrier. Cheap and combat effective when not put in a situation over its head. Used as a convoy escort or (very) light raider, it can be quite the fun little ship to play. Weaknesses? Easy to pop or at least quickly render combat ineffective. If used in a counter-carrier/fighter role, it's tiny fighter wing will be quickly overwhelmed. It also doesn't have enough tractors.

There are other carriers, but the above covers the basics. As mentioned earlier, the real problem with the Klingon carriers isn't the carriers themselves. It's the presence of weak to mediocre fighters until the Z-Y (you can get by sometimes with the Z-V, depending on the situation), and weak escorts until later in the war.

=====

By Michael Lui (Michaellui) on Friday, March 16, 2007 - 03:37 pm: Edit

Paul

If you can scrape up the money you need to update your set. The Klingons have average to good CVs now. The Hydrans have average to bad (not counting the IC). And since F+E disregards how good/bad the fighters are (and refits), it doesn't matter what fighter models the CVs have.

Although I will admit that in SFB a fully outfitted Klingon CV group will have problems facing their equivalent enemy CV groups until they get their better fighters/ships.

Quote:

If given the choice, I think most would avoid the Penal ships in SFB.

Like the plague. Unless fighting a newbie (and even then, only if we're in a good mood).

By Andrew Harding (Warlock) on Friday, March 16, 2007 - 04:10 pm: Edit

In general I prefer the Z-1 to the Z-V, considering the difference between "too slow for fleet use" and "just fast enough to catch a base" to be minor.

The real weakness of Klingon carrier groups is the escorts.

By Paul Edwards (Pablomatic) on Friday, March 16, 2007 - 04:28 pm: Edit

Rich: Now I have a better grasp. Would it be fair to say that Klingon carriers are all useful in their own right, but fighting against a comparable enemy force they don't stack up? (You mention that C8V costs more than a Fed CVA--it isn't as good is it?)

Again, I've never played with fighters except against Kzinti attack shuttles and the Attack Shuttle Carrier in the old SFB (and only once-the fighters befuddled me and I lost), so if anyone would like to describe the Klingon fighters, I'd like to hear. What gives the Z-Y and Z-V comparative advantage over their alliance counterparts? Because if you can use better fighters in later years the enemies' fighters are also better. I know that some fed fighters have photons (that they have to land to reload?) and hydrans have hellbores or fusions etc., so what are the characteristic advantages/disadvantages of Klingon fighters? I suppose they use disruptors. How often do they have to land and reload those?

Also I read somewhere else on these boards that Lyrans use Klingon fighters. Is that right?

Michael: As for updating my books, I have none anymore to update. I might start playing again depending on my reception on these boards and how SFBOL pans out. So far SFBOL seems a little sparse. Basically, if there's a fun and vibrant community of compatible players I'll consider it. To be a good SFB player takes significant dedication and I want ready made opponents that know what's going on. If I get that part handled, I might start sabre dancing again--ideally in a campaign setting.

I guess my little experience with F&E gave me the impression that the Klingons and Lyrans were weak in fighters, and have to make up the difference in compot with numbers, specialty ships like SFGs and maulers, and ultimately a BB or two.

By Paul Edwards (Pablomatic) on Friday, March 16, 2007 - 04:31 pm: Edit

Question:

What I want to hear next though, are people's experiences flying the D7N. As I said before...I want to fly one. Do they get a better chance for legendary crew/officers?

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Friday, March 16, 2007 - 05:06 pm: Edit

The only thing that makes a D7N different from any other Klingon ship in SFB is that it can't mutiny and gets a fighter as part of it's normal complement.

I think F&E has special uses for them (they come with/act as a Diplomatic Team?) but nothing else in SFB itself.

By Martin Read (Amethyst\_Cat) on Friday, March 16, 2007 - 05:10 pm: Edit

Gary: And the fact that it's the only D7 variant with no zero-energy weapon systems.

Edited to add: Er, I forgot about the D7V, which loses its drone racks to make room for the fighter decks and (for some reason) doesn't have an ADD.

=====

By Ezekiel Price Carpenter-Hyland (Admiral\_Zekedak) on Monday, March 19, 2007 - 06:16 pm: Edit

The D7N has no TACTICAL advantage over a normal D7, and can be less effective in most circumstances, particularly prior to Y168 when no fighter is available. Even when fighters are carried, the honcho flying it should only be used to escort the ambassador's administrative shuttle, not risked in some mundane solo action. STRATEGIC value of a diplomatic ship is an entirely different matter. As such, the D7N should only be put into direct combat when victory has some political importance, like in a scenario where it gets to collect tribute or establish relations with some planet, that is if the Vudar/Orions/opposing empire cannot stop you. If that's not the case this ship stays at home and a regular combat unit takes it's place. Perhaps the D7N would be risked late in the General War, a time when the DSF resorted to desperate measures. It could also be used to kill off a political rival by sending them on a suicide mission. For God's sake man, haven't you ever seen Star Trek VI: The Undiscovered Country??? Were talking universal Armageddon!!!

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Monday, March 19, 2007 - 06:28 pm: Edit

Actually I can see the D7N being used as 1) A way for the emperor to get around, 2) a means for the emperor to send a Knight Paladin to check on some admiral (you KNOW he has the emperor behind him when he arrives on this) 3) To visit places like Vudar, Slidaria, etc, 4) To carry ambassadors to neighboring polities (like the LDR, Lyrans, Feds in peacetime). Since I get the impression that there are a LOT less straphangers in Klingon service, you could move your diplomats in secure comfort (well, Klinks don't expect much) instead of the Fed Starliner pod...

I don't get the impression the anyone else (but the Feds) really has much in the way of diplomatic missions. I mean, the Lyrans are going to send emissaries where? Or the Roms and Gorn. MOST races have only one neighbor they really communicate with...

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Monday, March 19, 2007 - 06:32 pm: Edit

Unless you're playing in a campaign that gives it specific abilities (which creates a balance issue for other races in the campaign) or a scenario that calls for the D7N, you shouldn't ever see it.

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Monday, March 19, 2007 - 08:06 pm: Edit

The Roms and Gorns probably have some use for diplomacy - there have to be some minor races in their territories. But they use standard warships for the duty - as do the Feds. The Klingons, with their use of subject races, needed something a bit 'different'.

By Paul Edwards (Pablomatic) on Monday, March 19, 2007 - 08:27 pm: Edit

Hey thanks a lot for the info guys. I hear you. It's probably less effective than a comparable refit D7.

Too bad. I just like the flavor. In my opinion the races don't need to all have the same ships. I mean the feds get that cool GSC while other races make do with inferior models. The key is that every race has some unique capabilities. Captains of each race have to find winning strategies exploiting the construction doctrines of that race.

I was disappointed originally when all races were given carriers and fighters (way back) because originally it was the Kzinti's "thing." Now every race gets carriers, PFs, BBs, etc. Then they gave the Feds drones. Well I want my Klingons to have GA Shuttles and launching tracks like the Gorn. Boo hoo.

I don't want to take anything away from SFB, but flavor is good IMO. Each race should have unique characteristics--sure

everybody needs diplomats, but different races put emphasis on different things.

Michael: No offense, but don't all the races have hundreds of minor planets, NZ civilizations, etc. that must be negotiated with?

Ok, what special abilities might a D7N have in a campaign?

=====

By Ezekiel Price Carpenter-Hyland (Admiral\_Zekedak) on Tuesday, March 20, 2007 - 12:26 pm: Edit

In addition to diplomatic functions (making treaties?), these ships could have a higher chance for outstanding crew or legendary officers. They could also be required to collect on taxes from some fraction of the empire, something akin to the need for J-class ships in F&E (production lost if there are not enough around). Another F&E-like option would be to require admirals fly N-class ships for the combat bonus.

I'll also point out that the PhD shipyard has additional diplomatic ships based on the C9, C6 and F5. None of these ships have drones, something the brass apparently hate. No wonder they killed the D7D.

[www.phdship.com/03kln/03klnships.htm](http://www.phdship.com/03kln/03klnships.htm)

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Tuesday, March 20, 2007 - 01:29 pm: Edit

I don't think the point of Diplomatic ships is to enable better command and control. Its more a matter of having the ship with the facilities to support the mission of high level representatives of the empire.

So the Lab guys are outstanding researchers for looking at germs and stuff. The engineers have special cross training to evaluate foreign tech, the navigators are especially precise (for those authorized corridor transits). Plus the captain and crew is certainly more polished than normal.

=====

By Alex Aminoff (Aaminoff) on Saturday, May 12, 2007 - 12:19 am: Edit

I always imagined the D7N "diplomatic" cruiser as a rather more Klingon event. Conquered planet in rebellion? Send the D7N. "Imperial Representative K\_\_\_\_\_ is deeply pained by your lack of loyalty. We will now bombard your planet until morale improves." Then after the bombardment the "diplomat" goes down to the surface to "negotiate" with whoever is left. Or for situations requiring more "subtlety", beam some elite politically reliable Klingon boarding parties down to eliminate political leaders of insufficient Klingon-friendliness, take hostages, etc. The D7N is what Klingon subject races use to scare their children. "Eat your peas or the D7N will get you."

=====

By Terry O'Carroll (Terryoc) on Saturday, May 12, 2007 - 02:14 am: Edit

Klingons use drafted subject races in their normal crews, but all of the crew of a D7N are ethnic Klingons. That's really the big difference. A D7N carries VIPs and highly sensitive diplomatic documents. Non-Klingons are a security risk. Other empires don't have this problem because they don't use drafted slaves as crew, so they don't need special diplomatic ships.

=====

By Ted Fay (Catwhoatsphoto) on Saturday, May 12, 2007 - 08:48 am: Edit

Additionally, the D7N has two shuttles instead of two drones. After Y167 the D7N also carries one "best available" fighter as an escort.

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Saturday, May 12, 2007 - 09:29 pm: Edit

I like how Aminoff thinks...;

=====

By thorin palladino (Thorin001) on Thursday, October 25, 2007 - 01:59 pm: Edit

NEW SCENARIO

Situation:

You are commanding a destroyer squadron escorting a trio of tugs on an emergency resupply run when a pair of Fed DDX's appear in front of you.

Setup:

Five maps laid together the short way.

5

4

3

2

1

Feds: 2 DDX's within 5 hexes of 0101 of map 3. WS 1\*, speed 0 facing C

\* may have 2 scatterpack shuttles prepared

Klingon: 3X Tug A with poor crew and 2 cargo pods

Escort ships are a minimum of 3 size class 4 hulls with a maximum BPV of 75% of the total cost of the Fed force (including full 20% Co), including CO. All ships within 10 hexes of the center of map 1. WS 1, speed max facing A.

Map: Semi-fixed. North edge is fixed, all others float.

EW is in effect.

Special victory conditions:

a) Klingon ships that disengage off the north edge of map 5 do not count as disengaged.

b) Each undestroyed cargo box exiting off of the north edge of map 5 is worth 1 victory point for the Klingons

c) Each cargo box destroyed is worth 1 victory point for the Feds.

As the Klingon commander, what is four force composition, special equipment, initial setup, and basic battle plan?

=====

By Jeremy Gray (Gray) on Thursday, October 25, 2007 - 02:52 pm: Edit

Remind me, what's the BPV of a Fed DDX (I'm away from my books)?

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Thursday, October 25, 2007 - 02:55 pm: Edit

Why even say "a maximum BPV of 75% of the total cost of the Fed force (including full 20% Co)" when the Fed force is not variable?

=====

By Scott Tenhoff (Scottt) on Thursday, October 25, 2007 - 03:14 pm: Edit

This sounds vaguely like a MJC scenario, but I'll bite.

2 Fed DDXs are worth 340 BPV, that means 68 BPV of COI for the Feds. Total force=408.

That means the Klingons get 306 for ships+COI.

A Klingon FSX (F5X-Scout) is 190 BPV.

A Klingon G2 is 50 BPV, take 2, total 100 BPV.

((Your requirement of 3xSC-4 escorts kinda makes G2 the default with an X-Ship))

That leaves 16 BPV for COI, scraping the bottom of the barrel. Which should include:

5 Type-IECMXM drones, and the rest for drone speed upgrades, you have 4 B-racks on the 2xG2, 2 GX racks on the FSX, and 4 B-racks on EACH Tug-A. So you're going to be stuck with a bunch of medium speed drones probably. (Well IIRC GX racks come with Fast Drones).

Get up to speed 20, get the ECM drones launched and following all of your ships, and start slogging ahead. Use the FSX to O-ECM against both DDXs, and you should be able to crank up max ECM (4? w/ Poor crews IIRC) on the TG-As.

4 ECM self-generated, 3 from ECM Drone, 6-O-ECM against the DDXs. The DDXs will have to self-generate 8 (? Wasn't it increased?) ECCM, that'll reduce their ability to hit with photons, and more importantly drain power away from fast-loading and their own speed.

The FSX shall be using 14 power to it's sensors, 2.5 for HK, 10 for speed, the rest for it's own ECM (6). That's 32.5, it only generates 30. So you might have to skimp on self-ECM and boost it with batteries if the situation calls for it.

You then use your huge drone launch ability, 16 per turn, to deter the DDXs from getting close while you slow-tail it for Map 5 and off the board.

Don't bother charging the TG-A's disruptors probably, as they shall be neigh ineffective. Unless their is a down shield of course to zing.

=====

By thorin palladino (Thorin001) on Friday, October 26, 2007 - 12:49 pm: Edit

I listed the Klingon as a percentage of the Fed force because my books are currently on a different continent.

Starting a new scenario seemed like the best way to jump in and start talking to people.

Scott,

Why this force mix?

Not picking; the why is the most important part of any tactics discussion

=====

By Scott Tenhoff (Scottt) on Friday, October 26, 2007 - 01:48 pm: Edit

Well it's the best way to out EW the Feds.

You'll never be able to out-shoot the Feds with 3xF5Bs (You'll never get 3xF5Ws or even add F5Ls into the mix). An F5S will have to be towed by the tugs to energize it's sensors and try to jam everything (it's power deficient). Oh, I suppose you could go HF5 w/ 2xSpecial Sensors, it's cheaper than a FSX, but higher MC. You could definately choose that if you want.

The Feds have too much "Crunch" for the Klingon frigates to handle w/o EW support, plain and simple. And any 3 Klingon SC-4 ships aren't going to have much chance to breach a DDX's shields without landing some good drone hits. Depending on damaging an x-ship with drones isn't that great.

The tugs you don't want them leading the way, as if they get crunched you lose VPs, the Feds gain VPs. And they suck at trying to hit w/ Poor crews.

The Tugs have 3P-2ks (do they have the K-refit?) and 4 Disruptors, we'll ignore their P-3s. So all of the Tug's "Crunch" is in the disruptors, and Poor crews make those hit much worse (joy), thankfully they have 4xDroneBs each but those aren't guarenteed hits, so that'll tie up the Fed's Phasers/ADDs. So the Tugs need to 'go turtle' and try to iron-jaw their way through the photon+phasers of the DDXs.

My plan isn't to damage the DDXs with drones, but use the drones as mobile terrain that the DDXs will have to sacrifice Phasers to get through (or take to shields) for them to get decent fast-loaded photon shots. Their deterrent only really. If the Klingons do charge in to nuke a TG-A, you'll still have 9xP2s on the tugs (maybe P1s), 4 P2s on the G2s, and 7P1s on the FSX (last ditch firepower). That'll trash a single DDX if it comes down to it.

=====

By Jeremy Gray (Gray) on Friday, October 26, 2007 - 03:08 pm: Edit

What about the alternative disruptor-heavy approach?

1xF6 + 2xE6. 288 BPV, leaving 18 BPV for CO and drone speeds (so probably about the same as the above force...lots of medium speed drones, and very few fast).

I would buy a few fast ECM drones (in fact, that's the only fast drones I'd buy), and use a mix of Type-IM and Type-IVMs.

Rather than heavy EW, I'd count on speed and massed disruptors, with just enough EW to make the Fed burn some power. The number of drones is about the same, but I've never been crazy about counting on medium speed drones to keep a fast ship off me.

The Tug-A is still move cost 1 with two cargo pods, and the poor crews basically mean a 1-shift on the 12 disruptors you have on the the tugs. The shift is bad, but not so bad that they will be ineffective in large numbers. Combine that with the 10 disruptors on the three escorts, and you get 22 disruptors firing every turn, quite respectable against 8 photons. The DDXs will be challenged to fast load all those photons over and over

again, so I'm betting that while the Klingons will likely lose a ship, they can run away with the rest.

(Just thinking out loud here).

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Saturday, October 27, 2007 - 08:05 pm: Edit

Is it just me or is the Klingon F6E Escort Battle Frigate a better drone ship than the F6B Drone Battle Frigate?

F6B = 4xDrone-B, ADD, 2xDisruptor, 5xPhaser-1, double drone control (100 BPV)

F6E = 6xDrone-G, ADD, 7xPhaser-1, double drone control, full aegis, 2 fighter ready racks (120 BPV)

The F6E actually throws 2 more drones per turn and has the same number of total drones. The only possible edge the F6B has is the 2 disruptors but the 2 FX Phaser-1s the F6E puts in their place aren't too bad of a deal.

You'd think the Klingons would just build F6Es (without the expense of aegis and ready racks) instead of F6Bs.

=====

By Michael Powers (Mtpowers) on Saturday, October 27, 2007 - 08:25 pm: Edit

Well, the F6E will probably give up some of its drones for ADD or Type-VI. Also, the F6E has fewer drones on board in total; the F6E must have all ADD as its "third reload", while the F6B just has triple reloads.

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Saturday, October 27, 2007 - 09:36 pm: Edit

Nope.

G-Racks have 3 reloads, 1 of which are ADDs. 6x4x2=48 spaces of drones + 6x8=48 ADDs. Really don't need more ADDs (and the actual ADD has up to 36 more).

The F6B has only 2 reloads. 4x6x2=48 spaces of drones.

=====

By Michael Powers (Mtpowers) on Sunday, October 28, 2007 - 01:07 am: Edit

Gary: You have to buy ADD for the racks to have them ready at the start of the scenario. This reduces the total number of drones available in the initial rack load, which is where the F6E is supposedly superior to the F6B.

I thought the F6B got a triple-reload Y175 refit...actually, I'm kind of surprised to learn that there are ships that don't. Ah, well. So they've got the same amount of drone reloads, then, assuming that the G-racks are all drones.

=====

By Ken Kazinski (Kjkazinski) on Sunday, October 28, 2007 - 11:48 am: Edit

Neither ship gets the Y175 Refit.

The F6E costs 120 while the F6B costs 100.

=====

By Richard Sherman (Rich) on Tuesday, October 30, 2007 - 10:07 am: Edit

Gary,

You also have to factor in cost there. An F6B is a steal at 100 BPV. One of faves amongst the newer ships. At 120 BPV, the F6E is pricey for it's mission, that of a carrier escort. It's weapons suite is formidable, but that's not all there is to be an effective carrier escort. For a heavier escort, I still lean towards the AD5 or AD6 for that kind of money.

Of course, it does have the advantage of being SC4, if playing with variable carrier groups.

Back to the F6B...I'd take that ship over a regular F6 any day and twice on Sunday. Power curve makes it a fast and very dangerous ship. Just wish it had 1 more tractor beam...

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Tuesday, October 30, 2007 - 05:12 pm: Edit

I'd cancel the entire F5 class and build nothing but F6B's.

Seriously.

=====

By David Slatter (Davidas) on Wednesday, October 31, 2007 - 07:25 am: Edit

If I recall correctly, the F6E counts as a heavy escort in F&E.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Wednesday, October 31, 2007 - 08:58 am: Edit

f5W is a decent war destroyer.

=====

By Dave Butler (Dcbutler) on Wednesday, October 31, 2007 - 11:27 am: Edit

According to the version of the SIT I have, the F6E is a light escort in F&E. I think that that's a bad call, but I suppose the production limit (assuming it didn't evaporate in SO) saves it from being completely broken.

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Wednesday, October 31, 2007 - 12:47 pm: Edit

But, back to my original question, does the F6E seem like a better drone-chucker than the F6B?

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Wednesday, October 31, 2007 - 12:53 pm: Edit

Drone chucker? Yeah. But the F6B is a better overall combat ship.

And I'll take a F6B over an F5W any day....

=====

By Richard Sherman (Rich) on Wednesday, October 31, 2007 - 01:35 pm: Edit

Gary,

Well, I guess it would really depend on the situation and how the player uses the F6E. If just using it as a "plain old warship" (which would violate the rules), then yeah, obviously it can put out a great volume of drones over the short term. Problem is, it's not supposed to be used that way.

A second issue is that it relies on its G-racks for both drone offense and drone defense. The F6B doesn't necessarily have to do that because of the dedicated ADD system it has.

Thirdly, I guess you could look at its performance over the long haul, drone-wise. The F6E is going to have to reload sooner than the F6B, but is also going to reload quicker per drone rack. That factor could be highly dependent on the combat situation as well, but I generally would favor the F6B here.

As to non-drone considerations, it's true that the F6E has a better phaser suite because of those 2 extra P1. But again, if it's defending against drones or fighters, that potentially offensive weapon might get converted to the defense. After all, that's what phasers are often for. With the F6B's disruptors, it's less likely that those offense weapons are going to be used for a defensive purpose. Even if the foregoing is not a consideration, disruptors tend to be a more effective (but not efficient) damage producer in my view than the same number of phasers.

Finally, power curve is kind of a non-issue to me in this case, because the F6B's is sooo good that the fact the F6E's is even better is kind of irrelevant. [F6B has a firepower-to-power ratio of 3.33; the F6E has 4.29. Generally, anything over 2.5 or so is considered outstanding and exceptional. Moreover, the ships that do have these excellent curves actually tend not to have enough raw firepower to punch a shield and do real damage by themselves.]

So...given all of that, plus the cost, I think I'd stick with the F6B over the F6E.

Doesn't mean I wouldn't take an F6E in a carrier group, tho...

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Wednesday, October 31, 2007 - 02:12 pm: Edit

Quote:

Well, I guess it would really depend on the situation and how the player uses the F6E. If just using it as a "plain old warship" (which would violate the rules), then yeah, obviously it can put out a great volume of drones over the short term. Problem is, it's not supposed to be used that way.

Agreed. However, usually the required escorts are considered a negative when creating a fleet unless you know you're facing lots of seeking weapons or the escort is as good or better a combat ship than the non-escort that would have been taken with this BPV/Command slot. I think the F6E is in this category.

Quote:

A second issue is that it relies on its G-racks for both drone offense and drone defense. The F6B doesn't necessarily have to do that because of the dedicated ADD system it has.

They both have an ADD in addition to the drone racks.

Quote:

Thirdly, I guess you could look at its performance over the long haul, drone-wise. The F6E is going to have to reload sooner than the F6B, but is also going to reload quicker per drone rack. That factor could be highly dependent on the combat situation as well, but I generally would favor the F6B here.

I don't follow your logic. They both have the same total number of drones. The F6E can launch them faster, which is generally a favorable condition.

Quote:

[F6B has a firepower-to-power ratio of 3.33; the F6E has 4.29. Generally, anything over 2.5 or so is considered outstanding and exceptional.

How are you calculating this?

=====

By Richard Sherman (Rich) on Wednesday, October 31, 2007 - 03:13 pm: Edit

I agree that the F6E is "in this category" as you said. I just don't agree that it is superior to its native sister, the F6B. For general combat purposes, I'd rather have 2 Disr and 4 B-racks than 2 P1 and 6 G-racks. I consider disruptors a more reliable and effective damage producer than phasers and drones generally. Again, that is highly situation- and force-dependent. As to the F6E retaining its ADD, color me surprised...

As to drone reloads, think of it this way. If both a G-rack and a B-rack were fully loaded with type I drones, which one would run out of drones to launch sooner? In consideration of their respective racks, which would you rather be able to do, launch 6 drones for 4 turns, or launch 4 drones for 6 turns? Moreover, which drone rack is better to use the "ship-wrecker" type IV drones in?

I calculate the ratio by taking the total power of the ship and dividing it by the total amount of power necessary to load/reload all phasers, plus the power necessary to STANDARD load the heavy weapons. This gives you a single figure that is a rough idea of how the ship performs under "pristine" conditions, usually during the first part of the battle. This ratio doesn't really work as well for the plasma races which often tend to have skewed numbers high (although I'm working on an adjustment factor), but it works well for others. I use some additional factors for Lyrans, Tholians, and Selts. Andros really don't work at all. Consider:

Fed CAR+ 36/[9 for phasers+ 8 for photons]= 2.12

Kli D7K 39/[9+8]= 2.29

Fed DD+ 23/[7+8]= 1.53

Kli F5L 22/[5+4]= 2.44

Kli D6B 37/[7+8]= 2.47

Tho C 31/[8+4]= 2.58

Hyd TR 32/[8+6]= 2.29

Lyr CL 25/[6+4+2]= 2.08

Kli F6B 30/[5+4]= 3.33

Kzi CL+ 25/[4+8]= 2.08

Kzi CM 30/[5+6]= 2.73

Lyr CWB+ 32/[8+6+2]= 2.00

I use these figures sometimes in head-to-head match-ups to see if there is a huge discrepancy (more than about .5)

between two opponent ships. Seeing such a discrepancy can have a huge impact on tactics, or may even cause me to pick a different ship.

[This is why a ship with meager weapons, like the Skyhawk-A (approx. 2.63), can just utterly ruin the day of a ship like a Fed DD+ (1.53), but a Fed DW or DDG+ (both at 2.09) is more competitive].

Stated another way, it's a cheap and easy way for me to be able to tell something about how a ship might actually perform other than just how many weapons it is bristling with.

But it's certainly not a sole criterion type of thing.

Anyway, when we do finally meet up and play (hopefully soon!), don't count on me taking the F6E...unless it's flying with a C7V! [Hmmm...on second thought, you won't see it all...other than the F5V and D6V, I'm not a fan of Klingon carriers...]

=====

By Jim Davies (Mudfoot) on Wednesday, October 31, 2007 - 07:59 pm: Edit

Quote:

As to drone reloads, think of it this way. If both a G-rack and a B-rack were fully loaded with type I drones, which one would run out of drones to launch sooner?

If both ships are launching at 4 drones per turn, the one with B racks. Because 2 G racks can be reloaded every turn while the other 4 launch, they never run out (assuming unlimited reloads).

Quote:

In consideration of their respective racks, which would you rather be able to do, launch 6 drones for 4 turns, or launch 4 drones for 6 turns?

6 for 4. Mass and timing. Besides, I can launch more slowly if I want.

Quote:

Moreover, which drone rack is better to use the "ship-wrecker" type IV drones in?

G racks. Because if I lose a drone rack to damage, I can kill an empty rack rather than one of my precious IVs.

Which book is the F6E in? I can't find it.

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Wednesday, October 31, 2007 - 09:12 pm: Edit

CL #31

=====

By Kerry E Mullan (Nomad17) on Thursday, November 01, 2007 - 09:02 am: Edit

OK true but a major question here. As it's an escort unless you have a carrier that requires it to be there it is not going to be a usable ship.

I mean the Fed DE, hydran DE and numerous other escorts are actually great ships if in one on one combat or anything close, but as they are escorts then you need a carrier to allow them to be put on the drawing board.

Due to this factor the whole discussion is moot.

=====

By Richard Sherman (Rich) on Thursday, November 01, 2007 - 03:44 pm: Edit

Kerry,

While I absolutely agree with you, I guess an adaptation of an old saying is appropo here:

The rules are only as good as the people who enforce them.

Does that mean that there is actually something stopping someone from taking an F6E in a fight? Of course not...other than his opponent, based on what is written on a piece of paper.

Besides, if a player wanted to "technically" comply with the letter of the rule, and didn't want the obligatory CV and fighters,

they could just take a tug (probably a battle tug) and, under the S8 rules, declare that the F6E is "escorting" a T7 with 2 battle pods. The Feds can do the same thing with a DEA or NAC and a BTL+. Welcome to twinkie camp.

So, from the perspective of a player who might have to face one or both of these ships, isn't really that moot.

For me, unless it was some kind of cool scenario, I'm not playing against an opponent who shows up with an F6E and nothing else. That's despite the fact that I think I could cream the thing with a commensurate amount of points used for a standard Fed, Kzin, or Hydran warship.

Jim,

Man, those were all really excellent points. And you might've convinced me that the F6E is better than the F6B except for 2 things: 1: cost. 2: disruptors. I want those disruptors and 20 BPV, and I'm willing to give 2 G-racks, 2 P1, and Aegis to get it.

'Course, I'd point out that cycling 2 of the racks for perpetual reloads largely eliminates Gary's hope for greater drone throw-weight (at least in the short-term).

=====

By Jeremy Gray (Gray) on Thursday, November 01, 2007 - 03:58 pm: Edit

I like twinkies. They have a camp?

=====

By John Carroll (Jcwl) on Friday, November 16, 2007 - 01:38 pm: Edit

Yes, as do the Ho-Ho's, Ding-dongs, and all the Little Debbie's assorted pastries...

=====

## ROMULAN TACTICS

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Friday, January 05, 2007 - 03:15 am: Edit

Jeremy Gray and I are going to play a patrol scenario as part of our ongoing Admiral's Game. This battle is based on (SG52.0), Raid On A Mining Planet.

The scenario has the addition of the Romulan Patrol ship (a K5C) and an Orion CR.

Romulan Forces: 5x DefSat around a class-M planet; 1x Mining Station (hidden) on the planet, 6x Ground-based PH-1 (1 per hex side); 1x K5C Oathkeeper.

Orion Forces: SAL+ Queen (1x PL-S, 4x Plasma Rack); CR Firefox (1xPl-F swivel/carr, 2xPhot)

The year is Y172. The Orions have 15 turns to accomplish their mission.

Both sides are going to be limited to 10% CO's options. Aside from the additional units, the scenario will be played as written. Some added victory conditions for the purpose of our campaign: Defender earns 3 RPs for every crystal saved, attacker earns 3 RPs for every crystal recovered (max RPs available: 36). With our tight budgets, every point helps!

As per the scenario rules, the Orions need to circle the planet at range 5 or less to scan for the mining station, gaining at least 10 points of lab info using the control spaces, before the location of the Mining Station is revealed. Then he has to loot the crystals, and my job is to stop him.

Any input welcome as to Romulan tactics and/or options. The K5C can't match both Orions alone, and the DefSats (once they fire) can be handily chewed up by those D-racks on the SAL+.

Keep in mind that Jeremy has nothing really to lose aside from allowing me to gain EPs (they aren't his ships in the campaign), while the K5C is one of my regular warships out of my order of battle.

=====

By Ed Crutchfield (Librarian101) on Friday, January 05, 2007 - 08:59 am: Edit

Well since he has to circle at range 5 or less your NSM and any T-Bombs could be used to even things out. I forget can you use CO for the ground based phasers, and if so can they be lumped together or do they have to be used separately. If

you can use them then buy your TBs and transfer them to the K5C for use.

=====

By Jeremy Gray (Gray) on Friday, January 05, 2007 - 05:54 pm: Edit

I'll take any advice on the Orions as well. I had to pick a cartel, which sort of drove the choices on the options. I've been playing lots of games with photons, so I put in a few plasmas the Feds don't get to see just for a change of pace. I think its been a couple years since I've flown an Orion and ages since I fired a PI-S or a PI-D (but I have had plenty fired at me).

=====

By Jim Davies (Mudfoot) on Friday, January 05, 2007 - 08:49 pm: Edit

(for those looking for it, SG52 is in module S2. Fixed map, 15 turn limit.)

Adding the CR and K5C confuses matters. Can either Orion gain information on the planet, or is it just the SAL?

And what sort of Defsats are they? P2 are rubbish, F-plasma will make things rather more interesting.

10 points of information will take 2 turns at R2, or about 4 turns at R5, and all the time you're getting phasered. So you have to kill the defsats and ground bases quickly once you start looking at the planet.

As the Orion, I'd kill the K5C as soon as possible, and then I'd have a free run at the planet.

As the Rom, I'd use the planet (and its defences) for all the cover I can get, especially using it to absorb plasma. But I think you'll get tractored and crushed.

This should be a walk for the Orions.

I didn't think the Orions got the Carronade that early. Can't remember the date now, so I could be wrong.

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Friday, January 05, 2007 - 09:46 pm: Edit

Jim: The Romulan DefSats are PL-F.

The Orions get the Carronade that early. It's the Feds who don't get it until Y175.

I won't comment on the rest but thanks for your input, I do appreciate ongoing conversation!

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Friday, January 05, 2007 - 09:55 pm: Edit

Ed: Sadly, I don't think it works that way. I can't combine the bases for purpose of CO's.

But thanks anyway. There are still some merits in your ideas.

=====

By Ed Crutchfield (Librarian101) on Saturday, January 06, 2007 - 12:04 am: Edit

Dale,

Are you going to be using the normal rules for the defense satellites, or using the restrictions in the scenario, because it appears in the scenario that the locations are known, while in th rules they have to be detected. Also it seems they cant be fired on until they fire.

Ed

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Saturday, January 06, 2007 - 12:38 am: Edit

Ed,

I believe their locations will be known but they cannot be fired upon until they themselves fire...

=====

By Ed Crutchfield (Librarian101) on Saturday, January 06, 2007 - 10:13 am: Edit

Yes the scenario rules lists whehe they are, makes them a little less effective, takes away the surprise of them being at 1 hex. I also saw it the scenario that the ship attacking has to stay in the same orbit?

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Saturday, January 06, 2007 - 07:15 pm: Edit

Turn 1 is complete. The Orions came in at speed 26-27. The K5C plotted speed-19. It winged a G-torp at the Orions and turned off, circling behind the planet. The SAL peeled off while the CR ran in to act as a "minesweeper" of sorts.

The G-torp was targeted on the SAL, and later ended up impacting for 15 on the #6.

The CR came in and, when it got to range-5, DefSat-3 bolted 2x F and fired 2x Ph-2 (hitting with 1 bolt). Impulses later, DefSat-4 did the same. Then the Planet's GBDP went to work, nailing it with 3x ph-1. The two "revealed" DefSats later fired their PH-3s at range-2 for minimal damage.

The CR lost its #1 and #2 shields and has taken a handful of internals, including 2x Ph-1 and a warp box (plus some fat).

In reply, the CR obliterated both "revealed" DefSats before turning off, nailing 1 with 2x OL-16 Photons, and the other with 3x PH-1 (and later a launched PL-F). The K5C turned in after it, trailing, and lobbed another G at the SAL (which turned off after bolting an S-Torp, 2-Ds, and firing 4x PH-1 at range-10. Only 1 D hit and the total damage was 7).

Both Orions lost a LWarp box due to engine doubling at the end of the turn.

If we get the chance, we may continue this around 7 pm Pacific... or if not, tomorrow.

=====

By Jeremy Gray (Gray) on Saturday, January 06, 2007 - 07:50 pm: Edit

My lack of experience with Orions is showing a little in this one. In hindsight, I would have played turn 1 a bit differently. Biggest thing I would have changed - double both engines on at least one, if not both ships. As it was, I doubled only one, and had plenty of speed and EW, but not enough reinforcement.

Adding the CR and K5C to this scenario really changes the dynamic. Without the K5C out there, the Orion can use carefully planned speed changes to draw out Defsat plasma and manage the range game. The K5C really forces the Orions to burn more power on movement.

The Orions are far from out of it, and the CR has created a little bit of a whole in the planet's defenses. The downside is it is short two forward shields, hampering its future movement. Even so, its hard hitting weapons are intact and the SAL+ is still a big threat.

=====

By Richard Sherman (Rich) on Tuesday, January 09, 2007 - 01:33 pm: Edit

Jeremy:

For purposes of those nice Plas-D racks, don't forget that both the ground bases and the DEFSATs are smaller than SC4...

=====

By Jeremy Gray (Gray) on Tuesday, January 09, 2007 - 03:56 pm: Edit

Richard, absolutely. One Def Sat has already died under a hail of PI-Ds.

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Monday, March 05, 2007 - 06:52 am: Edit

So how did it end?

=====

By Jeremy Gray (Gray) on Monday, March 05, 2007 - 08:56 am: Edit

Mike, a repost from our campaign thread...

The Orion Raid on the Romulan colony has been completed. The Orions succeeded in destroying the K5C Oathkeeper in its effort to defend the planet, as well as the orbiting Def Sats. The CR sustained moderate damage in the engagement, losing virtually all of its shields and suffering about 10% damage. However, given the time remaining the Orions were only able to recover half of the dilium present before they had to disengage. The SAL+ and CR departed, leaving a terrified and angry mining colony in their wake. (We elected to split the RPs available rather than play out what was going to be a tedious nine turn siege. Based on the time remaining, the status of the

remaining Rom defenses, and the available transporters, I don't think I could have recovered more than half. I think we both just wanted what was sort of an ugly battle to end so we could get on with the next battle...)

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Thursday, March 08, 2007 - 09:43 pm: Edit

New question: We have a campaign battle in the queue that I could use some input on. A Rom battlegroup has encountered a Fed CVA group.

Romulan forces: KE; K5S; SKB w/4x G-1, 4x G-F; SKE; SPA; K5L.

Fed forces: CVA w/12x F-14, 12x A-10; DER; 2x DE; SC+.

Map is double-sized, but fixed. 10% commander's options are allowed (and are already pre-decided).

Any suggestions on tactics the Romulans could take to fight this buzz-saw? Note, I'd stake my car on the fact the Feds have two SWACs aboard that CVA, which is gonna make my plasmas tough to employ.

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Thursday, March 08, 2007 - 09:48 pm: Edit

I should add that the CVA has the "awr" refit; the SPA does NOT have its "+" refit; and that one F-14 and A-10 are EW fighters.

=====

By Kevin M. McCollum (Kevinmccollum) on Friday, March 09, 2007 - 01:17 am: Edit

try like mad to lure the fighters across some mines. even NSM. make sure to set the mines to the sixth fighter (or fourth, or fifth) so individual fighters don't detonate them. since there are no scouts, might forget using cloak and using passive fire control for a EW shift. keep the speed up.

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Friday, March 09, 2007 - 02:01 am: Edit

Kevin: First off, thanks for the input and reply.

Unfortunately, there ARE scouts, one on each side. The Feds have a SC+, while the Roms have a K5S.

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Friday, March 09, 2007 - 03:26 am: Edit

Alot depends on how Jeremy uses fighters.

If he keeps them with the fleet and charges you (and with all those gatlings available for plasma defense, he just might) your best bet might be to kill as many fighters as possible and then leave.

If he splits the fighters off from the support of the carrier group (big mistake, IMNSHO), you should shotgun those plasma and nail the fighter group, then work on the CVA. The Fed SC is a non-entity; it doesn't have enough power to do significant EW work and stay alive. It IS, however, annoyingly good at keeping lock-on to a cloaked vessel occasionally. About the only thing your KF5S is going to be good at is killing drones.

A Fed CVA group is deadly, and no doubt about it. You have only ONE R-torp, so you are going to HAVE to get close. If you stay away, you'll never land a plasma hit, plus he has enough drones onbaord the carrier (AND the escorts) to launch drones at you over...and over...and over.....

If you get close, you get gatling'd and A-10'd to death (Do NOT underestimate those A-10's.)

However, given this is a campaign, and that the CVA is a high-value unit (indeed, the CVA group is probably the most DANGEROUS force he has, bar none), you have to decide if taking out the CVA is worth losing your force.

Given its composed of only ONE heavy unit (the KE), I'd say go for it; losing the CVA is going to hurt him a lot more than losing a bunch of DD/CL hulls will hurt you.

=====

By Paul Stovell (Pauls) on Friday, March 09, 2007 - 03:56 am: Edit

Dale,

I think Mike hits the mark when he suggests the CVA is a target worth losing ships to kill. This is likely to result in the CVA being played cautiously.

For my money have a plasma launch plan to kill as many Fighters as possible and a bolt plan to threaten the CVA. Then launch the plasma and close in behind it. IF the plasma is real then use phasers on the fighters and consider cloaking and leaving, or resetting to try another run in. IF the plasma is pseudo pick your best target and blow it up.

Am I right in assuming that killing an escort or two might force the CVA out of the line the following turn?

=====

By Kevin M. McCollum (Kevinmccollum) on Friday, March 09, 2007 - 04:20 am: Edit

duh. sorry, didn't notice the scout.

=====

By Richard Sherman (Rich) on Friday, March 09, 2007 - 04:48 am: Edit

Well...your only real tactical advantage here is speed. You're going to have to keep it up to avoid the moving terrain that will be his drones. His gats are going to shred your plasma, so you may have to resort to bolts to score damage.

The real problem you've got is that he may just not cooperate with the speed game. The Fed could - theoretically - keep a significant number of fighters in, tractor as many as he can, then move at you at high speed once he close one part of the board off with drones. If he pulls the F14s along for defense, moves to and maintains range 8 or closer for 8 impulses or thereabout...your ships start vaporizing to fighter and ship-launched photons plus P1. Your scout isn't powerful enough to make enough photons miss. Cloaking in that situation might not help either, and he can then get in amongst you where your mines might be as annoying to you as they are to him.

If he launches early, you can fight him, and I agree with Mike that the fighters should be the target. If he doesn't, and tries the above, unless you get lucky with bolts and phasers (or a couple of NSMs), I'm not sure what your counter would be with the light forces you have.

OTOH, if the CVA is all that matters...then just go bezerker. Throw out plasma and mines in his path. Use TB, the K5S, and the Sky-E to clear drones. Make him shoot at your fighters. Hurl your ships at the CVA. Most will die (the K5S and maybe Sky-E won't), but you might put the ship down.

If you see both SWACs out and you aren't in a close run already, kill them with phasers and engage. If you already going in, but plasma isn't out yet, kill them anyway, but you might have to break off and try to reposition if it takes too much to shoot them down. If you're in and plasma is out already, given his number of gats on defense, well...you might've lost right there.

Oh, and definitely do the tractor tricks you've already learned with your carrier. If anything, that might at least frustrate the Fed a little and give you a morale edge...

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Friday, March 09, 2007 - 05:44 am: Edit

Given your forces, unless you plan on trying to kill the CVA and/or its fighter group, you should just leave.

=====

By Ted Fay (Catwhoatsphoto) on Friday, March 09, 2007 - 09:35 am: Edit

If your campaign has free fighter replacements, then flee. Otherwise, kill a couple of fighters with massed bolts at range 10. You are hopelessly outmatched IMO.

=====

By Jeremy Gray (Gray) on Friday, March 09, 2007 - 10:01 am: Edit

In our campaign, up to 50% of fighter losses on each carrier are replaced for free each campaign turn. Spares can also be used. Combining the free replacements and the available spares, I should be able to fully outfit the CVA for next turn even if it loses all of its fighters. Now, if I'm forced to use up all

my spares this turn, and it happens again in the next campaign turn, I might have a problem.

Mike is right though. The CVA is without a doubt a high value unit. Combined with the initial out lay for its fighter group, the cost of replacing it is very prohibitive. Escorts I should be able to replace if needed (might have to steal from other carriers), but losing the CVA itself would truly suck rocks. Certainly not a state secret - Dale know this. The test for me is to protect it properly while welding its combat power, but not to get so conservative that it becomes a white elephant.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Friday, March 09, 2007 - 10:33 am: Edit

"Fed forces: CVA w/12x F-14, 12x A-10; DER; 2x DE; SC+. " So that is how many gatlings? I don't have my books at work. 12 F14= 12

Each DE= ? 4?

DER= ? 4?

CVA= ? 4?

So that is 24 Gatlings chopping up plasma?

24 gats x 4 shots each x 3.5 damage per shot@range 1 x .5 for damage reduction = 168 points of plasma killed off? Or am I missing something?

Then the feds can shoot the A10s Photons in addition to the CVA (4 more there) PLUS CLOUDS of drones (Look at the f14 rules) plus all the escort g racks plus the A10s.

The Romulans need to never even show on the map. If they show up for even a single impulse, they can get jackpotted by a narrow salvo of standard drones from the CVA. Just run away...

=====

By Greg Ernest (Grege) on Friday, March 09, 2007 - 10:56 am: Edit

Leave. You don't have the firepower to take down enough fighters at range before they close behind a wall of drones and blow you apart.

=====

By Jeremy Gray (Gray) on Friday, March 09, 2007 - 11:25 am: Edit

One thing to remeber about the F-14s: This is Y172, which means these are base F-14s, not F-14As or better. So no Type-III rails. Just two Type-Is and two Type-IVs. Still not trivial, but not the monsters we usually invasion (the best drone armed fighter the Feds have until the F-14 gets all its special rails is actually the F-15 - all hail the mighty CVB).

Total gatlings in the force is 28 (12 on fighters, 16 on ships), so maximum plasma shreadage is 168-224 point of plasma a turn. Total photons in the force 21 (11 on A-10s (EW fighter doesn't get one), 4 on the CVA, 6 on the DEs). The ten ship based photons would be well suited to lobbing standard or proximity photons from behind a drone wall.

Why am I helping the Roms?...

=====

By Tom Carroll (Sandman) on Friday, March 09, 2007 - 11:30 am: Edit

You're not. You're just trying to talk him into a fight that he will lose.

=====

By Ted Fay (Catwhoatsphoto) on Friday, March 09, 2007 - 11:49 am: Edit

I agree with Tom. Even in 172, the battle is hopeless for the Romulan force. With drones, the CVA group can even deny you a range 10 bolt shot on a \*ship\* - which would be the only worthwhile target.

However, if you \*must\* fight for a bit - then that's what I would do. Use your most wily anti-drone tactics and attempt to get a r10 bolt shot on a ship. Avoid range 8 unless he's cycling photons. You can't kill enough fighters to make them a worthwhile target, so get a ship or don't bother.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Friday, March 09, 2007 - 01:59 pm: Edit

I would add that on a fixed map you can't play long range phaser 1 fire games either.

This is one of the few matchups (if I am visualizing the SSDs correctly) that the Feds have a lot less Phaser 1s than their opponents.

As for targeting your bolts, I suggest everything against the closest escort, the CVA should NOT be leading the pack in their charge.

But given the Feds and a fixed map, he should be in no hurry to turtle in herding you into a corner, firing waves of drones and narrow salvos of photons against any Rom not in EM and/ or using lots of EW.

Again, just disengage and bring back a force with signifigant drone/ fighter defenses.

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Friday, March 09, 2007 - 04:17 pm: Edit

Gee, guys, I'm not sure, but I think some people think I should retreat... ;-)

=====

By Ted Fay (Catwhoatsphoto) on Friday, March 09, 2007 - 04:50 pm: Edit

Only if you want to live.

=====

By Richard Sherman (Rich) on Saturday, March 10, 2007 - 01:40 am: Edit

Well, I guess I'm one of the few that's not saying outright retreat. It's just that on a fixed map, you really don't have enough plasma to scare him out of a high-speed run with tractored fighters. If he doesn't do it, or you're willing to spend ships for a crack at the CVA, then maybe something worthwhile can be accomplished...

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Saturday, March 10, 2007 - 04:07 am: Edit

You would have a better chance with a fleet of Warbirds...

=====

By Michael Lui (Michaellui) on Monday, March 12, 2007 - 04:15 am: Edit

Run away. You don't have to forces to beat him.

=====

By Larry E. Ramey (Hydrajak) on Monday, March 12, 2007 - 10:10 am: Edit

Totally disagree.

The Roms can win this handily, IFF they pull significant fighters over bombs.

Fixed map... \_1\_ map? That is pretty claustrophobic.

Hidden mine placement?

The Roms can place a lot of mine under cloak and then try to draw fed fighters over them. The Fed ships are monsters at point blank and pretty worthless outside of R2.

=====

By Jeremy Gray (Gray) on Monday, March 12, 2007 - 10:37 am: Edit

Map is 2x2 (so 84x60 hexes). No hidden mine placement (sorry mine warfare fans).

=====

By Kevin M. McCollum (Kevinmccollum) on Monday, March 12, 2007 - 10:44 am: Edit

no hidden placement of mines? do the Feds get to use ECM drones and all the specialty drones when they come available?

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Monday, March 12, 2007 - 11:19 am: Edit

I actually don't know many SFB players who use Hidden Mine Placement.

=====

By Jeremy Gray (Gray) on Monday, March 12, 2007 - 11:57 am: Edit

Hidden mine placement slows the game down considerably. If you are playing with it, players feel obligated to track the movement of everything to try to figure out where it is safe to

fly. Of course, a computer tracking ships could do that for you, but when you are playing this as a game and you have to do it manually, it is a huge drag. Most of the guys I've played with don't like to use hidden placement as a result.

I don't hold it against guys if they track movement if using hidden mines. If you don't, you are asking to hit a mine at the worst possible time. Its a valid approach to minimizing the effect, and it is probably fine with one or two ships on a side in a battle. But in fleet battles with easily a dozen ships on the map, plus fighters and seeking weapons, it is just a gigantic pain in the butt. If I'm ever forced to play with hidden mines, I would track the movement of all ships (as my opponent I'm sure would), and we would take months to play a few turns. I'll pass.

And yes, Feds get access to all the special drones. Roms get cloaked decoys and ECM plasma...oh, and cloaks! Your point? Hidden mine placement is equally painful to both sides (I'm using T-bombs in our current base defense battle - having them hidden would be cool, but I don't want to go there). When it comes to mines, I see the impact of no hidden placement as equally good (or bad depending on your perspective) for both sides. Yes it is harder to get someone to smash into an NSM and ruin their day, but it is also harder to get a cloaked ship to run over a T-bomb and expose himself. It all comes out in the wash.

Sorry for the rant - I'll get off my soap box now.

=====

By Simon Robinson (Loki) on Monday, March 12, 2007 - 11:57 am: Edit

The group I play with always use hidden mine placement - it takes more work, but it's a lot of fun (depending on if you dropped the mine or ran into the datted thing).

Currently working on an excel spreadsheet with macros that will enable us to use hidden deployment and cloaked units and minesweeping etc to speed things up (also means that you can generate a random minefield for solo play) Still has a long way to go but when it's ready it will be awesome.

=====

By Loren Knight (Loren) on Monday, March 12, 2007 - 01:07 pm: Edit

We play hidded mines as well as that is their main function besides blowing up.

Of course if you transport a T-Bomb then there is dummies or the real thing but it's not hidden per say. There is usually not enough mines in a scenario to worry too much about the delay. In a base mine field scenario we have a standing rule. IF the owner mistracks his field and something gets by a mine we don't go back but consider it a misfire AND the mine is revealed. If the mine is still over looked any unit that later causes it to explode doesn't, it must misfire and the mines possition is revealed.

This put all the responsibility on the owning player and doesn't distract from the game if a mistake is made. This lightens the load and keeps the game fun.

Archive through November 08, 2007

-----  
Star Fleet Universe Discussion Board: Star Fleet Battles: General Tactics Discussion: Romulan Tactics: Archive through November 08, 2007

-----  
By Jeremy Gray (Gray) on Monday, March 12, 2007 - 01:52 pm: Edit

Example of how mines could get out of control: Dale and I are typically playing battles with 5-7 ships per side. The Roms frequently have NSMs on many of their ships (all of the eagles) plus a very heavy, if not full, load of T-bombs. As I end up hunting a lot of cloaks, I tend to buy a lot as well. It is entirely possible for us to deploy, including dummies, nearly 70 mines in a game. In the current BATS assault, I've used less than half of my T-bombs and built a defacto mine field around one hemisphere of my base. We are on turn 20 of this thing. If Dale

had the track all the movement of my ships to figure out where the mines may be, we might not be on Turn 10.

The guy laying mines is not the only person who needs to track them. Hitting a hidden NSM with a cruiser in a fleet battle can be a game breaker. Imagine, your CC is leading your fleet of DDs and CLs on a battle pass. You get lazy, and didn't keep track of that enemy FF that cut across this path four turns ago and you hit an NSM. Bang, #1 shield is gone. Same impulse, a barrage of prox torps or disruptors rain down on your unshielded CC. The hits need not be superb, just about a dozen internals - and your CC is now a mess and can't remain a significant factor in the battle. Sure hope it was not an important battle in that campaign you have several months or years invested in.

Now, I'm not complaining that hitting a mine could change the outcome of a game. I've had it happen when mines are not hidden. However, the threat of this happening in a fleet battle means both sides need to track the hell out of the enemy ships. Boring, tedious, and un-fun.

I find mines have plenty of utility without being hidden. Seeking weapon defense, cloak exposure, explosive terrain - all work without the mines being hidden. For the amount of added effort and book keeping, I don't see hidden mines as worth the trouble.

=====

By Larry E. Ramey (Hydrajak) on Monday, March 12, 2007 - 02:18 pm: Edit

Jeremy,

Your rant is kinda funny comming from an ex-ASW guy!

My group always used hidden mine placement. You didn't really need to track every hex, the turns were usually the REALLY important places to look since that is where we would drop them to pull seeking weapons over.

Your point about the cloaked FF zipping in front of the fleet is well taken..... and to me one of the reasons the cloak costs so much darn BVP!!!

Since this is a tactics thread not an opinion thread I won't try to convince anyone they should or should not use hidden mine placement. I feel its not QUITE as bad as Jeremy is making it out to be.

Back to Tactics:

Rommies: Bolt everything at R10 at the best target then leave. You can't win this.

=====

By Jeremy Gray (Gray) on Monday, March 12, 2007 - 02:30 pm: Edit

Larry, I do ASW for a living. It is not necessarily my idea of fun. Remember what we call it in the Navy ... Awfully-Slow-Warfare. I've spent days hunting subs. That doesn't mean I want to spend days playing SFB (at least not anymore - the wife would kill me)

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Monday, March 12, 2007 - 02:52 pm: Edit

Larry: The FF doesn't even need to be cloaked to pull it off. All you have to do to give the meticulous, movement-tracking player fits is run a FF laterally across the enemy's approach vector.

And I don't blame the guy for tracking movement. It slows things way down, and you can do things to drive them crazy. Both of which lead to a frustrating game, esp. if one or the other player does not wish to use hidden mines.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Monday, March 12, 2007 - 02:56 pm: Edit

The fed should be moving aggressively to close the map with you. You shoot plasma and he gatlings them to death. If you go for a range 10 pass, you have to come away from the edge where you can exit.

The problem is if you are facing the Feds to bolt the wad and then turn to disengage, the Fed will pursue and fire the wad of photons at something (small) in a narrow salvo. Followed up by

his Phaser 1s. A jackpot means you abandon it to die or turn around with no plasma to keep the Fed from overrunning you. The Fed has a BUNCH of psuedo photon overloads called Phaser Gatlings and at short range they are BETTER than photons. If you bolt the wad, he can close with impunity. And You will be wading through plenty of drones to get range 10.

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Monday, March 12, 2007 - 02:58 pm: Edit

Larry: The FF doesn't even need to be cloaked to pull it off. All you have to do to give the meticulous, movement-tracking player fits is run a FF laterally across the enemy's approach vector.

And I don't blame the guy for tracking movement. It slows things way down, and you can do things to drive them crazy. Both of which lead to a frustrating game, esp. if one or the other player does not wish to use hidden mines.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Monday, March 12, 2007 - 03:26 pm: Edit

The cure is to limit each player to a certain amount of time to do all the paperwork/ EA.

If a mine gets forgotten, well they were built by the lowest bidder anyway and maybe they'll go off later. Or the Salvage fuses (from the CL story about the Klingon female officer who has her son killed) could just have gone off early...

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Monday, March 12, 2007 - 03:51 pm: Edit

It's more work to track where a mine \*could\* be than to keep track of where it is. Time limits can punish one more than the other.

=====

By Jeremy Gray (Gray) on Monday, March 12, 2007 - 04:13 pm: Edit

I'm not worried about the guy who laid a hidden mine. He knows were the thing is. I'm worried about the guy who is fighting him. It is a well known tactic in that environment to track the other guy's ship to minimize "retracing his steps" and hitting his mines. Its really not too hard in a duel or squadron battle. But it can get really ugly when the numbers get bigger. The paperwork is continuous (not just limited to EA), and just slows down play. Every impulse will take a little more time - and it really starts to add up.

Visible mines probably cost us some realism (or like me, you can just wave your hand and assume that sense the sensors can pick up shuttles, they can pick up the hex of a mine), but it does make games move faster. It also makes them less nerve-racking. Again, less stress and mental fatigue is not necessarily realistic, but I'm all about keeping the fun-factor high and the gas-factor low.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Monday, March 12, 2007 - 04:40 pm: Edit

An alternative we tried once was that a mine could be detected at range 2 if laid during a scenario. This allowed you to slam on the brakes or maneuver clear and still let us get the game moving.

=====

By Jeremy Gray (Gray) on Monday, March 12, 2007 - 04:45 pm: Edit

That would actually be a very nice compromise.

=====

By Kevin M. McCollum (Kevinmccollum) on Monday, March 12, 2007 - 04:57 pm: Edit

I have to agree that the roms can't win the scenario since hidden mine placement has been removed from them. one of their greatest strengths.

=====

By Martin Read (Amethyst\_Cat) on Monday, March 12, 2007 - 05:12 pm: Edit

Quote:

I have to agree that the roms can't win the scenario since hidden mine placement has been removed from them. one of their greatest strengths.

Not "removed from", but rather "not granted to"; as an Optional Rule, hidden mine placement is by default not used.

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Monday, March 12, 2007 - 05:16 pm: Edit

Besides, what's good for the goose is good for the gander. I don't think I'd want to try to crack a Fed BATs if he could zip his ships in a circle around it and god knows where (or if) he left mines!

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Monday, March 12, 2007 - 05:44 pm: Edit

Or for that matter the Tholians maneuver off wedding cake sides not covered by fire (especially before you have the injuns circling the wagons).

Drop a full load of tbombs here and there and wait for the ships to come zooming in to crash the web (when you come up to the veranda between the outer and middle rings for reinforcement).

HMM, a possible term paper.

=====

By Randy O. Green (Hollywood750) on Tuesday, March 13, 2007 - 08:16 am: Edit

If we're using hidden mines, we overlay the map with a thick, hard plastic sheet we have and just draw a trail behind each ship as it goes with grease pencils.

=====

By William J Gauthier (Emperorvortia) on Wednesday, November 07, 2007 - 10:07 pm: Edit

Here's a slightly beginner question:

How do you avoid getting Flashcubed and lit up, particularly by the Gorn. Typically, the Cloak puts a Romulan vessel at a significant BPV disadvantage, and as a newbie, my first instinct is to retreat back to my cloak to recharge those long-charging Plasma Torps. Unfortunately, T-bombs really ruin my day, and when you're dealing with the 100 points of Plasma coming from a Gorn vessel, G13.37 really doesn't help all that much.

Not cloaking seems like the obvious solution, but when you are running Romulan, you're at a significant BPV disadvantage and it's an uphill battle to win a stand-up fight. If we assume don't cloak, is there any time when it is wise to do so, at least while facing a Gorn opponent?

=====

By Michael Lui (Michaellui) on Wednesday, November 07, 2007 - 10:26 pm: Edit

If you read G13.552 you should notice that it says: ...t he period of this lock-on lasts only until the next roll to retain lock-ons in the sequence of play.

If you then read the sequence of play you will see that that next roll is even before launching/firing any weapons or operating tractors. Plan ahead. Just because you're under cloak doesn't mean you can't use ECM or WWs and unless those plasmas are launched at Range 0 or 1 (from inside the T-bomb radius) you have quite a bit of time to play EW/speed games.

=====

By William J Gauthier (Emperorvortia) on Wednesday, November 07, 2007 - 10:31 pm: Edit

So what you are saying is, as long as I keep my EW game tight, I need not fear the T-Bomb as much, because he has to roll to retain lock-on first? Splendid, I had that out of order (Suprise, suprise). Thanks for the clue in.

=====

By Michael Lui (Michaellui) on Wednesday, November 07, 2007 - 10:43 pm: Edit

If you purchase G2 it has the most recently updated Sequence of Play in it. I think.

=====

By William T Wilson (Sheap) on Thursday, November 08, 2007 - 02:37 am: Edit

The sequence of play regarding flash-cube has always been correct. Anyway, yes, if your opponent can't retain the lockon, a flashcube just costs you the 10 damage from the T-bomb. And that can add up. But it really only is a problem in duels. In a fleet or even squadron action, nobody has time to sit around and flashcube you for half a turn.

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Thursday, November 08, 2007 - 02:52 am: Edit

Figuring out the cloak took me a while. I was an experienced Gorn player before taking on the Roms in the current campaign I play with Jeremy (fighting his Federation).

How you use the cloak really depends on what ship. The Romulans have more variety in their fleet than just about anyone. I've found that Eagles cloak really well; Hawks do it okay; and Kestrals suck at it (except the small ships, which can cloak well).

In Kestrals, I usually go for a ballet and keep the speed up instead of relying on the cloak. In Eagles, I use the cloak a lot. In Hawks, well... typically I'm mixed in with either Eagles or Kestrals, and the beauty of Hawks is they can hang with either. Thing is, you gotta plan to use the cloak; you can't just say "Oh shite, he's about to run me over - time to cloak!" In Eagles I usually find dropping to speed 0 until the fadeout is done and then accelerating back up to speed is best, as the speed-0 just denies a lock. Against T-bombs, I've done some wacky things like move into reverse to avoid the blast radius. Of course one trick is to not cloak all your ships at once, but cycle them. If he tries to jump a cloaked ship, punish it with an uncloaked one.

Er, of course that is a fleet action I'm thinking of.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Thursday, November 08, 2007 - 10:41 am: Edit

The biggest point of playing a cloaker is you HAVE to have a plan to get out from under the cloak.

So you fire your torps to hit/ keep the Gorn away.

Cloak and hopefully the Gorn and his torp loses lock on.

Have a speed change or two to allow for additional attempts to get his lok on to fail.

Turn so that the Gorn has trouble sitting atop you.

Plan on coming out of cloak with speed changes. You want to be far enough away from him to make sure you can restart the engagement without him smashing you on your last impulse of fade in before he runs out any torps you fire.

REMEMBER, 2 can play the tbomb game AND you should have a NSM to make him think twice about crisscrossing you and your trail.

=====

By Larry E. Ramey (Hydrajak) on Thursday, November 08, 2007 - 11:59 am: Edit

If the Gorn has 100 hot in the tubes and you cloaked.... you have made what is known as a "tragic tactical mistake"

You cloak AFTER you nail him with plasma so that his 100 quickly becomes 50 because 2 of his plasma tube just got boned.

You cloak AFTER the Fed runs through your enveloper at full strength and you drop another F torp or 2 on him to make him cry for the pain he has already taken as the cloak keeps the range in the 9 bracket.

Speed changes are your friend. If you get a head to head underrun its hard for him to stay on you long enough.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Thursday, November 08, 2007 - 12:07 pm: Edit

You can also do the pump fake where you START to come out of cloak, and then fade again if he commits to coming closer than you feel comfortable with.

You have to either have a speed change to be moving fast when you come up OR, get your opponent facing in such a

way that they HAVE to HET to get to you. And if they DO HET, fade back out.

Your turns are really all about positioning him in a bad facing or running over one of YOUR tbombs/ NSM.

=====

## KZINTI TACTICS

By Jim Davies (Mudfoot) on Friday, March 09, 2007 - 03:47 pm: Edit

What's the YIS of a cricket bat? Is it available in commander's options? BPV?

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Sunday, March 11, 2007 - 02:25 pm: Edit

Can the cricket bat be enhanced by Legendary Officers? Are there X versions?

heh.

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Sunday, March 11, 2007 - 09:39 pm: Edit

Can a cricket bat be overloaded?

=====

By Tim Longacre (Timl) on Sunday, March 11, 2007 - 10:58 pm: Edit

What's the range of the cricket bat? does it diminish in effect with range?

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Monday, March 12, 2007 - 12:31 am: Edit

Jesus wept.

\*sends them all to the Booth\*

\*sets it on 'Dungeons&Dragons'

\*settles back to enjoy the screaming\*

=====

By Terry O'Carroll (Terryoc) on Monday, March 12, 2007 - 12:37 am: Edit

-----

Quote:

Jesus wept.

-----

Shouldn't this post be in the "Biblical Archaeology" thread?

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Monday, March 12, 2007 - 12:53 am: Edit

\*gets out the firehose\*

=====

By Michael Lui (Michaellui) on Monday, March 12, 2007 - 04:37 am: Edit

Can you use Proximity Fuses on a Cricket Bat? And what's the effect of being uncontrolled on a Cricket Bat? And does a Cricket Bat affect a Poor Crew? (Or would that be "Does a Poor Crew affect a Cricket Bat?")

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Monday, March 12, 2007 - 08:57 am: Edit

Ahem. The Cricket Bat is a Hydran-only weapon, and you non-Methane breathers should not be discussing the rules for it's use as it is considered unreplicable, just like Andromedan weapons and systems. Besides, you couldn't understand the rules for the use of the Cricket Bat anyway...

=====

By Jonathan Biggar (Jonb) on Monday, March 12, 2007 - 12:28 pm: Edit

Hmmm, I thought the Cricket Bat was a new Tholian anti-Selt weapon...

=====

By Jeremy Gray (Gray) on Monday, March 12, 2007 - 12:31 pm: Edit

Don't taunt the cricket bat.

=====

By michael john campbell (Michaelcampbell) on Tuesday, March 13, 2007 - 03:12 am: Edit

Gee...I guess the World Cup must have started!

=====

By Alex Aminoff (Aaminoff) on Saturday, May 12, 2007 - 12:01 am: Edit

Re: Lyran CA vs Kzinti CC.

The Kzinti CC is one of my favorite ships. The disruptors of a Klingon, the Ph-1s of a Lyran, and the drones and ph-3s of a Kzinti, plus plenty of power and that little bit of extra shielding. Unlike some other Kzinti ships, which dictate how you must play them, the CC is flexible. In particular, in Y144, you are not forced to rely on those slow drones.

Against a modern Lyran, whose ESGs discourage an overrun, I might try saber-dancing. Unfortunately for the Lyran, in Y144 the ESG capacitor has not been invented yet, so the ESG is a very power-intensive weapon. Therefore I would try to arrange battle passes at range 4-5, exchanging disruptor and ph-1 fire, trying to draw the ESG activation without going for a closer encounter. After a few turns of this, when both ships have some internals and some damage to power systems, go for the overrun. The ESG, of which only one is likely to be powered each turn, will be spread among me & my drones, and I can anchor and put out more damage with ph-3s and more drones (possibly including some that have been floating around the map acting as mildly annoying terrain since turn 1).

In my brief search, I did not find a YIS for armored drones. Armored drones, especially the old half-armored type I, are the cat's cheeze even against non-Lyran opponents; against Lyrans of course they are even more so.

One cute tactic if armored drones are allowed: plot an odd-numbered speed. Find an impulse when speed 4 moves and you do not. The impulse before, launch an armored type IV with extra external armor. Then, after it moves in front of you, grab it in a tractor. Now wander around the map with your Fist of Punching Through ESGs in front of you. Of course some planning is required so that your final overrun happens in the direction the fist is pointing, but you can rotate it 1 hex side per turn IIRC.

I'd say the critical don'ts are, don't get hung up on the drones - they are slow, don't expect many to hit, they are there for ESG absorption; and don't forget about the infamous Lyran seeking weapon, the suicide shuttle.

One other thing to remember: ESGs are hard to use. The Lyran has to accurately project when the situation 4 impulses from now is the right time, and announce and set radius accordingly. In the Ricky's Boston area campaign, my Lyran opponent was a pretty good player, but he often got his ESG timing wrong. It's just hard.

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Saturday, May 12, 2007 - 12:15 am: Edit

Armor is available for drones in Y67 (YFD12.0). If you tractor your own drone (or any friendly drone) it goes inert (G7.522).

=====

By Kevin M. McCollum (Kevinmccollum) on Saturday, May 12, 2007 - 04:00 am: Edit

You do realize that power can be stored for up to 25 turns in the ESG itself. all the lyran has to do is put spare power into it and leave it there till ram time.

=====

By Christopher Ozeroff (Scionkiller) on Friday, May 18, 2007 - 01:12 pm: Edit

Hey guys,  
I have an honest tactics question, so I hope I don't get beaten by the cricket bat used on MJC.

Small base assault mission, Year 167.

Klingon forces are two D7 Battlecruisers, one that will carry on to the rest of the campaign and one "expendable" ship. Both have just medium drone speed upgrades, making their total BPV  $121 + 4 + 121 + 4 = 250$ .

Kzinti forces are one CS (a campaign cruiser) and one base station, both with medium speed upgrades, making the total

BPV  $116 + 8 + 120 + 4 = 248$  BPV. Probably 4 BPs will be thrown into the balance for the Kzinti.

All ships/bases have no refits.

As we are new players ramping up to all the rules, the following rules will NOT be allowed:

- Commander's Options
- Scatterpacks and T-bombs (no BPV for them anyway)
- Tractor beams are limited to just holding drones until burnout (no ship to ship tractoring, rotating, etc)
- Docking and base repair
- Suicide shuttles, MRS shuttles, any other special shuttles EXCEPT Wild Weasels, which are used
- Mid-turn speed changes
- pre-plotted movement (we both used to play with the old commander's edition)
- generally, anything that's in Advanced Missions

Notable rules that we will use:

- Electronic warfare
- Boarding party combat and hit and run raids
- Some simple sensor rules (just loaning of EW and extra drone control)

Any advice for the Kzinti player? Does this seem relatively balanced, since BPV can be misleading?

=====

By Kerry Drake (Kedrake) on Friday, May 18, 2007 - 01:27 pm: Edit

Well, if you are using EW, the Kzinti would have the upper hand (IMHO). The BS does have 22 Power and 2 Special Sensors and that is going to make it bad for the Klingons...Even worse if you start at WS-III giving the Kzinti BS full phaser capacitors for its 6 P-IV's and 3 P-III's (13.5 points in the bank). The BS also has 2 drone racks of its own plus an ADD making it all but drone proof from the Klingons (if they are not allowed Scatter Packs).

Keep the CS under the guns of the BS and D7's are going to get hurt trying to score damage through the EW shift the BS can make....

=====

By Christopher Ozeroff (Scionkiller) on Friday, May 18, 2007 - 01:38 pm: Edit

As I see it, the pros for the Kzinti are:

- 50% faster drone firing rate with ammo to match. This is further accentuated by the ADD that the base has to shoot down Klingon drones
- EW advantage due to special sensors, however I don't know how to leverage this best as the base has very little power in general and specifically it has extremely few batteries
- phaser-IVs have a huge range advantage over phaser-IIs, especially if I can force an EW shift

Cons for the Kzinti:

- the Klingons have many more disruptors for long-range sniping and close-range crunch power
- a D7 has significantly more power than a base station
- the Kzinti cruiser has to stay close to the base for mutual protection, so the Klingon has a significant mobility advantage

=====

By Christopher Ozeroff (Scionkiller) on Friday, May 18, 2007 - 01:40 pm: Edit

Yeah, that's very similar to what I was thinking. I'm just wondering about the details. What sort of EW settings should I use? I have only two points of reserve power to adjust, so that's kinda the trick.

I think we would probably start with WS-III for the Klingons and WS-I for the Kzinti. Isn't that the norm for base attacks, generally?

=====

By Ted Fay (Catwhoeatsphoto) on Friday, May 18, 2007 - 01:57 pm: Edit

As much as possible, use OEW - especially if you only have power to loan to one unit. That way, you can force a shift against all Kzinti targets - possibly including your drones - which would make your drones more effective.

Remember, that under the new rules, a base that fires weapons does not blind special sensors. That will give you a huge advantage in EW. That also means that you should power all channels every turn. In this way, you will be able to loan EW and/or distract incoming drones.

IMO the D7s cannot win a war of attrition at range 15. Your ph-4's are just too much and the EW advantage is very telling against his weaker ph-2s. If you carefully time your fire so that fire is near the end of a turn and/or he's out of position to make a charge, then you also hit him every turn while still maintaining the threat of close range ph-4.

I think the D7s' best chance is to close to range 15, fire at the base, and then close to range 8 at slow speed with overloads, wild weasels, maximum ECCM, and as much reinforcement as can be brought to bear. Assuming the Klinks get UIMs, they have a 1-5 to hit with the overloads, which will offset the EW advantage somewhat.

Anticipate this tactic by timing your fire so that if he wants to do it he will face ph-4s at range 8 - as opposed to firing too early and allowing him to dip into range 8 and then get back out. Also, stagger your drone launch so that he can't weasel one big wave. That way, you might be able to force him to get closer after launching a weasel if he wants to fire at you. Closer will hurt you more - but will hurt him MUCH more.

As for the CS, just have him sit with TACs on the base. That will give him power for reinforcement and/or overloads - making sniping at him less effective.

Not that I've been asked to give advice to the Klingons - but I will. Leave. This is a campaign, and the odds are staked against you. Come back when you have a third D7 to back you up.

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Friday, May 18, 2007 - 02:16 pm: Edit

Kzintis: Fire 4 Ph-4s and the 2 CS Disruptors at a D7 every turn. Launch your drones in pairs but don't be afraid to launch your drones at incoming Klingon drones (a large wave for example). The CS should be ok if it just sits and TACs and puts remaining power in specific reinforcement; the BS will need to spend 11 points toward protection (6 ECM plus 1 sensor plus 4 self-loaned ECM), though you can hold 2 back as batteries and only use if the Klingons have sufficient ECCM to drop below a 2 shift. Note: this will mean that you will have to drop some Ph-4 fire eventually, especially if you want another sensor powered for drone control. You WANT the Klingons to power ECCM as then that is less power for reinforcement. Don't worry about Klingon ECM - time is on your side.

=====

By Christopher Ozeroff (Scionkiller) on Friday, May 18, 2007 - 02:19 pm: Edit

Heh, I hope the odds aren't stacked TOO much in the Kzinti's favor, because I organized the campaign and I wouldn't want to be unfairly advantaging myself. This is part of a rotating Captain's Game campaign, so he can afford to junk one of the cruisers as long as he doesn't junk his own. What I mean is that there's no economic system, and the minimum score for a scenario is zero so there's not much to lose as long as he doesn't affect his future scenarios.

I was worried that it would be the opposite way around. The Klingon player is the most experienced player in the group, and the Klingons are his preferred race. I'm the second most experienced (probably), but all I used to fly were Feds and Andros, and I have a professed dislike of drones. :-) Neither of us have played for about a decade.

I took Kzinti simply because it was the last race left to choose from, and as the organizer I wanted to make everyone as happy as possible. I've heard that the early Kzinti's were really terrible ships, so I wanted to get a sense if the scenario was unbalanced \*against\* me.

Anyway, I appreciate your tactical advice for both players. What would be the implications of adding a couple of more

rules? I really want to keep it as simple as possible, but would the addition of Scatterpack's and T-bombs make a big difference in play balance?

Suppose I did allow them and also gave the Klingon player the Commander's Options points to spend on them. What then should the Kzinti player should purchase with his points?

=====

By Christopher Ozeroff (Scionkiller) on Friday, May 18, 2007 - 02:25 pm: Edit

Andy: Interesting advice! I was thinking of forcing a constant +1 shift, not a constant +2 shift.

=====

By Ted Fay (Catwhoeatsphoto) on Friday, May 18, 2007 - 02:35 pm: Edit

Scatter packs and T-Bombs would favor the Klinks. He would be able to deliver waves of 12 drones instead of waves of 8 (tops for two turns drone launch) - and possibly launch 20 drones in two turns (SPs plus ship launches - assuming the Zin destroy drones as he goes). T-Bombs also favor Klinks because he can destroy incoming Zin drones without wasting phasers.

I actually would recommending an F5 or E4 to the attacking Klingon force to balance the forces. Rely on an assessment of the overall strategic situation, rather than on BPV - which as everyone knows is broken.

=====

By William T Wilson (Sheap) on Friday, May 18, 2007 - 02:36 pm: Edit

It seems balanced enough. Without a power module the BS will be short of power, so its ability to do magic with EW is not going to be that great. It will probably not even have enough power for its self-generated EW limit, and since it has the bulk of the firepower, it will probably be the primary target.

The Klingons cannot really sit at long range and plink, they probably will not be able to overcome the base's reinforcement. So they will have to come into close range instead. They should try to get between the base and the cruiser so they can't concentrate fire at close range.

The base is vulnerable to mizia attacks and hit & run raids but to almost nothing else, it has something like 60 free hits between cargo and repair. Also, special sensors have higher damage priority than P4s, so they'll have to score a few phaser hits before the firepower degrades in any serious way (the P4 is definitely more valuable). Guard your stuff.

Bases are really too weak if you don't use the revised advanced missions base rules. In particular, bases can change their rotation speed, don't blind their own sensors with weapons fire, never run out of CDR repairs, and have special (improved) firing rules for their phasers. And some other abilities you won't likely use. Never running out of CDR is really useful - you can CDR your shields, your hull boxes, whatever. CDR of hull is great on a base because the enemy will just have to destroy it again, of course, it's not better than repairing a phaser. Although, it's difficult to repair a P4. You'll probably end up repairing them as P1s, once they get damaged.

Don't automatically dump all your base battery power into reinforcement if you get hit - most of the damage will probably hit free hits anyway, and power is at such a premium on the base.

The special rules are a little odd in that they disadvantage both sides, but probably the Kzinti a little more, because anchoring is more useful to them, and boarding parties favor the Klingons. Special sensors will matter until the base fires its phasers, then they won't because of lack of power.

The first pass will be the key to the scenario, because it will be the only time the Kzinti will have an EW advantage. Afterward, the Klingon advantage in overall power will give them the advantage. For fairness, the Kzinti should start at WS-2 or 3 (no real difference between them without scatterpacks or suicide shuttles being allowed), otherwise, the Kzinti will lose their early advantage.

Without scatterpacks or anchoring allowed, the drones will probably cancel each other out. Both sides have plenty of drone defense and drones will just be an irritant. I would use the base drones purely as counter-drones and the CS drones "offensively" (although all they will do is force the Klingons to shoot them down, they won't seriously impact the battle).

Edit: EW power allocated to a sensor doesn't have to be assigned right away. You can activate a sensor without specifying what mission it will perform or what its target will be, and you can allocate power to EW lending without specifying who is the recipient. This is true even for O-EW, as far as I know. So this mitigates the base's lack of batteries. O-EW is a really good idea.

Also consider the campaign situation. You will win if the Klingon "main" ship is destroyed, so focus on doing so. I'd expect the Klingons to send the "expendable" ship in first, to encourage you to fire on it and leave the valuable one alone. In this case you might want to separate the CS (normally staying with the base would be the right choice) to try to get behind the Klingons, since you know your more valuable target will likely be in the rear. If both Klingons follow the CS, that's OK, you get a turn of P4 sniping where the base is relatively safe from attack.

Additional edit: I see scatterpacks as basically a wash. Without the threat of an anchor, they just aren't as scary. The Kzinti have more drone control ability (because they can use a sensor) but the Klingons cannot fill the channels they already have without using scatterpacks.

As far as ranges, I see range 8 as being the one the Klingons need. Range 3 or less is the death zone, where the base will wreck somebody with 70-100 points of P4 damage. Range 8 is the range where P2s gain effectiveness (assuming no R3) and it also allows them to use overloaded disruptors and UIM.

=====  
By Joe Stevenson (Alligator) on Friday, May 18, 2007 - 02:38 pm: Edit

Quote:

catter packs and T-Bombs would favor the Klinks. He would be able to deliver waves of 12 drones instead of waves of 8 (tops for two turns drone launch) - and possibly launch 20 drones in two turns (SPs plus ship launches - assuming the Zin destroy drones as he goes). T-Bombs also favor Klinks because he can destroy incoming Zin drones without wasting phasers.

-----  
Can't the Kzinti do the same? I don't see how this favors them solely

=====  
By Kerry Drake (Kedrake) on Friday, May 18, 2007 - 02:44 pm: Edit

If you DOCK the CS to the BS using C13.411 you can send an additional 4 points of power from the CS to the BS, and if docked EXTERNALLY can also conduct some offensive actions...

=====  
By Larry E. Ramey (Hydrajak) on Friday, May 18, 2007 - 03:05 pm: Edit  
I'd leave.

This is a campaign. Campaigners don't get old by flying into the teeth of fixed defences. Seriously... the Klink can win this if they want, there is no question that if they roll up to the base they WILL gut it. If nothing else the marines will spike the APRs and simply unpower the BS. (Remember that unlike other power systems the APR must be guarded on a per box basis)

However, you are going to send a D7 back to the yards.... maybe to the scrap yard if you screw up and eat drones at a bad time.

This is not a battle you want to fight.

=====  
By Christopher Ozeroff (Scionkiller) on Friday, May 18, 2007 - 03:08 pm: Edit

Thanks for all the great responses, guys, lots to think about!

Quote:

I actually would recommend an F5 or E4 to the attacking Klingon force to balance the forces. Rely on an assessment of the overall strategic situation, rather than on BPV - which as everyone knows is broken.

-----  
Ted: I agree that it should be adjusted on overall assessment, I just don't have enough experience to make that call correctly yet. I don't think BPV is "broken", it's just that all possible tactical combinations can't be represented as a single number. SFB would probably be boring if it could. I think BPV is a pretty good estimate for what is essentially a very hard problem.

Joe: Yeah, I thought SPs for each side would about cancel out, and t-bombs in turn help destroy the waves.

Kerry: Docking is not allowed, one of the rules that was excluded for simplicity.

Sheap: Good points about Mizia, Hit and Run, and the free hits I get.

Anyway, the consensus seems to be that it's not totally lopsided. I think I'll stick with the rules and forces we have now and see what the result is. However, if it is a real cakewalk for the Kzinti, I will take that into consideration for the rest of the base assaults in the game.

I like the idea of adding a small ship for balance. Even better, but again I'm not sure about the exact forces, would be to have the campaign cruiser that is attacking be supported by 2-3 small ships. Two destroyers, a destroyer and two frigates, or something like that. That would still hopefully add some firepower, while at the same time making the campaign cruiser the flagship and center of attention, which I think will be most fun for the players.

I can't balance the scenario (if it turns out to be unfair) by replacing the defending cruiser with a smaller ship or ships, because it is important for the overall campaign attrition that the cruisers participate in several scenarios.

One final thought. What if the attacking Klingons go for serious damage to the defending CS instead of the base station? Again, destroying the base gets them nothing except points for the current scenario, while managing serious damage to the CS would hamper the Kzinti player in the rest of the campaign.

Edit: Hmm, that is two votes for lopsided-ness.

=====  
By Ted Fay (Catwhoatsphoto) on Friday, May 18, 2007 - 04:36 pm: Edit

The CS doesn't have much to worry about under the protection of the big guns. If they concentrate firepower on the CS, then the BS will wack the Klinks.

=====  
By Michael Lui (Michaelui) on Friday, May 18, 2007 - 04:42 pm: Edit

ALL bases with Phaser-4s are under priced. ALL bigger they are the more under-priced they are. Give the Klingon an extra F5 if he stays to fight.

Quote:

What I mean is that there's no economic system, and the minimum score for a scenario is zero so there's not much to lose as long as he doesn't affect his future scenarios.

-----  
I'd run if that base didn't absolutely have to be destroyed and I only had 2 unrefitted D7s. Even with the extra F5 it'd be a close call. Is he getting anything out of this fight besides a few VPs?

=====  
By William T Wilson (Sheap) on Friday, May 18, 2007 - 08:31 pm: Edit

In a "free" campaign (any campaign where you choose your own targets) there's no incentive to fight at a base unless you know you can win and I think that is coloring a lot of the perceptions here. The Klingons do not need a bigger to win this scenario. They need a bigger fleet to be ASSURED of a

win in the scenario. The current Klingon fleet has an expected damage of 56 points at R8 and can arrange to have this happen where only 4P4s are facing them, and they'll be looking at about 60 points of return fire from the Kzinti (assuming 4P4, which the Klingons can arrange, after all the base is not going anywhere). EW makes this worse, if they fire into a +1 shift, the Klingons drop to 41 expected damage. However on the second battle pass the Klingons have the advantage as the Kzinti will be shooting a fresh shield and the Klingons will hit the same (down) shield on the base. Now, as I mentioned previously, the base is big and spongy and takes a lot of damage, but looking at the damage output, it's pretty close.

=====  
By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Sunday, May 20, 2007 - 01:53 am: Edit

To make this 'balanced' vs 2 vanilla D7's with speed-20 drones, I'd change the Kzinti CS to a CL, or a couple of FF's.

=====  
By Jeff Laikind (J\_Laikind) on Sunday, May 20, 2007 - 01:29 pm: Edit

Sorry, Mike. While a good balancing recommendation, Chris did list the Kzinti CS as being a campaign ship, while the BS is not. In that case, a Civilian BS (P-1's) would be the unit to switch to. Without the P-4's, the D7s would definitely close.

## =====

# GORN TACTICS

By Jim Hart (Vandal) on Thursday, January 18, 2007 - 02:51 pm: Edit

First, a Gorn should never go 16/8, he should go 17 (top of turn mode). If he is reinforcing against a Dis/Drone ship, use your drones to soak his phasers and approach him on a shield line. His maneuvers will tell you which shield is reinforced, then you shoot the other one.

This does put you at more risk of plasma, since it's not a classic oblique attack. But there are no totally safe tactics.

=====  
By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Thursday, January 18, 2007 - 04:41 pm: Edit

I think that OFTEN speed 16 is a better choice. Then you can spend a point to get an extra move to speed 17 and keep the same turn mode with an unplotted change.

But I am no good at actually playing (there are no players here in Charleston as far as I can tell)

=====  
By Jim Davies (Mudfoot) on Friday, January 19, 2007 - 03:37 pm: Edit

It's true about the 16-17 changeup, because it'll get you a move on the next impulse. But that works only in the second half of the turn (see the chart), and Zach's opponent was going 16/8, so the 16 is at the start of the turn.

I wouldn't want to go 16/8 as a Gorn because I'd want to be able to keep control of the middle of the map.

=====  
By Kenny Bruce (Lt\_Bruce) on Tuesday, January 30, 2007 - 07:31 pm: Edit

Question: whats the best way to beat a Hydran Dragoon with a Gorn Battlecruiser. I played it once on an asteroid map... found myself range 1 from the dragoon... Ouch. Then his fighters finished me off.

=====  
By Kenny Bruce (Lt\_Bruce) on Tuesday, January 30, 2007 - 07:33 pm: Edit

Not the heavy battlecruiser. The 160 bpv one from basic set.

=====  
By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Tuesday, January 30, 2007 - 08:56 pm: Edit

High speed.

Always make him eat at LEAST 50 in a lump to get close.

Kill the fighters as soon as you see them.

They are worth AT LEAST 2 phaser ones at range 4 or so.

=====

By Tim Longacre (Timl) on Tuesday, January 30, 2007 - 09:40 pm: Edit

First, is this against the Dragoon or Dragoon+? It does make a big difference.

If it is a DG+, to keep it about even, he should have 2 ST-Is or 1 ST-II (depending on skill level), otherwise he really starts to out-BPV you. If he has a Dragoon, 3 ST-IIs should be an even-up fight, BVP-wise.

Also, what kind of refits and enhancements do you have (Sabots, Carronades, etc.)?

Here is a small set of tips:

Assuming a non-refitted DG, you want to keep the distance open (more than 8) until you are ready to kill him. This means AFTER the fighters are dead (don't be afraid to launch enveloping torps at them if you need to, as they are that dangerous), and you've created enough weak shields that a modest plasma strike will hurt him. You both have really good power curves, but the DG is limited in speed compared to you (whereas the DG+ is not). It's not a big difference, but it's one that can determine who controls the tempo of the battle.

Against the DG+, you need to do the same thing, but you will have a harder time of it, as now he can force you to move before he does, and he can keep up with you enough to pin you in a corner (if on a fixed map). Once again, try to kill the fighters first.

In either case, remember that EW is more your friend than his. Next, you both have something in common that can work against you if you let it: your heavy weaponry fires almost all over the place. If you can goad him into chasing you when your torps are loaded, make him walk through a few if wants to get to you.

A common tourney tactic is to launch an enveloping S and an F to weaken all the shields and drop one. This doesn't work so well vs. a refitted hydran, as the gats fire forward, but if he's flying the DG you might want to try it.

Make sure you use your shuttles. At the very least, you can try to use them to do several things: dogfight his fighters (I think this is still allowed), hit them with your 6 P-3s (which might cripple them at point-blank range, but your shuttles WILL die), or hit his ship with their P-3s.

=====  
By Kenny Bruce (Lt\_Bruce) on Wednesday, January 31, 2007 - 11:58 am: Edit

It was the Dragoon+ (definitely makes things a little more difficult). He had two stinger IIs, which were trailing about 6 behind him. I made the mistake of going a little slower than top speed and reinforcing, and of not saving enough firepower for the fighters.

Thanks for the advice. (I definitely agree about EW).

=====  
By Kenny Bruce (Lt\_Bruce) on Wednesday, January 31, 2007 - 12:00 pm: Edit

Also, no commanders options or improvements (like sabots) were allowed.

=====  
By Tim Longacre (Timl) on Wednesday, January 31, 2007 - 02:21 pm: Edit

Kenny, you're welcome.

In the case of the DG+ and the fighters, though, he has the advantage over you by about 8 BPV. If you play the match-up again, suggest the he use ST-Is or ST-Fs (at 8 an 7 BPV each, respectively). That will even the field, especially if you can't have T-bombs to make up the difference.

=====  
By Troy J. Latta (Saaur) on Wednesday, January 31, 2007 - 11:17 pm: Edit

A sabot is no more of an improvement than his + refit.

=====  
By Michael Lui (Michaellui) on Thursday, February 01, 2007 - 04:14 am: Edit

Actually the main problem is the asteroids. If I was the Dragoon I wouldn't be coming out of there. All it would be to me is a little more ECM against the Hellbores which use 2 dice to hit and real damage off of the plasmas as they have to travel through the asteroids to get me. And I would take the Stinger-Fs for the gatlings to polish off any plasmas that got that far and load them down with ECM pods in case the Gorn decided to shoot his phaser-1s at them.

=====

By Peter Thoenen (Eol) on Thursday, March 15, 2007 - 05:39 pm: Edit

Alright, don't have time to playtest so soliciting thoughts before the fight:

I (Gorn) have:

CMX x1

HDX x5

F-TH x1 (don't ask

Opponent (allies, campaign):

Andromedan:

SAT x1

Missionary x1

Eliminator x1

Mamba x1

Zin:

GBDP x6

GBD x6

BHB x2

HBMR x12

GMG x2

GMB x1

GSA x5

OR:

ph1 x-54, S x12, M x7

v.

TRL x5, DisDev x3, Drones x40, Dis (r10) x36, Mauler

Either strat I don't plan to get close to the ground bases till late and deal with the units and / or sat.

SO what I am curious is:

Any reason I wouldn't want to just go r15 and park and lob torps and / or crawl forward @ spd 4? I can phaser / ww his torps if needed and Torp anything that tries to close.

I know X is suppose to dictate range and stuff but in this case, not sure what the ballet will get me, especially as I can't honestly think my opponent will purse (I have him once he leaves the support of his base).

I think both are viable (ballet or park / crawl) but just trying to get opinions.

=====

By Michael Lui (Michaellui) on Friday, March 16, 2007 - 07:17 am: Edit

Be very careful that the DisDevs don't bring you to point blank of the Kzinti's drones. You probably don't want to be crawling if he manages a good roll or two with them. It wouldn't be fun to wind up in the same hex or one hex away from them in the DD firing step, they'll impact before you can launch a WW. Ballet, but that doesn't mean that you can't use a WW drogue if you need to.

=====

By John Carroll (Jcwl) on Monday, July 02, 2007 - 12:16 pm: Edit

What options would you take for a Gorn FF+? Opponent is an Orion LR.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Monday, July 02, 2007 - 12:46 pm: Edit

LWO! Allows you to crunch him with a surprise bolt at range.

Alternately SABOTS and a seeking weapon or phaser drogue.

A seeker drogue will make him run away at least once and will compensate for your arming cycle.

FIXED MAP? Any objectives here?

Generally, tbombs and extra BPs are always nice.

Commando raids should be against his (few) control spaces if you plan hit and runs. If you plan on board to capture include a marine combat engineer squad.

You have real difficult issues with weapon arming cycles, so the gorn anchor is your best bet.

If you get in a speed/ turning duel you probably lose, so brick the nose and keep moving towards him. At least your weapons hold cheaply. But what will HIS weapon options be? All F or D torps? If I was him, I'd be choosing QWTs.

=====

By John Carroll (Jcwl) on Tuesday, July 03, 2007 - 07:30 pm: Edit

The map is a 2 x 2. Objectives, I must hold the system, as I am defending and he is aggressing.

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Tuesday, July 03, 2007 - 08:45 pm: Edit

LR+ weapons are DISR, 2x Drone-B. Year is Y171. Oh, and there's a class-M planet in the middle of the map, too. The Gorn FF+ will set up near the planet.

=====

By Les LeBlanc (Lessss) on Tuesday, July 03, 2007 - 09:05 pm: Edit

Your phasers are going to be chewed up by drones, your F torp out run. Hide behind the planet if you can, maybe he'll go away.

:-)

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Tuesday, July 03, 2007 - 09:09 pm: Edit

Actually, with this ship (49 BPV) and this campaign (10% CO's), I think your choices are kind of limited. You've got 4.9 points... you could buy a T-bomb (4 points) and convert 1 BP to a Commando Squad (.5)...

=====

By Jon Berry (Laz\_Longsmith) on Wednesday, July 04, 2007 - 01:32 am: Edit

Prep a weasel. If I was the Orion, I would love to anchor you then feed you a scatter-pack.

(No Dale, I won't to that trick. Maybe.)

--

Jon Berry

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Wednesday, July 04, 2007 - 04:46 pm: Edit

Don't even attempt to fight. Just run.

He has the same 3 Phaser 1's as you , but in 360 mounts.

He will come by in saber dance passes with the option point at range 8 coming at the end of the turn. Either you have launched already or not.

1) You have launched : he takes it out for a ways and determines if it was a pseudo by letting it hit for a few points. If yes, he can return to try some more. If no, you are out of plasma (and with no Carronade) so he can double everything, put up a brick against your pitiful "alpha strike" can close and gut you. 2 drones at the end of a turn followed by 2 more at the start of another will kill you 100% of the time.

2) You haven't launched. He fires the phasers at you with the disruptor and loops off to return later.

3) You just dont have the power or weapons to fight this duel. If there was a freighter to help or some planetary defenses of something perhaps. But as is, you either die or get captured.

=====

By John Carroll (Jcwl) on Wednesday, July 04, 2007 - 04:56 pm: Edit

If I do not fight, he disruptd my economy in this system. The BPV for my ship is 50, allowing 5 CO points.

=====

By Kenneth Jones (Kludge) on Wednesday, July 04, 2007 - 05:05 pm: Edit

So he disrupts your economy.

Uhm how much is the disruption worth compared to the probable loss of your FF and subsequent disruption of your economy.

IE do you have a relief force on the way? Or some sort of inherent time limit?

If not his LR+ will kill your FF and still disrupt the planet/province for no gain of your own.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Wednesday, July 04, 2007 - 05:59 pm: Edit

John,

You have 3 choices:

1) Fight valiantly until the relief force arrives.  
2) Get heavily damaged/ crippled/ captured and your economy disrupted. PLUS have to pay for repairs/ replacement of the FF.

3) Run away and get your economy disrupted

As far as I can tell, option 1 is NOT part of the scenario. Besides, given the BPV disparity (he should be at about 85 + IIRC) you really won't "lose" the scenario under the standard conditions.

A fair battle would be a DD+, DDF or basic BDD vs his tricked out LR... And no I didn't look up the YIS.

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Wednesday, July 04, 2007 - 06:41 pm: Edit

The Gorn \*does\* have the Carronade available, FYI.

=====

By Jim Davies (Mudfoot) on Wednesday, July 04, 2007 - 08:19 pm: Edit

This is not winnable. Leave.

He has stealth or more power, more shields, more weapons, more BPs, better turn mode, more DamCon and two safe HETs. And he's nimble. You have more hull and cargo, maybe 1 more power and no safe HETs.

If you stay, you will be destroyed. Unless he captures you first.

=====

By John Carroll (Jcwl) on Wednesday, July 04, 2007 - 10:59 pm: Edit

I appreciate the opinions as to what to do/take in this battle. I do not, however, accept the idea that this battle is already lost. As the defender I have onoly to survive the encounter. If I can do this without any internal damage then the battle is a stalemate, and the defender wins.

The carronade option turns the Plasma-F into an every turn, short range, direct fire weapon. This option could turn out to be quite useful.

=====

By Jon Berry (Laz\_Longsmith) on Thursday, July 05, 2007 - 12:04 am: Edit

Well, if you do stay and fight, you're in for one heckuva uphill battle.

Good luck to you.

--

Jon Berry

=====

By Tos Crawford (Tos) on Thursday, July 05, 2007 - 12:50 am: Edit

Keep your speed up. Speed 28 should work.

The speed 20 drones and scatter pack become less of a threat. Don't arm a WW.

At high speed you don't need fire control, in fact the (D19.31) EW bonus levels the playing field. The Orion does need fire control if he wants to keep his drones in flight.

The Orion has very little spare power without doubling. Any turn you can get him to double engines is a major plus for you, but if he doubles, run like the dickens. Once he catches you, you die.

Forget the carronade. If you need to use it, you are already too close. Force him to deal with your plasma every few turns without giving him the opportunity to hurt you.

Don't bother trading phaser volleys. The shield damage you do this turn isn't as important as the energy will be next turn. For phasers to be effective you need to pay for fire control and lose the (D19.31) bonus.

You should have 4 spare power a turn. Split that between ECM and negative Tractor as you see fit. Plan for the range 3 tractor attempt every EA.

Your game is attrition. Reduce his drones. Reduce his warp power. Reduce his shields with your plasma. Don't get caught without an exit strategy if he doubles. Force him to come to you and run uphill into your plasma. Play defensive enough and I think you have a shot at an (S2.27) stalemate, which is a win for you.

If the long game is not to your liking, arm a pair of SS, wait for the turn he doesn't double, grab him in a tractor and hit him with everything all at once, then see who is left.

Good luck. Let us know how it goes.

=====

By Reid Hupach (Gwbison) on Thursday, July 05, 2007 - 02:38 pm: Edit

Remember the Orion if he wishes can take an all PH boat, 6ph1's is hard to beat with a small ship, one solid volley and there goes a shield.

=====

By Jon Berry (Laz\_Longsmith) on Thursday, July 05, 2007 - 03:08 pm: Edit

The Option mounts are already decided, DISR-FA and 2xB-Racks (Medium Speed).

And yes, and LR(111) is a very wicked ship, but that's not what's being faced in this campaign scenario.

--

Jon Berry

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Thursday, July 05, 2007 - 09:21 pm: Edit

Given the above (and the advice from TOS is good) what I'd do as the Orion is:

1) Approach you head on doubled with a brick and no disruptor. You launch and run away. Or close and die at range 0.

2) I phaser the torp (3 P1 at range 1 is about 9 off the warhead?) and eat it on my #2 or 6. Maybe put 2 into ECM and get a +1 shift on the nearness chart. Lose 1 engine box and some of one shield.

3) Follow you at range 15 (or so) speed 25 (or so) NOT DOUBLED. Repair my engine, You EITHER disengage or turn around.

4) If you turn to stay I launch 2 heavy drones and slip around my base course enough so I don't get in front of them. After the turn break I close with everything doubled and launch 2 more heavies and close for the anchor.

ALTERNATE GAME PLAN:

Cruise around at speed 20 or so with nothing doubled and trade long range shots with you. I get +2ECM for free and have 3 P1 AND a disruptor to your 3 phaser 1s. Sooner or later you lose.

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Thursday, July 05, 2007 - 10:23 pm: Edit

I think something that's being forgotten is that the Orion loses the Stealth bonus if it doubles any engines.

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Thursday, July 05, 2007 - 10:58 pm: Edit

Its cloak cost goes up as well....

Given the loadout, I think the Gorn has a chance.

=====

By Reid Hupach (Gwbison) on Friday, July 06, 2007 - 05:00 pm: Edit

Sorry hadn't seen the earlier post that the Orion weapons had been chosen.

=====

By Michael Lui (Michaelui) on Friday, July 06, 2007 - 09:26 pm: Edit

John

Regardless of everyone else's posts, the first thing you must do is to find out what the Orions' objectives are.

1. Destroy/cripple/drive off your ship.
2. Raid planet.
3. Destroy planet.

Second, find out if he has any limitations:

1. Not getting crippled/destroyed.
2. Time limit (how many turns before leaving).
3. Special budget (any EPs spent on drones/shuttles/etc).
4. Special victory conditions.

Third, combine the 1st and 2nd things to figure out what you need to do to win (or at least make him lose if you can't win by your own VCs).

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Tuesday, October 23, 2007 - 06:51 pm: Edit

Situation: 3rd Gorn-Romulan War.

Basic Rom tactic: Grab undefended planets, fortify them, and then dig in and make the Gorns lose ships and time taking it back....while the rest of the fleet heads further into Gorn space.

Scenario:

Y93

Class-M planet, hex 2215. 3 GCL's per hexside.

Romulan has 500 BPV for ships/fighters. No bases (exception:ground fighter bases), orbital or ground. WS-3.

Gorn has 500 BPV for ships, troops, and equipment.

WS-3.

Commanders' options ARE in use.

This is an EY scenario.

The Gorn has 100 turns to take the planet; after that, the Gorn counter-offensive is blown because he is behind schedule.

Control of the planet is defined as controlling 2/3rds of the planets GCL's for 64 consecutive impulses (2 complete turns). As there are 18 GCL's, this means the magic number is 12.

Discuss.

EDITED per Andy's comments.

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Tuesday, October 23, 2007 - 07:05 pm: Edit

Without Commanders Options and published Commando Ships (or even Troop Transport Freighters), the Romulans can win by purchasing 1000 boarding parties. There is no official Gorn fleet you can purchase with sufficient ground combat potential to destroy > 650 boarding parties.

Ask again after Module Y2, when the Commando ships and Ground Bases have been published.

=====

By Lee Hanna (Lee) on Tuesday, October 23, 2007 - 07:32 pm: Edit

The Gorn will have to watch for Romulan ships hiding in the atmosphere and/or on the surface, using Hidden Setup. They should open with a pass by one or more ships, using every defensive trick they can (EW, high speed, etc.) to try and remove the surprises by passing up to 1 hex from the planet. Probes will be critical!

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Wednesday, October 24, 2007 - 05:12 pm: Edit

Good one with the probes; most folks forget about them.

=====

By Reid Hupach (Gwbison) on Wednesday, October 24, 2007 - 07:49 pm: Edit

OMG I just noticed the title to this thread???

Since when have Gorns had or used tactics???

=====

By Jim Davies (Mudfoot) on Wednesday, October 24, 2007 - 09:16 pm: Edit

The high speed range 1 pass will probably hit an NSM...with 500 BPV the Roms can get 25 snipes. That's 25 NSMs.

Actually, 500 BPV is rather a lot in EY. In Y93 it's something like a Vulture, 10 Warbirds and 18 BPV of ground troops, plus commander's options. In other words, the fully maxed out 11-ship battle fleet.

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Thursday, October 25, 2007 - 08:46 am: Edit

Well...yeah.

S8.0 does apply, BTW. Altho taking a planet defended by 25 Snipes would be...interesting...

=====

By Ezekiel Price Carpenter-Hyland (Admiral\_Zekedak) on Thursday, October 25, 2007 - 07:46 pm: Edit

I think the Gorns capturing Romulus while the entire Romulan fleet goes -space happy- in Snipes over some minor planet in the Neutral Zone to be just as interesting... OK, not really.

=====

## THOLIAN TACTICS

By Timothy J. Bruce (Korrah) on Tuesday, August 14, 2007 - 01:54 pm: Edit

et al:

I'll offer my opinion on the matter in brief, and those who are interested in my logic can continue to the end. Tholian tenders and bases would most likely operate with at least one 4+2 Disr/Phot flotilla; even those assigned to a base.

PF's can be sent out to engage an approaching fleet before the fleet arrives at the tender/base. Because PF's operate at the same speeds as a CAX/CF/CW they can return to their tender/base and rearm, repair, and resupply, before the approaching fleet engages the tender/base. The survivors are now in a position where they may defend their tender/base or they may abandon it, as the situation dictates.

PF's can also be sent to strike any force which seeks to bypass their tender/base. Again, they can pursue CAX/CF/CW forces, but can completely overtake any other force, and easily return to their tender/base for resupply and repair w/o fear of interception/interdiction. This can be performed even at extreme ranges since PF's have an independent endurance of about one week.

Given this, the "average" mission of any PF (even one assigned to a fixed asset) would be far away from their tender/base. Tholian bases would most likely have one flotilla of Phaser PF's, and another flotilla of Disr/Phot PF's because a homogeneous force of Phaser PF's alone would be incapable of completing their assigned mission: strike warfare. If only one combat flotilla were authorized, the theatre commander would be a fool if he did not allocate Disr/Phot PF's because of this simple fact.

At first I had many comments regarding the purpose of Tholian PF's and strike warcraft in general. After typing several paragraphs I came to a few conclusions:

1) Any treatise of value on "strike warfare" would be a book, not an SFB article.

2) There are far better texts written by greater experts than I on this matter.

3) Immobile assets, such as fortifications, serve to support a mobile force, not the other way around.

4) Accepted "battlefleet warfare" doctrine, historically vetted, dictates no one should engage a fortified position unless that position/fortification is itself the primary objective or it directly threatens the force commander's ability to maintain his army; either the fortification should be completely bypassed or the defenders should be drawn out and away from the fortification before the engagement.

The Battle of Jericho happened because the Isrealites could not bypass the city w/o risking attack on their rear from a numerically and materially superior force. The Allied Powers of WWII, on the other hand, bypassed Japanese strongholds in the Pacific Theatre whenever possible because the ultimate objectives were not those islands themselves, and bypassing them did not threaten the fleets.

My specific SFB backing?

1) PF's are capable of operating independently from their tender/base for up to a week because their mission requires them to do so, not because the architects thought it would be cool or it was merely a technical possibility.

2) A PFL and a PFS are actually cheap compared to two regular PF's when one considers a 4+2 squadron suffers far fewer casualties than a 6x squadron.

3) It is doubtful, in a strategic sense, that a PFL or a PFS takes any more time to manufacture than a regular PF. A factory might be able to churn out several PF's in a week. The difference between "several" and "several minus one" is minuscule, and each power devoted several factories to the manufacture of PF's.

4) A 4+2 flotilla is also capable of performing many police missions, not only making them a valuable force multiplier, but this also means they have a peace-time mission. This is because of the capabilities offered by the PFS and PFL components. A standard 6x flotilla would only be useful in combat operations, and have no place during peace-time.

5) Since PF's were never intended to indefinitely operate independently, there was no need to use starship-grade reactors and cooling systems, and hence their "Engine Degradation". They are designed to strike an incoming target before that target arrives on scene, return to their tender, and then execute another engagement with their tender's support; a "double-attack" or "striking twice with one swing". While installing starship-grade engines would meet this goal, it would add no further benefit and therefore there was never any desire to do so. They are just as capable of performing their mission under the cheaper construction as they are with the more expensive engines.

6) Any asset important enough to warrant a fortification would also warrant additional PF flotillas.[0] Anyone who has commanded a Tholian fortification quickly realizes the web's ability to block heavy weapons is a double-edged sword. It can be assumed any sane commander would operate at least one Disr/Phot flotilla because this gives him a potent force which is capable of leaving the web (when opportune) to execute overload shots and return to the web to maintain/maximize his phaser superiority. It can also be argued the Phaser flotilla would be incapable of fulfilling their strike mission given their lack of heavy weapons, and most likely no better at the web defense role than their Disr/Phot counterpart.

But what the heck do I know? I'm just some guy on the internet with access to navy.mil, af.mil, and google.com. Your mileage may vary, and if you actually have situations in your current game or campaign refuting my claims then by all means carry on the way you are. I'd rather be taught something new by a competent opponent than be proved right against an inferior opponent.

[0] This is related to the simple truism "Anyone worth shooting once is worth shooting twice"

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Tuesday, August 14, 2007 - 05:16 pm: Edit

1) PFL and PFS take a LOT of extra resources. IN fact it is CHEAPER for the THolians to assign a PC based PF to a squadron than the PFL and PFS IIRC.

2) The main role of the PF at a Tholoan base is to reinforce the outer shell of the web. All other considerations are WAY secondary. If the outer shell can be maintained indefinitely, the base Phaser 4s will win out eventually. And the PF phaser ones are a huge help.

3) The THolians regard their ENTIRE cluster as a fortress. Penetrations are interdicted by the fleet (especially WC equipped fleets) and the PFs are support units.

4) If a PF squadron tries to intercept main force penetrations without support it will get plinked to death at longer ranges by the other fleet using a combination of fleet level EW and long range narrow salvoed disruptors.

I think your reasoning is flawed

=====

By William T Wilson (Sheap) on Tuesday, August 14, 2007 - 06:08 pm: Edit

There is a difference between cost and speed. A PFS costs a lot (less than a frigate, but more than any other kind of PF), but is still easy to build. But it provides a lot of capabilities. A PFL only costs a little more than a standard PF (a transporter, shuttle and tractor beam are cheap, compared to scout sensors).

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Tuesday, August 14, 2007 - 06:19 pm: Edit

PFs, even Tholian ones, are attrition units. They are designed to be built quickly with the goal of trading them for enemy warships. Long range patrol will be a primary mission, from Tholian or any race's base. The ships stationed at the base would be the primary units to fire phasers through the web to help defend the base (and PCs are excellent in this role).

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Tuesday, August 14, 2007 - 06:20 pm: Edit

ROFL!

You do realize that a YEAR has passed in this discussion thread? (One post is August 21, 2006 and then next is August 14, 2007, continuing the discussion.)

=====

By Roger Rardain (Sky\_Captain) on Tuesday, August 14, 2007 - 08:00 pm: Edit

Apparently some thought was required.

=====

By David Crew (Catwholeaps) on Tuesday, August 14, 2007 - 11:39 pm: Edit

Timothy Bruce has been popping up all over the board and commenting on old threads. My guess is that he has just discovered the boards, has time on his hands, and is spending it reading the archives.

Most usefully, he has some interesting contributions to make. I for one don't care how old the thread is if new discussion is generated.

...but yeah - that coincidence is amusing...

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Wednesday, August 15, 2007 - 09:18 am: Edit

Look at the cost of a PC based PFT with 6 Pfs and a regular squadron of 4 PF, PFL and PFT and THEN tell me the 4+2 is a better deal for the amount of firepower.

=====

By Alan Trevor (Thyrm) on Wednesday, August 15, 2007 - 09:56 am: Edit

Time out for a second:

Just what is this "4+2 Disr/Phot flotilla" that people keep talking about? The Tholians do not have photon torpedo-armed PFs, at least not in the official SFU. For primary weaponry, the Tholian options are either 2 disr and 2 ph-1s (the standard Arachnid) or 4 ph-1s (the Arachnid-P). Secondary weaponry is either 2 ph-3s or 2 web generators (eventually upgradeable to snares). But there are no (official) Tholian photon PFs.

=====

By Timothy J. Bruce (Korrah) on Wednesday, August 15, 2007 - 11:51 am: Edit

David:

You're 2/3 right; I have found some free time and am spending it scouring the boards, but I have known about this forum for while.

Mike:

If the PF's only engage with support from their tender, then they aren't really performing their strike role, and one certainly could omit the PFS and rely on the PFT for EW support.

It seems to me (and I could be very wrong on this) since PF's can fly far faster than their tender, she could launch her flotilla against a hostile force in advance before she engages them. She would still have enough time to recover them, and if the

enemy continued his charge, then engage the enemy directly with her PF's. Even if the enemy attempted to disengage, the PF's still have enough endurance to execute a second strike w/o their tender's support. In short: Any enemy near a PF flotilla is going to be attacked twice whether they like it or not, not merely once. They would even be able to engage a receding force given their week-long endurance and excellent speed.

If the only time your PF's engage the enemy is when the hostile force has already engaged your base/tender then I believe you are seriously misusing a most potent force. Your PF's are only attacking once when they should be attacking twice (or possibly more if your enemy pauses, halts, or slows down to collect/protect straggling cripples). It sounds like you're using them as very expensive fighters, which is fine if it gets the job done, but if you're going to use them like fighters it would probably be cheaper to simply buy fighters not only in terms of initial cost, but operational costs and replacement costs. I don't know if 12 fighters can be built any faster than 6 PF's, but I suspect an FCR squadron can deliver said replacements faster than a TUG or freighter or PFT could.

Given the lack of any SFB rules regarding the ease and speed of delivering replacement fighters and PF's, I'm wary we might be entering a phase which is not objectively solvable. I don't want to "jump the shark", so I'm not going to argue if it's easier/faster/cheaper to replace one over the other in "your" game.

I do remain adamant PF's should be executing multiple sorties against "any" force in "any" game, with at least one long before the tender/base is within range, and they are really only able to fulfill this mission with their PFL and PFS compliment under standard configurations rather than the phaser configuration. They were designed for this very purpose, and they perform it admirably.

mea culpa re Alan:

I don't keep the SSD's at work, and so I was unsure if they did or did not have a Phot PF. I don't edit posts because this has a nasty side-effect of making discussions difficult to follow (worst-case (but often typical in other fora): person A says something incendiary, person B responds in kind, person A edits original post and then acts like the victim of that big bully person B). It's also easier (for me anyway) to admit error or accept correction as a new post, rather than hunt down the "edit/delete post" button.

So, I happily stand corrected. The Tholians do not, under the current rules, operate Photon armed PF's. This correction changes neither the "substance" nor the "character" of my argument, however. The presence/absence of Photon armed PF's is logically moot.

It sure is nice to know though, because I was curious on what something with Phot and Ph-1 which could walk through a web might do to an assaulting force... and now I see that can't happen. Many thanks.

et al:

Compared to a BB, an FF could be considered an "attrition unit", but an FF (typically) does not fulfill the "strike warfare" mission role. The definition of "attrition unit" is orthogonal to my point of "strike warfare", but I certainly agree an attrition unit would probably be the most efficient strike warcraft.

I think perhaps I haven't been clear on something, and I fear if I don't clear this up people might think I'm just trying to be obtuse and combative rather than exploring doctrine. There is a difference between "Strike Warfare" and "Attrition Warfare". I would agree a PF qualifies as an "attrition unit" in terms of cheapness of cost or ease of replacement, but the primary mission of the PF is to engage the enemy in "Strike Warfare" and only secondarily "Attrition Warfare". Fighters (I believe universally considered "attrition units") defending a fixed asset would be more than capable of executing sorties against an encroaching force (39AU can be traversed in less than 30 minutes at 12c, which about the distance between Earth and Pluto), but they are incapable of striking any targets which

simply bypass their base. To use fighters in battle typically requires their carrier also engage the targets (SFB operates very differently than a WWII naval game) because Fighters lack the endurance necessary engage targets at range. They primarily fulfill the "Attrition Warfare" mission, and only secondarily enter the "Strike Warfare" mission. Yes, one can argue by analogy to "off-map drone bombardment" that fighters can appear w/o their carrier, but given the endurance of shuttlecraft their carrier must be "very" near the fray (close enough to be threatened by any flanking/disengaging units). Fighters admirably execute "Attrition Warfare", but not as well as PF's for most "Strike Warfare" missions.

While these two doctrines are very similar under modern understanding, they differ substantially enough to be two different doctrines/missions in modern military science. S&S did not give shuttles and PF's their various capabilities and limits because it looks cool in the ship description text; they did so because there were no units which fulfilled those two roles, and only units with those same capabilities and limits could adequately perform those missions.

At any rate, I'm not trying to poke badgers here. It's more fun to ponder the implications of tactical doctrine than to get side-tracked in squabbles over minutia.

Blargh. I fear I may have either tapped this discussion, or poisoned it beyond repair. I sure hope neither is true, and I hope most here don't confuse my passion and verbosity with antagonism and trolling.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Wednesday, August 15, 2007 - 02:18 pm: Edit

Tim, several errors:

- 1) "PF's can fly far faster than their tender..." WRONG. They all move at speed 31 max.
- 2) Strike role is whatever they happen to be doing at this instance. PFS are a ROTTEN deal for the Tholians given the price of a PC based PFT. And the Tholians can churn out PCs easily. That cost is reflected in economic BPV...
- 3) Attacked twice... WRONG. The PFs have limited range on their weapons, while few opponents will be so limited. So the PFs get attrited on the way in, ALPHA struck at range 8 or so and attrited on the way out.
- 4) PFs FIRST role is protecting what the THolians have the hardest time replacing (and can least afford to lose) which is large scale infrastructure and bigger ships. If the bad guys attack your wedding cake, they aren't moving towards your colonies and such. If they try to bypass your bases, your PFs can shadow the bad guys (from ahead or astern) to keep them at tactical speeds until main force units arrive...
- 5) "it would probably be cheaper to simply buy fighters " except the fighters are nowhere as good fighting behind webs (phaser 1s vs P2 and 2) AND lack web devices to pump up the web AND can be attrited much easier (a PF takes 25(?) or so to kill outright, anything less and it coasts back to base for repairs) AND don't have the tactical range AND cannot reinforce shields.
- 6) "deliver said replacements " WRONG. PFs have the range to ferry themselves! And the holdfast is small so they can be shifted readily at need. FCR/ FCR pods are for OFFENSIVES in someone elses space!
- 7) I think you have speeds confused. 12C is only speed 12, which is a Tactical warp speed. You are at strategic warp speed until you reach range 75( if they have P1), 100 (P4) 50 (P2) etc. Warp 7 (for example) is  $7^3 = \text{speed } 343$  or 343 times the speed of light! I discuss this issue in my "Q'Lever" story demolishing retrogrades and discussing why the ISC would just bypass a Kaufman retrograde...
- 8) Fighters don't lack endurance, what they lack is STORES of expendibles and recharges. All phaser fighters (like the THolioans have) are fine without the CV if you don't plan to do combat repairs. I think the canon lets fighters perform missions with durations in HOURS. Look at the varied fighter swarm discussions, the Bargantine campaign and such.

9) Please define "Strike Warfare" as you are using the term. I am unclear on what the heck you are trying to say is "orthogonal."

10) Again, you can use a squadron of 5 PCs much like a PF flotilla (except for the command issue) and for about the same cost. Are you saying that 6 PF (with PFL and PFS) are a better deal than 5 pc (pcs are 59 points each?)

=====

By Timothy J. Bruce (Korrah) on Wednesday, August 15, 2007 - 04:19 pm: Edit

Mike:

1) I assumed PF's, unlike fighters, would enjoy strategic warp mobility exceeding 31. Either I am completely in error, or your "house" differs from my "house". If PF's were not able to enjoy strategic warp mobility that would imply they are also unable to conduct independent strikes and raids, which then leaves one to ponder why they have such endurance since it no longer serves any practical purpose. We might have to agree to disagree here.

2) This may very well be true. If it is more efficient for Tholians to mass-produce PC's than it is for them to mass-produce PF's then I wish them luck with that. I am skeptical this is the case because that would imply they have little to no use for PF's, forcing one to question why they ever operated PF's in the first place.

3) This is related to point #1. Force A approaches force B. Force B launches PF's to intercept Force A /before they two groups directly encounter each other/. The engagement is played out (perhaps the PF's can do little more than recon, or perhaps they can perform a strike and cripple a vessel or two). The PF's return to their tender. If Force A choses to continue the engagement then we have the traditional "my PFT is in a fith" scenario. If Force A opts instead to withdraw, the PF's would still be able to engage another strike sortie away from and independent of their tender against Force A (possibly picking off any stragglers or crippling a few survivors). In this example, and I assume these SOP's where PF's are concerned, three engagements (three SFB scenarios) happened but only one directly involved the tender from Force B. The first and third engagements may have happened a few light months away from the tender, clearly well out of range of any single weapon in SFB, but well within a PF's operational range. This is an implication of #1.

4) I never contradicted the Tholian defensive doctrine. I agree if Tholians operated PF's they would be pressed to protect Tholian assets. I merely point out they would typically be called in to do so while at open at least as often, and more likely more often, than at anchorage or other port. I believe I may have addressed this in #3 as a logical implication of #1, which is clearly expressed in the K rules. It doesn't look like either of us is going to convince the other he is in error here.

5) I thought a scenario happens at "tactical range", and fighters (by definition) operate within a scenario. I can only assume you mistyped your point, I'm too thick to get your point, or I've grossly misunderstood "tactical scope" from "strategic scope". Of course all three could be true ;) My suggestion on maximizing fighters instead of PF's was based solely on the notion that your PF's do not engage on independent strikes (#1, #3, and #4), but instead fight the enemy "at home". Yes, a flotilla does indeed offer capabilities no squadron can offer, and maintaining the web certainly would be high on my list, but wouldn't a PC be a better choice since (according to you) "...Tholians can churn out PCs easily.", and PC's offer far more power with which to "pump up the web" and can reinforce shields? Perhaps maximizing fighter cover with PC's would be better at defending a base in-place than maximizing PF's, but if #1, #3, and #4 are valid then maximizing the PF's would minimize the need to defend a fixed-asset in-place. We might never settle this point.

6) Yes the hold fast is indeed small. Perhaps the holdfast is small enough for a PF to traverse (they do have a week-long endurance), or perhaps not. In any event, I think it's universally

agreed fighters do not have the necessary endurance to ferry themselves to their deployments unless their deployment is within the star system of their manufacture. So the real question becomes that of range. If a PF can travel anywhere within the holdfast w/o resupply or a tender, then this point is moot. But if the holdfast (an entire Hex in F&E) is indeed larger than the week-long endurance at speed 31c (your assertion, not mine) then delivery of replacements becomes an issue. Since there is no hard-and-fast rule in SFB regarding this (and I don't know if there is one in F&E; I've never played) I submit it may be fruitless to pursue this issue beyond "this one could easily vary house-by-house, and therefore is subjective". There may be no single "right answer" on this one.

7) I know 12c is only "twelve times the speed of light". In #1 I admitted to the assumption (possibly erroneous) that fighters did not enjoy strategic warp mobility. If they do not, and assuming their cruise speed (not flank) is between 12c and 20c, my assertion they could engage an enemy anywhere within the same system as their base/carrier in under an hour is valid. Now, since they lack strategic warp mobility, OTOH, they would be incapable of intercepting a force which veered away from the system by as little as a light-week. A light-week is a very small distance to a starship or PF, but an almost infinitely large distance to a fighter. If you believe fighters enjoy strategic warp mobility then they could certainly engage in the interception strike outlined in #3. If they lack strategic warp mobility, OTOH, even if they can engage a target 39AU away from their base/carrier it might very well be a one-way trip since even with the packs they can't exceed 31c and thus never be able to evade a pursuing force. The hostiles could just warp ahead of the fleeing fighters and force a second engagement.

8) No, they lack endurance too. It says so in the book. Their mission lifetime is measured as just a few hours. They are incapable of striking any target beyond 150-200 AU from their base/carrier. Any vessel with strategic warp mobility can traverse this distance in just a few minutes. This implies fighters must operate with support from their carrier/base. This is tautological.

9a) Two things are "orthogonal" to each other if they are "mutually independent with respect to each other". Ex: If we are discussing the difference between the look of pencil lead on paper vs. ink on paper, pointing out "pencils are typically long and narrow" is orthogonal to the discussion. Often, but not always the case, "vacuously true" points are also "orthogonal".

9b) Ahh! Excellent point! Yes yes, if my vocabulary is muddy then this will go on very long w/o someone getting hurt feelings. If you might indulge me with a day or two I'll be able to offer citation to authoritative sources (because "what is X" typically requires more than a one sentence answer). If you you believe I'm asking for too much on this point, then I guess there is nothing further to discuss here.

10) I assumed a PC takes a heck of a lot longer to produce than three 4+2 PF flotillas. Any nation with an enemy on her doorstep is allowed to enter deficit spending, because an irrational nation would never survive long enough to even become a nation. I doubt the Tholian Harassment Squadron spent their time on picnics, but instead maintained continuous pressure on the Tholians. I doubt wages and salaries increased at all during the first hundred years of the Holdfast's arrival. I suspect darn near everything was nationalized because of the emergency, and citizens, who just escaped death from the Seltorans, were willing to do darn near anything to prevent the same fate from Klingon executioners. I can imagine an economy much like the on Stalin imposed on the USSR during his reign (mathematically brilliant, but it does take quite a pair of stones to actually implement), because I assume the Tholians are rational. My point is predicated on the assumption that more than material, but labour and currency are required to make anything, and a PF flotilla requires far less material than a PC while their EPV could still be explained

simply by the fact they may be very labour intensive to produce. We may never agree on this point since there are no clear rules here.

Thanks for the very orderly discourse! It was very easy to respond to you via the line-items. If you can be satisfied wait awaiting on 9b for a day or two you would not only know what I think I'm talking about, but could verify or refute for yourself.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Wednesday, August 15, 2007 - 05:34 pm: Edit

1) Fighters, AFAIK, have strategic warp, or else they would NEVER fight anywhere except for right at their base/ CV. The ships would "juke" them.

2) Your PFs are no faster at strategic warp speeds than ships AFAIK. If you could accompany your PFs with your fleet you should. Otherwise the PFs will take withering fire from a superior BPV force (if the fleets are equal) or will win easily (in which case the enemy will withdraw anyway). You are advocating operting the PFs independently for no reason. Assume I am the Klinks with a 500 BPV force (D7, D5, 2 F5 and 1 F5s is close)and you have a tender, 4+2 pf squadron and PCs to fill it out (2 more PCs?). If you send in the PFs alone I should be able to smack them pretty briskly with narrow salvos and EW support. I will have EW superiority and a passel of Disruptors. You are inviting defeat in detail because you have split your force.

3) How do you plan for your Pfs to be able to outrun my ships to your tender? You will be trying to dock them while I am shooting at your PFT with EVERYTHING. And if you are doing repairs you will be short that much more power for the PFT to use in combat. I assume your 2 PCs will be wanting EW support.

4) SVC discussed this issue when he was explaining the role of the Tholian POL. All you need to do is get ANYTHING in front of an invading force to make it drop to tactical speeds. Then there is the little problem of staying at "too close to jump into high warp" and "far enough away so they don't blow me up" until the fleet arrives.

5) "PC's offer far more power with which to ``pump up the web" Please look at the SSDs. PFs have a LOT more spare power after housekeeping. Especially if they are moving too. The canon is that the Tholians have an aotomated PC factory and all other hulls are modification from the basic design. And the basic hull is the easiest to produce, hence its longevity.

6) The holdfast is one hex for the Dyson sphere and some adjacent hexes. I think we can safely assume the Tholians have plenty of bases and operations all throughout their space for the crews to stretch their legs, recharge ewnvironmental and drain accumulated ionic charges. All you'd need is an AUX PFT a week out from Tholia and a week from the border and you'd be fine. The Tholians certainly aren't MINING raw materials from the sphere, so you can assume plenty of ground bases too. Even if they are in an asteroid field where a mining station has been parked.

7) Warp 7 (for convenience's sake) is speed 343. So you are covering almost 50 light weeks a day. ( $343/7=49$ ). So you are getting 343 light weeks travel in a week of endurance. Do you think bases are more than 6 light years or so apart?

8) I am unfamiliar with that canon. Where did you get it from?

9) As for "Orthogonal" I understand the concept. I had calculus (though in the interests of full disclosure hated it). Geometry too (good at that though).

10) I agree that PCs are harder to build than Pfs. BUT PFLs and PFS are also hard to build. Or they'd be a lot more common and cheaper. SPP and I discussed the matter when I was trying to develop tactics for a NON Webcaster equipped squadron to do the "rebel reduction" scenario. The PC based PFT is a GREAT deal and we both (SPP and I) think that if you have the choice, bringing along the PFT is a better deal than otherwise. Other races really don't have a PFT with quite the "discount."

REDUX: Still don't see a definition of strike warfare in your response. I don't see this as a valid arguement, unless I am missing something. Strike is a MISSION made by forces that have mobility and tactical or local surprise. They concentrate forces and STRIKE. And the reverse is also true. Attrition MAY be part of strike warfare as you gain localized superiority and attrit the enemy. There is a mini campaign based on the idea. Knossetts war?

=====

By William T Wilson (Sheap) on Wednesday, August 15, 2007 - 05:42 pm: Edit

Quote:

That cost is reflected in economic BPV...

BPV has little if anything to do with the actual cost to build and operate the ship. It is unfortunate that ADB conjured up the idea of "economic BPV," or at least that they called it that, because that implies that BPV is in some way related to cost when it is not. The point of BPV is to rate a unit's overall effectiveness and nothing else.

As far as the strategic speeds of fighters and PFs:

Whether PFs are faster than regular ships over short differences seems to be undefined in the SFU. They get no such advantage in F&E, but the scale there is probably too large to reflect it. Either side of the argument would be believable within a local campaign's house rules.

Fighters can disengage by acceleration so they assuredly can manage speeds faster than 31 for at least a brief period. How long they sustain that speed is also undefined. There are many scenarios where fighters go on independent strikes away from the carrier. The rationale to do this is often questionable as fighters and carriers are much more effective together than either is individually, and everyone agrees that no matter how fast and long-ranged the fighters are, the carrier is better, but it can and does happen. (Perhaps the carrier is waiting for a rendezvous with other ships, or perhaps the target is in some terrain that the fighters can handle but the carrier can't, like really dense asteroids).

It seems reasonable that the two limitations on fighter endurance are either the fuel for the craft, or the comfort of the pilot. I argue that fuel for the craft is unlikely to be the limiting factor. There is background material in J2 that it is possible, if unpleasant, to go from Earth to Vulcan in a transport shuttle. Vulcan is about 16.5 ly from Earth, so it seems reasonable to assume that fuel range on a fighter would be at least 5% of this (and even if not, perhaps the fighter could carry drop tanks on its pod rails). This is also good additional evidence that strategic speed of shuttles is higher than their tactical: at tactical speeds, such a voyage would take two years and would not be merely unpleasant, but totally impossible.

It seems plausible that SFU pilots could manage at least the same level of endurance that today's pilots can, which means the upper limit is around 40-50 hours. Naturally, most of this would be travel time. If you assume the cruising speed is 12c (I think it is likely to be much faster as even freighters can make much higher speeds out of combat) this puts the maximum distance (including round trip return) at about 300 light-hours, which is almost two light weeks. I suspect that fighters' non-combat cruising speeds are probably about 60c, which gives fighters a "strategic" maximum round-trip range of about 1/4 ly. If you pretend that warp 8 is 512c (which is unfortunately not nearly fast enough to cover the distances depicted in the SFU) a ship could cover this same distance in a couple of hours. Close enough to put the base/carrier within striking distance if the enemy defeats the fighter squadron and decides to press the attack, but not close enough so that it is just accidentally going to get overrun.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Wednesday, August 15, 2007 - 06:20 pm: Edit

Again 12C is only speed 12.

Most fighters in the PF era were capable of speed 30 with packs.

So there is no reason for the fighter (now going 30C even if it can't go to "high warp") if it has an endurance of 8 hours (think poop stops here) to not go  $8 \times 30 = 240$  light hours per flight/ 24 hours a day= 10 light days between pit stops. All without any thing the worse for wear.

IIRC, ships (and fighters?) don't really use much fuel at cruising speeds. It is the dash speed that and changing speeds that is fuel intensive.

Look at the SVC story on the Mutiny on the Demonslayer or the other stories where the fleeing ship cannot exceed speed X tactically for the duration of the scenario. The escape of the C8 Kang? is a perfect example...

=====

By William T Wilson (Sheap) on Wednesday, August 15, 2007 - 07:13 pm: Edit

I would expect that packs would not be used in long distance travel, but rather would be more like afterburners. You go fast, but you use more fuel than you gain in speed. Possibly packs have no effect on fuel economy. (Or possibly even with the packs, the fighter carries enough fuel to outlast the pilot). Possibly packs have some other problem, like overheating, "ionic charges" or whatever that prevents them being used more than a few minutes at a time. And packs may work at "high warp" or they may not. But, none of this is defined anywhere.

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Wednesday, August 15, 2007 - 08:41 pm: Edit

Michael Grafton.

PCs take a lot longer to produce than PFs and, unlike PCs, don't require a shipyard.

PFs also are FAR more effective in open space than you indicate as they have EW advantage over all of their opponents. In open space, in Y180, I would rather face a PC than a PF.

=====

By Michael Lui (Michaellui) on Wednesday, August 15, 2007 - 11:32 pm: Edit

Guys, you are making some serious mistakes on your time/distance ratios. "C", AKA Warp 1, the speed of light, is measured in SECONDS.

Therefore making that 16.5 LY from Earth to Vulcan in a transport shuttle HAS to be done at strategic speeds, NOT tactical speeds. And if that transport shuttle is doing it within 50 hours,  $16.5LY/50H = .33LY/H$ , then:

$.33LY/3600Secs (1 Hour) = 4MonthsxC(.33LY)/3600Secs = (91.25DaysxC/3600Secs = 2190HoursxC/3600Secs = 131,400MinxC/3600Secs)$

$= 7,884,000SecsxC/3600Secs = 2190xC$ . Now,  $2197xC = Warp 13$ , so we can clearly see that fighters can also attain strategic speeds, if only for the endurance of the pilot.

=====

By jack huskey (Plasmax) on Thursday, August 16, 2007 - 12:47 am: Edit

This discussion reminds me how much ADB needs to make an operational level game.

=====

By Terry O'Carroll (Terryoc) on Thursday, August 16, 2007 - 07:50 am: Edit

IIRC in Module J it mentions that most fighters were used in ship-to-ship combat until the invention of warp packs. I'm pretty sure it's "canon" that warp packs not only increase speed, but increase range as well.

As for PFs getting two hits in: PFs are not strategically faster than warships. It's established that bigger engines = higher top speed. PFs can reach their top speed sooner, but would have a lower top speed and could be caught by pursuing ships if they didn't have too much of a head start.

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Thursday, August 16, 2007 - 09:01 am: Edit

Terry. Where is it established that larger engines = higher top speed? The B10 is hardly the fastest ship in the Alpha Quadrant, despite 60 point engines.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Thursday, August 16, 2007 - 10:27 am: Edit

Andy Palmer read the description of the battle involving 2 B10s vs some Andros.

It specifically talks about how the B10 can go faster than its escorts...

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Thursday, August 16, 2007 - 10:54 am: Edit

Mike Lui:

"Guys, you are making some serious mistakes on your time/distance ratios. "C", AKA Warp 1, the speed of light, is measured in SECONDS..."

NO! Light speed is measured in whatever convenient scale you choose. So it can be miles per second (180k), kilometers per second (300k) or parsecs per decade. The point is that the UNITS of measurement can be anything as long as the measurement is accurate. I chose Light Weeks because that is the scale I was given in Bruces argument. Light doesn't change "speed" if we change the scale we are measuring over from one distance to another. Just like I don't get taller or shorter if you measure me in metric (182cm) versus American (6'1"), cubits (dunno), ritz crackers or whatever...

"Therefore making that 16.5 LY from Earth to Vulcan in a transport shuttle HAS to be done at strategic speeds, NOT tactical speeds. And if that transport shuttle is doing it within 50 hours,  $16.5LY/50H = .33LY/H$ , then:"

SORTA NO! mostly. You are right that we pretty much require Strategic warp travel in shuttles to go between systems.

Travel 16.5 LY at speed 12 (admin/ HTS shuttle with packs) would take you over a year...  $16.5LY / (12 Ly/ Year) = 1.375 YEARS$  or about 500 days.

You go 16.5 LY at warp 7 it would take you 16.5 LY/ (343 LY/Year) = .048 YEars or about 18 days. So yeah, you could make the journey in a shuttle (think of them as sailboats crossing from England to America as opposed to a 747). NOW you know why people ride on "liners" and such ships. Not many people have the patience/ mental health to spend a couple weeks cooped up aboard a shuttle (or a small 25' sailboat)

$.33LY/3600Secs (1 Hour) = 4MonthsxC(.33LY)/3600Secs = (91.25DaysxC/3600Secs = 2190HoursxC/3600Secs = 131,400MinxC/3600Secs)$

$= 7,884,000SecsxC/3600Secs = 2190xC$ . Now,  $2197xC = Warp 13$ , so we can clearly see that fighters can also attain strategic speeds, if only for the endurance of the pilot"

Where did these numbers come from? NOBODY can go warp 13. Even given some handwaving time distortion effects, even X ships don't go that darn fast.

=====

By William T Wilson (Sheap) on Thursday, August 16, 2007 - 11:08 am: Edit

Yeah, the 2 B10 battle in module R5 specifically states the B10 is a little faster. I also seem to be remembering some post from SVC that generally bigger = faster within the SFU (for a given type of warp technology, obviously).

PF warp engines are sufficiently different from ships that I would accept them being either faster or slower than regular ships at non-tactical speeds over a short distance.

-----

Quote:

making that 16.5 LY from Earth to Vulcan in a transport shuttle HAS to be done at strategic speeds

-----

That is what I said (you still can't go warp 13, though ). The 50 hour limit doesn't apply to the transport shuttle, though. I

guessed 50 hours as the maximum length of a fighter mission (based on the amount of food, oxygen, etc. that can be carried on a fighter, the need for the pilot to relieve himself, need for sleep, discomfort from sitting in a fighter seat for two days straight, etc.) This is based on the maximum length of B-2 missions today although I suspect even the B-2 is probably a little more comfortable than an SFU fighter. Anyway, in a transport shuttle, you can at least get up and walk around, or lay down for a nap. I can imagine a trip in something like that taking a few weeks or even a month (somewhere between a cross country trip in a Winnebago, and the occasional people who sail preposterously long distances in boats much too small for the journey).

Wrong math or not, though, you still raise a point that is frequently overlooked because it is beyond the scope of SFB and too small to see in F&E: Speeds measured according to the traditional "warp factor cubed" rule just don't work. They are too slow.

=====

By Timothy J. Bruce (Korra) on Thursday, August 16, 2007 - 02:14 pm: Edit

wow this thread has become lively!

J1.71 and C7.13 indicate fighters can disengage by acceleration, so I accept that fighters do enjoy strategic warp mobility. G9.14, and perhaps a tad of Real Life. There are certain limits to human (or gorn, or whatever) endurance which most probably would limit single-seat missions to less than 24 hours, which does reinforce limited endurance. While it would seem they are more than capable of exceeding speed 31 by C7.13, I doubt they can do so for any considerable time because J1.73 and G9.14 explicitly denies fighters operating away from their carrier/base. One might allow fighters to engage in a strike mission w/o their carrier analogous to "off-map drone bombardment", but J1.73 seems to imply (although this too might be a "house rule") the carrier is so close to the battle that it would not have time to disengage or escape if the hostile force were victorious. The carrier is effectively "just off that edge of the map there" and a sitting duck w/o her strike craft in the event the opposing forces were victorious.

I am in factual error regarding the endurance of PF's. K0.21 states most missions have an upper-limit of 48 hours. Typical practices of modern militaries is never to schedule a mission exceeding 2/3 of a vehicle's endurance because of the rational assumption that "things happen" in combat such as losing fuel from damage, losing engine power from damage, excessive fuel use from combat manoeuvres, pilot fatigue, et cetera. So it would seem reasonable to place the absolute maximum upper-limit (never to exceed) at 72 hours, and starting any scenarios between 49 and 72 hours might invoke K6. Given this, I certainly wouldn't schedule any strikes exceeding the 48 hour mark, and I correct any previous assertions of a PF's endurance to no more than 72 hours.

K0.21 further explicitly approves their strategic warp mobility indicating they often engage on independent strike missions on F&E hexes adjacent to their tender/base; i.e. their tender/base never encounters the enemy on such strike missions.

Larger ocean-going vessels are usually faster than their smaller brethren in the Real World because they are capable of possessing larger engines. One can easily draw parallels to the SFU, and I would support that claim. In this case, a BB might very well be faster than an FF (this may or may not affect your campaign's movement) given her thrust to mass ratio could be higher (the exact amount is, of course, up to the "house" since there are no hard-and-fast rules for this). There is, however, something to be said about those very, very large (proportionally) engines on a PF which were designed for excellent speed. I do not believe it is by accident SFU INT's and PF's are analogous to WWII PT's and E-Boats in a multitude of ways. While they lack the endurance of a cruiser (no PF squadron is sent on a 12 month exploration cruise), I'm certain they are more than capable of out-running a CX/CF/CW

squadron, and while this is conjecture I believe it is not w/o merit.

Assuming the maximum strategic warp speed of a unit were proportional to the unit's maximum tactical warp speed (which is determined house-by-house given the lack of rules), PF's have the highest of all units, capable of S\*60, where S would be the strategic coefficient. Your game might set S = 1/6 and treat the result as strategic hexes, and another game might set S = 11.5 and treat the result as "warp factor". In the latter case, a typical warship would be a Warp-7 unit, whereas an X-Ship, Fast Ship, or War Cruiser would typically be a Warp-8 unit. Since there are no clear rules here, one might use a different value for S based on size-class (BB vs FF example above) or mission role, such as an FCR or APT might receive a bonus while another unit might receive a penalty.

K0 and K6 explain a PF's dependence on a tender/base, but also permit considerable independent operations.

Now if we put all this together one might agree I offer ample argument to support my point, but one still might disagree with me, which is acceptable.

Now as for a definition of "Strike Warfare". "Strike Warfare" is (in the most simplified form) to be "projecting offensive power at a distance". What kind of distance about which are we talking? The typical "carrier duel" is not an exercise in "strike warfare" because the carrier itself is directly engaged in the battle; she's on the map. The "Red, White, and Blue" scenario, OTOH, is an excellent example of "strike warfare" because the Hydran PFT never approached the enemy; she projected her offensive power /over a distance/ via her PF's. A CAD might also qualify for this mission via Type-III-XX cruise drones. If a base on Earth used her fighters to strike targets on Mars, then this would be an example of "Strike Warfare", again because the base was never engaged by the enemy. Being on the same map as your enemy is being engaged. This is tautological.

I am not at liberty to share my subscription to Janes, and since it costs several hundred per year I doubt anyone here is going to rush out and buy one I found a URL which introduces the topic.

[http://www.navyleague.org/seapower/revolution\\_in\\_strike\\_warfare.htm](http://www.navyleague.org/seapower/revolution_in_strike_warfare.htm)

One will need to account for some differences between Real World and SFU. First, in the Real World fighters travel a heck of a lot faster than their carrier, and so with a 10-16 hour endurance they can still engage targets several hundred kilometers away. The carrier, OTOH, might only be able to travel (at flank) about 1500-1700 meters in 30 seconds. This is important, because in SFB most units can travel in a single turn farther than their weapons can reach, whereas in the Real World the reverse is true.

At this point I'm going to remind myself "this is all just a game". While I might have much support for my position, I don't "need" to be right, I don't "need" someone else to be wrong, and let's not forget the Chinese Rule[0]. I doubt either of us are interested in fighting over a game, especially one in which we might never even play together. This really boils down to house rules. Any given house doesn't need "justification" or "rationalization"; the house can simply forbid or permit a given action by fiat. If I don't agree with a ruling then I am free to decline joining your group, and vice versa.

I doubt either of us think this is so important it should risk camaraderie and esprit d'corps. I believe I have satisfied my points that PF's also exist to strike distant targets (those at considerable distance from their tender/base) and I doubt I can add anything more to support my argument. Either you buy it, or you don't buy it. For my part, I fear if I keep harping on the issue I'll only antagonize you, which is something neither of us want. Neither one of us wants to press this point so forcefully as to make enemies.

I believe everyone offered some good points supporting their position, so I'm quite thankful I started posting. I hope no feelings were hurt in any of this (certainly never my intent), and

my ideas sparked some thought on military doctrine within the SFU.

</RANT>

[0] No matter how good or bad an idea may be to you or me, there are over one billion people in china who don't care.

=====

By Timothy J. Bruce (Korra) on Thursday, August 16, 2007 - 02:22 pm: Edit

mae culpa: ``1500-1700 meters" should read ``500-600" meters. This is typical flank speed.

Addendum: Cruise speed is usually around 200-300 meters per 30 seconds.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Thursday, August 16, 2007 - 03:39 pm: Edit

1) "Larger ocean-going vessels are usually faster than their smaller bretherin in the Real World because they are capable of possessing larger engines"

NO! Read up on "hull speed." Basically if you have a shorter hull you end up "boating uphill" into your bow wave faster than a longer hull. Jeremy would be the man on this BBS for further information.

2) "I'm certain they are more than capable of out-running a CX/CF/CW squadron, and while this is conjecture I believe it is not w/o merit."

Ask SVC and SPP. I suspect you are incorrect. I think it is a matter of how "hard" you can make the warp bubble.

3) "Assuming the maximum strategic warp speed of a unit were proportional to the unit's maximum tactical warp speed (which is determined house-by-house given the lack of rules), PF's have the highest of all units, capable of  $S^*60$ , where S would be the strategic coefficient. Your game might set  $S = 1/6$  and treat the result as strategic hexes, and another game might set  $S = 11.5$  and treat the result as ``warp factor". In the latter case, a typical warship would be a Warp-7 unit, whereas an X-Ship, Fast Ship, or War Cruiser would typically be a Warp-8 unit. Since there are no clear rules here, one might use a different value for S based on size-class (BB vs FF example above) or mission role, such as an FCR or APT might receive a bonus while another unit might receive a penalty. "

Actually this is against the canon, or at best never addressed.. there are a LOT of ships with more warp boxes than they can use at speed 30. And having X number of extra warp does not a fast ship make... Look at a bunch of SSDs. For example, no one has ever stated that the Old Kzinti CI is slower strategically than the opposition despite its slower tactical speed.

4) You seem to be confusing Strike Warfare with strike MISSIONS. Strike warfare as I understand it is penetrating the enemies front with concentrated power to gain maneuver into the enemies rear. This means you bypass their defenses after breaking the crust and are stomping all over the soft rear areas (like the HQ, Artillery units, Logistics, etc)

A Strike mission is one where you engage, do your thing and then disengage. THATS what aircraft do. So you MIGHT use localized STRIKE MISSIONS to attrit the enemy over a broad area (thus requiring him to disperse his power and have many small reserves) until you can mass your forces for STRIKE WARFARE with a hammer blow against a target. You take the WHOLE TEAM and ram through the perimeter defenses, race to an objective and... You then can 1) go home, its dead or 2) Secure it for a base for future operations...

5) the article you cite is "A Revolution in Strike Warfare" by Rear Adm. John B. Nathman, USN, is director of air warfare, Office of the Chief of Naval Operations.

And he has it wrong IMHO. He is, BY DEFINITION, a squid zoomie Airedale Brown Shoe and they think of everything as solvable from a cockpit.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Thursday, August 16, 2007 - 03:42 pm: Edit

1) "Larger ocean-going vessels are usually faster than their smaller bretherin in the Real World because they are capable of possessing larger engines"

NO! Read up on "hull speed." Basically if you have a shorter hull you end up "boating uphill" into your bow wave faster than a longer hull. Jeremy would be the man on this BBS for further information.

2) "I'm certain they are more than capable of out-running a CX/CF/CW squadron, and while this is conjecture I believe it is not w/o merit."

Ask SVC and SPP. I suspect you are incorrect. I think it is a matter of how "hard" you can make the warp bubble.

3) "Assuming the maximum strategic warp speed of a unit were proportional to the unit's maximum tactical warp speed (which is determined house-by-house given the lack of rules), PF's have the highest of all units, capable of  $S^*60$ , where S would be the strategic coefficient. Your game might set  $S = 1/6$  and treat the result as strategic hexes, and another game might set  $S = 11.5$  and treat the result as ``warp factor". In the latter case, a typical warship would be a Warp-7 unit, whereas an X-Ship, Fast Ship, or War Cruiser would typically be a Warp-8 unit. Since there are no clear rules here, one might use a different value for S based on size-class (BB vs FF example above) or mission role, such as an FCR or APT might receive a bonus while another unit might receive a penalty. "

Actually this is against the canon, or at best never addressed.. there are a LOT of ships with more warp boxes than they can use at speed 30. And having X number of extra warp does not a fast ship make... Look at a bunch of SSDs. For example, no one has ever stated that the Old Kzinti CI is slower strategically than the opposition despite its slower tactical speed.

4) You seem to be confusing Strike Warfare with strike MISSIONS. Strike warfare as I understand it is penetrating the enemies front with concentrated power to gain maneuver into the enemies rear. This means you bypass their defenses after breaking the crust and are stomping all over the soft rear areas (like the HQ, Artillery units, Logistics, etc)

A Strike mission is one where you engage, do your thing and then disengage. THATS what aircraft do. So you MIGHT use localized STRIKE MISSIONS to attrit the enemy over a broad area (thus requiring him to disperse his power and have many small reserves) until you can mass your forces for STRIKE WARFARE with a hammer blow against a target. You take the WHOLE TEAM and ram through the perimeter defenses, race to an objective and... You then can 1) go home, its dead or 2) Secure it for a base for future operations...

5) the article you cite is "A Revolution in Strike Warfare" by Rear Adm. John B. Nathman, USN, is director of air warfare, Office of the Chief of Naval Operations.

And he has it wrong IMHO. He is, BY DEFINITION, a squid zoomie Airedale Brown Shoe and they think of everything as solvable from a cockpit.

=====

By Timothy J. Bruce (Korra) on Thursday, August 16, 2007 - 03:43 pm: Edit

Mike:

And there we have it. We are irreconcilable, but I'm glad we were able to liven things up. Thank you for taking the time to address my ideas and attempting to educate me, rather than hand-waving the whole thing.

=====

By David Crew (Catwholeaps) on Friday, August 17, 2007 - 01:45 am: Edit

I'll just throw something in from FnE: Fighters can (I believe) launch independent strikes (and back) up to a hex away from their base. They can certainly cut supply (i.e. kill and chase freighters) that far out. They can do this from Y168 (if not earlier). At FnE scale that is 500 pc - give or take. FnE turns are 6 months long, so speed isn't really an issue, but it does imply something about fighter endurance.

=====

By Michael Lui (Michaelui) on Friday, August 17, 2007 - 05:23 am: Edit

Quote:

Where did these numbers come from? NOBODY can go warp 13. Even given some handwaving time distortion effects, even X ships don't go that darn fast.

The numbers came from the logical division of the Light Years listed by the Time given, taken down to the seconds. All of them are correct. That Transport Shuttle would have to be going at warp 13 (per standard Star Trek canon) to hit those figures.

Actually the PD 20 system lists "Fast Dash" as Warp 9.5+. And, IIRC, the Enterprise was taken over at least twice by things that made it go faster than warp 13, and that was pre-Y168 war technology. I will admit that SFB and F+E "fudges" things a little for their own purposes, so maybe we should be using "Trans-Warp" Drive figures [Trans-Warp 7 (2401xC) instead of Warp 13 (2197xC)].

By Terry O'Carroll (Terryoc) on Friday, August 17, 2007 - 08:21 am: Edit

IIRC there's an article in Captain's Log #34(?) on pursuit in the SFU. It's aimed at roleplayers, but it's still interesting for anyone interested in SFU background.

By William Ames (Wfames) on Thursday, October 25, 2007 - 05:40 pm: Edit

Hello, I'm a new SFB player, who has, thus far, not played with anything more advanced than the basic set. Normally, I play Romulans, but I've developed an interest in the Tholians and thought I'd play them in this weekend's session. But looking at the Basic Set rules, it appears that in a duel scenario, web is all but useless. Given the high regard in which Tholian web seems to be held, this cannot be true. Am I misreading the rules, do I overlook something, or is web just lousy without the advanced game and/or module C2?

My thinking is: if I read the rulebook correctly, web costs six points of power per hex, is laid at strength 0, and requires one power per hex per strength to reinforce. Near as I can tell, it takes very high strengths of web to be effective in stopping ships. I've seen references to "breakdown strength" web being deployed in tournaments, which I take to be web capable of causing breakdowns. As I understand the rules, this needs to be strength 12, which will take a minimum of 18 points of energy to create. And since I can't make much use of a single hex of web, any sort of dangerous web would require an absurd quantity of power. Given that a PC only has something like 14 power (I don't have the SSD in front of me) I can't for the life of me find a way to use the Basic Set Tholian PC as anything other than a very maneuverable phaser boat.

By Alan Trevor (Thyrm) on Thursday, October 25, 2007 - 06:03 pm: Edit

William,  
In an "open space" battle, the Tholian PC is pretty much a very maneuverable phaser boat. Web is not much good in open space battles due to the power and time required to set the web up. Occasionally an exception will occur, but for the most part the Tholians (pre Neo-Tholian) are a Direct Fire race in open space with ships that are generally very maneuverable and well shielded for their BPV, but internally a bit fragile and with (sometimes) substandard energy or firepower. Where they excel is in prepared defense, with web already set up before the scenario begins.

When the "Neo-Tholians" arrive (actually, the 312th Battle Fleet from the Tholian's home galaxy) the Tholians gain the ability to effectively use webs in open space due to the web caster and snare technology the 312th brings with it. From that point on they possess, arguably, the most combat power at the tactical level of any race in Alpha Octant. But they are still

strategically limited due to their overall limited resources/small economy and the difficulty they have in producing web casters in this galaxy.

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Thursday, October 25, 2007 - 06:09 pm: Edit

William. A more subtle advantage of web, even at strength 0, is that it stops weapons fire, EXCEPT for Tholian phasers (note: G10.62). While there are more effective ways to deploy webs in other modules, even using the Basic Set rules, creative use of web can be an effective tactic.

This is not to say that I would recommend laying web in your first duel, as it does tend to be a slow and ponderous process, but the use of web to allow you to shoot at your opponent, without risk of immediate retaliation, should not be discounted out of hand. Perhaps in a squadron scenario you can try it out, or perhaps set up a scenario where you have some web pre-deployed, would be a good way to "try it out."

By Alan Trevor (Thyrm) on Thursday, October 25, 2007 - 06:14 pm: Edit

Note also;  
You remark that web "... requires one power per hex per strength to reinforce." That actually varies according to the year of the battle. The two critical years are Y160 (reinforcing energy becomes 50% more effective so 10 points of reinforcing energy would add 15 aggregate web strength points\*) and Y175 (reinforcing energy is twice as effective so 10 points of actual energy add 20 aggregate web strength points). The 6 energy per hex to lay zero-strength web in the first place does not change by year, however.

By Reid Hupach (Gwbison) on Thursday, October 25, 2007 - 07:37 pm: Edit

You know I always thought the tholians would make a great pirate race. Freighter catching as a sport.

By Alan Trevor (Thyrm) on Thursday, October 25, 2007 - 11:09 pm: Edit

Andy,  
I didn't notice your 06:09 pm post when I posted my 06:14 "Note also;" But zero-strength web does not stop weapons fire. You're misreading the rules. Specifically, you're missing the sentence in G10.61 that says "If the strength of the web is zero, this rule does not apply." Zero-strength web does interfere with other web. And a web caster fired as a caster can not fire through it. But ordinary weapons fire (including a web caster fired as a web fist) is not affected by the web until it is powered to at least strength-one.

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Friday, October 26, 2007 - 01:24 pm: Edit

Alan. LOL! Shows how much I play Tholians . Nonetheless, the basic point, that a web not strong enough to stop a ship's movement can still stop non-Tholian fire (for example, a strength 1 web).

By Alan Trevor (Thyrm) on Friday, October 26, 2007 - 01:43 pm: Edit

Andy,  
Yeah, the web rules are like that. The Tholians are my favorite race and I have probably played them more than I have played all other races put together. But I still keep a rule book handy and opened to G10, especially if I'm playing a base defense scenario.

## ORION TACTICS

By Scott Jackson (Wittybanter) on Monday, March 05, 2007 - 05:26 pm: Edit

A quick and probably silly question that I cannot find in the rules - can you buy Orion weapons with commanders options

in a standard scenario that allows the 20%? Or do they have to be part of your ship BPV?

=====

By Tim Longacre (Timl) on Monday, March 05, 2007 - 06:25 pm: Edit

Except for any special drones in any drone racks you may have, the weapons placed into the mounts of Orion ships adds to the ships BPV.

=====

By Reid Hupach (Gwbison) on Monday, March 05, 2007 - 08:37 pm: Edit

Actual some can subtract, the real cheesy weapons can reduce your points.

=====

By Paul Edwards (Pablomatic) on Thursday, March 15, 2007 - 06:05 pm: Edit

Can anyone talk about being the orions in a campaign? Seems to me it would be really cool to have secret asteroid bases and to harass the empires. Tell me of any experiences you've had like this.

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Thursday, March 15, 2007 - 06:13 pm: Edit

Check out the SFBOnline campaign VOID WAR (Discussion area in the STAR FLEET BATTLES > STAR FLEET BATTLES ONLINE > CAMPAIGNS > VOID WAR). There are 6 major empire players and 3 Orions players doing just what you've described.

We're still fairly early in the campaign so the Orions haven't really "gotten going" yet.

=====

By Paul Edwards (Pablomatic) on Friday, March 16, 2007 - 01:30 pm: Edit

Gary: Thanks for the tip. That campaign looks really really cool to me. The pirates can corrupt governments, start crime syndicates, etc. Didn't read all the rules, but IMO something like this is the way SFB was meant to be played!

I noticed the Orion ships mostly had one special sensor in an option mount to detect convoys and such--even though the sensors aren't needed in combat (these ships were solo, so not acting as fleet scouts). In a patrol scenario this configuration would be rare because the Orion doesn't have to consider other utilities for his ship besides combat performance. Sure, special sensors can be used in combat, but would most orions choose to take one per ship in a patrol scenario?

Is there a "Pirates Campaign" in any SFB published material?

=====

By Timothy J. Bruce (Korrah) on Thursday, July 19, 2007 - 03:44 pm: Edit

Paul:

Red WYN Express (T6.0 I think) perfectly illuminates pirate operations. Very different than national operations. The trouble here is pirates are \*NOT\* a cohesive unity, but a hodge-podge of free operators loosely governed by the cartels, which themselves are in \*DIRECT\* mutual competition [0].

If pirates are to really meet their true nature, one would need several different cartel players, or a hard-and-fast rule stating NPC cartels are universally hostile (although both states would really shine). Once the politics are worked out, one would then to consider the "loosely governed" aspect.

A cartel would pay in full for his vessels (rules state they do maintain hidden harvesting bases and concealed shipyards), but most of these are in turn purchased by indie operators. A fair means might be some portion of each production cycle is sold to operators, selected by die roll (perhaps proportional to 2D6; 2 = 0%, 7 = 50%, 12 = 100%). Players may or may not receive full compensation (I'm fairly certain there is corruption within the cartels). Now we come to an issue of deployments.

Since the bulk of the cartel is comprised of indie operators, the cartel player's forces would be variable. Those vessels he retained would be completely under his command, but a set of die rolls might determine how many of the indie vessels will

assist him on his current mission. If the cartel player accepts the indie help, he commands them in the scenario, but they must be paid for their efforts (something could be worked out using the Red WYN Express campaign as a guide, or whatever economics your campaign derives).

Ex: Cartel player A builds three LR's, three CR's, and one CA this production cycle. The CA is exempt from sale (see Orion Racial Rules in basic set), and after rolling the dice it is determined the player must forfeit four of the produced vessels. He opts to sell all three LR's and one of the CR's, but receives X EP's in trade. He then wishes to raid Kzinti Uranium colony in sector Q. He rolls some diece, checks a chart, and it is determined 2 LR's and a BR will join his force on this raid.

There is also an issue of "indie operations". Those owner-operated vessels will be out performing all kinds of mischief w/o the cartel player's involvement. Any "random encounters" should be conducted against the indie vessels, thus depleting their numbers. We should also remember that those vessels are permitted to harvest only certain amounts of material within cartel space (if pirates get too bold the fleet shows up and ruins everyone's day), so cartel players should not be exempt from any "random encounters" which pit pirate vs. pirate (the CA's are "enforcer" ships after all). The "randomly selected indie ally" dice rolls should not apply to this, since this is not a planned strike.

Clearly the cartels (just from reading the SFB rules) offer a great change from the nations, but in order to be most effective there must still be a few national players! This means unless you can get eight people to not only start the game, but maintain enough patience to continue one for more than a few encounters, the pirates simply aren't viable in a campaign unless solely as "random encounters" rather than fully-fledged, player-operated cartels.

[0] See Mancur Olson's books to learn more on cartelistic operations, and collective action by independent entities

=====

By Jon Berry (Laz\_Longsmith) on Friday, November 02, 2007 - 01:32 am: Edit

To revive the question old as time, what sort of stuff would you put in your Orion Option mounts?

For this discussion I want to start, pick a ship, pick option mounts, and defend your choice. Or why the selection is a bad one. I'm hoping that I can generate enough opinions, dissenting or otherwise, to create a CL article (or more, depending on interest).

I'll start;

Ship; LR

Option Mounts; Plasma-F, 2\*P-1

The underbuilt Frigate, the Orion LR is best used to pick off single targets, not tangling with a real frigate or anything bigger. I've augmented the basic strength of the hull, the 360' phasers with another pair of phasers, LS/RS. For crunch, I've put a Plasma-F in the nose.

Why? This is a very low power package, for coming into any scenario the Plasma holds for free, leaving power to be spent on more immediate things, like speed and EW. Also, the entire package can be fired at close range without AFC, albeit not all at once. Still, that extra point of power may come in handy.

The phasers are well suited to the raiding mission, being able to put 4 P-1's onto any target, save the forward and rear hex rows, which can get all five. In a fight against anything in its BPV class, the plasma is fired while closing on the target. The phasers are saved for any seekers the enemy may have, but ideally used on the opponent's ship. The plasma isn't expected to do real damage, rather the 15-20 points of damage it represents will take a huge chunk out of the shields of any police ship, and expect the enemy to react accordingly. The phasers are the real threat, and while refilling the capacitors all at once may prove a pain, it should be worth it for all the close range damage they can do, as well as their ability to shoot down seekers.

I do not recommend purchasing the Sabot for the plasma, as the energy for the effect isn't really worth it for the close range knife fight this package espouses.

I think this is a valid choice for any Eastern Captain, and should find its way into the occasional western cartel raider due to technology match ups.

-----

Thoughts? Opinions? Dissentions?

Either way, I'll come up with another ship/options later on for further analysis.

--

Jon Berry

=====

By Richard Wells (Rwwells) on Friday, November 02, 2007 - 03:33 am: Edit

I would mount plasma on one side to have the option of firing at a pursuing vessel.

=====

By Ted Fay (Catwhoatsphoto) on Friday, November 02, 2007 - 10:17 am: Edit

Personally, my favorite package in the LR is photon in the front and 2\*PL-F in the rear. You can come in with quite a whollop and arm the photon as needed. You can snipe or close. LP/RP plasma allows you to fight Gorn style.

=====

By Ted Fay (Catwhoatsphoto) on Friday, November 02, 2007 - 10:21 am: Edit

Also, Sabot, if available, is definitely the way to go. It's only 1 more energy for an F torp - and you get the needed extra range. Also, Sabot ECPs change speed with the ship - meaning that the LR can sport 5 ECM without expending any power (assuming it doesn't double) using a plasma ECP that's hard to kill. And it can do it twice, for a 12 turn long running battle.

=====

By Larry E. Ramey (Hydrajak) on Friday, November 02, 2007 - 10:31 am: Edit

You failed to point out what clan.

Hamilcar is NOT going to put its limited Fs on a LR, though it might drop a Gat in the nose.

The Western clans are most likely to go:

2 ph-1, 1 Drone and the Easterns will use what you suggested. 3 drone racks are pretty obscene too. There is little a police ship can do to stop that, though a convoy will launch every shuttle it has and reduce you to 3 ph-1s. However, a single LR should not be tangling with anything more than 1 Pol + 2 freighters.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Friday, November 02, 2007 - 10:54 am: Edit

I prefer all Phaser ones.

Enough to EASILY punch out a POL.

=====

By Jon Berry (Laz\_Longsmith) on Friday, November 02, 2007 - 12:43 pm: Edit

Cool. Would you guys like to write up more detailed opinion peices for why you choose those packages? It's much easier to fill a page that way.

SHIP; LR

ZONE; ISC, Romulan, Gorn, limited Federation

Package; 3\*Plasma-F

BPV; ((I forget the cost of an LR at the moment 62 total? 65 with the swivel mounts?))

I don't like this package much. While the idea of 60 points of plasma barreling down range at your opponent appeals to me as a captain, I feel that this places too much emphasis on the hammer blow to be a serious contender.

But this is actually a fairly low power choice, due to the plasmas holding for free at the start of the scenario. With no need for holding or arming energy, the LR can charge full in and shoot the wad at any target of its choice, and said target has little

choice but to weasel, get gutted, or hope for pseudos. Launch the pseudos as well, and watch the weasel get popped.

This package is good for a couple passes, assuming the pseudos get used right, otherwise the LR will fin itself sucking energy to rearm those torps, nescitating the doubling of engines to pay for the last turn of arming.

An alternate option would be to ignore two of the plasmas, using them to take damage to protect the one plasma you are still arming. Or, better yet, assuming the year agrees, operating as a glorified phaser boat augmented by the carronade.

Sabot for this package would be interesting, giving reach to the Plasma-Fs, especially when confronted by another plasma chucker, or, in an odd matchup, disruptor armed police ships.

This selection is particularly vicious against a convoy, being able to interdict up to six targets with the threat of 'weasel or cripple' While I wouldn't suggest spreading your plasma that thin, just the threat may open a hole for your LR to grab a freighter and run.

A gamblers selection, (FFF) is one to cause your opponents no end to worry, wondering what is real, what is not, and what to do about the follow-up phaser strike.

=====

By Ted Fay (Catwhoatsphoto) on Friday, November 02, 2007 - 01:48 pm: Edit

I think everyone here said why. All of them are good packages. The ph-1 package is gross (6\*ph-1 on a tiny FF, little power needed), but requires you to get close. All drones is also scary - until you run out of drones, and to be most effective you must get close again (but 3\*C-racks is great for a fast Hit and Run). My package allows you to fight from a distance, but is more of a "long haul" kind of fighter - but it's still scary for a one-time battle pass.

=====

By Jon Berry (Laz\_Longsmith) on Saturday, November 03, 2007 - 12:46 am: Edit

Alright then, time to move up in the world.

War Destroyer

Hamilcar Cartel

(Hellbore, Disruptor, Disruptor)

This package is based around two different operating principles. Against a convoy, the Hellbore is best used as a keep-away deterrent to the escorts, the threat of more damage on a shield reduced by previous Disruptor fire should give them caution and distance while you snatch a freighter or two. With 4 Phaser-3s and 3 Phaser-1's, you can deal with most drone waves escorts and armed freighters can throw at you, leaving your disruptors to put down shields in preparation for boarding operations.

Be wary of the high power costs of this package, as arming all three heavy weapons at standard levels will cost you 7 of your (18?) points of power. Of course, if the escort is out of the picture, the Hellbore doesn't really need to be loaded. Overloads are right out for the most part, unless you trade arming some heavies for overloading the others.

The DW is also the smallest Orion ship that can make a stand-up fight against another frigate or destroyer, and this package is excellent for duels, if only through the intimidation power of the Hellbore. And padded by the Disruptors, will last well into the fight once internals are taken.

Anything smaller gets crushed under overloads, and anything your size plays nice under your constant barrage.

((Just a quicky. Other opinions?))

=====

By Michael Lui (MichaelLui) on Saturday, November 03, 2007 - 01:17 am: Edit

Disruptors don't pad Hellbores. Disruptors are hit on Torpedoes and Hellbores are hit on Drones.

=====

By Jon Berry (Laz\_Longsmith) on Saturday, November 03, 2007 - 01:36 am: Edit

I could have sworn Hellbores were the torpedo hit, and the Fusions were the drone.

Gya. Research more next time.  
Thanks for the catch.

=====

By Michael Lui (MichaelLui) on Saturday, November 03, 2007 - 01:42 am: Edit

It's mostly because Fusions were introduced before Hellbores and so they got the Torpedo slot.

=====

By Jim Davies (Mudfoot) on Saturday, November 03, 2007 - 10:26 pm: Edit

Quote:

The DW is also the smallest Orion ship that can make a stand-up fight against another frigate or destroyer

-----  
An LR can take on most frigates (except FFG, F5B, SEA or ISC). An LR with 3 phaser-3s and a bad back could take a Hunter. Or a Gorn DD, for that matter.

=====

By Jon Berry (Laz\_Longsmith) on Saturday, November 03, 2007 - 11:04 pm: Edit

I was talking from a background perspective. The LR was designed to raid convoys and fight a police ship. The DW and BR were made to be more combat oriented.

These are, for the most part, just a first draft. Nice to work the kinks out now.

--

Jon Berry

=====

By Tim Longacre (Timl) on Sunday, November 04, 2007 - 12:19 am: Edit

Jon, unfortunately an Orion DW (ANY SC4 Orion, for that matter) cannot use Hellbores.

Trust me on this one. I found what I thought was a contradiction in the rules that wasn't about them.

=====

By Jon Berry (Laz\_Longsmith) on Sunday, November 04, 2007 - 01:38 am: Edit

Alrighty then! Scrap the Hdd.

I need something different....

Ah-Ha!

Special Sensor, Probe Launcher - 10, Drone Rack - B (Federation, Klingon, Kzinti Operating Zone. Other OZs could replace the Drone Rack with another Special Sensor or Probe Launcher.)

Not all missions the Orions find themselves in involve stealing people blind. One peice of information buried in the rules is that the Orions Navy invented and fielded the Probe Drone before any other empire.

This Package represents a non-combat mission for the DW in question. Ideally, this ship could be used as a reconaissance(sp) vessel, passively scanning a region of space with its Special Sensor, and passing that information along to other Orion vessels.

The Drone Rack would be filled with Probe Drones, up to the allowed limits, probably on Type-III frames, with some combat drones available, just in case.

Against a marauding monster, or for improptu research for which some Empires may pay bounties or fees for, this ship becomes far more capable than its normal bretherin. The lack of Lab spaces hurt in non-combat situations for all Orions, having to default to a single Control space for such purposes, but the Sensor and Probes more than make up for it.

If it comes down to killing a monster though, this ship may have some trouble. It may be worth it to replace the Drone Rack with a heavy weapon native to the Operating Zone to give this ship some punch should it be needed. Retain the Probe because Probes can't be shot down by MCIDS, and can be used to kill a monster straight out, dice permitting.

Not all Pirates are out to steal your resources. This pirate makes sure other pirates can get in and out before the cops show up.

((The more I think about it, the more I want to take this package, SS/P10/Photon into a few monster scenarios and see how it flies. Or prot in into my next Orion squadron.))

=====

By William T Wilson (Sheap) on Sunday, November 04, 2007 - 02:23 am: Edit

I figure the Orions would probably equip that ship with a cloak, as well.

=====

By Jon Berry (Laz\_Longsmith) on Sunday, November 04, 2007 - 08:24 pm: Edit

I have another thought for the DW before I move on, but I need to check some rules and Annex 8B very carefully first.

Until then, I'm gonna return to the LR for a moment, and look a little harder into the Phaserboat package;

The 'Phaser Boat' LR (111) is a prime and universal example of playing to the strengths of the hull. Able to put 4 P-1's into any arc, or all 6 onto the forward Hex Row, this ship will tend to out gun most other police ships outside the effective range of thier heavy weapons. Or just plain outgun them period. 4 or 5 P1s can crush a shield out to R8, and the devestaion that can be unleashed by this package at R0-1 cannot be understated on other small ships.

Add the Nimble status to the natural +2 ECM, and in a scenario with no time limit, the capacity to play a R15+ phaser barrage game to wear down shields first becomes an excellent tactic that shifts the fight even more in your favour.

The all-Phaser package is an excellent supplementary choice in a scenario with multiple Orion vessels. It can act as a light mid-range escort for larger hulls with heavier power requirements from their weapons.

Speaking of escorts, this package, when combined with an Aegis rig, even Limited and not Full, makes for a very dangerous carrier escort, able to P1s at mid range while most other escorts are saddled with P3s. And once the enemy gets close, firing those P1s as P3s will prove effective in saving energy and dealing damage in the long run.

A varient to this package, mostly available to the Hamilcar Cartel is to replace one of the P1s with a PG for close in firepower. However, if your number of option mounts available for PGs are limited, they would best be served on a larger vessel, one not so fragile.

Another common version is to replace one of the P1s (whether centerline or in the wings is the choice of the captian) with a heavy direct-fire weapon (Photon, Disruptor or Fusion). This serves to bring the crunch power of the LR higher, while taking a bigger toll on the power of the LR. Perhaps the best choice would be the photon for this hull, with both proximity fire for the approach, and O/Ls in the end game.

The Phaserboat is cheap, simple, and most importantly, effective in many roles. A good package for the beginner and expert Orion at all levels of play.

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Sunday, November 04, 2007 - 08:59 pm: Edit

An Orion carrier escort cannot have phaser-Gs.

(Odd but true. See (R8.R7) stating that "*These would always be "home territory" weapons.*" Since no Orion Cartel has Hydran territory as their "home", these cannot be used.)

=====

By Jon Berry (Laz\_Longsmith) on Sunday, November 04, 2007 - 09:16 pm: Edit

Thanks. Hrm, looking at my previous post, I put the two ideas (Aegis and g11) in different paragraphs. I thought I had seperated the ideas well enough.

=====

By Jon Berry (Laz\_Longsmith) on Wednesday, November 07, 2007 - 12:02 am: Edit

I'm back!

One more combat package for the DW, then off to the next ship-group.

Package; Fusion Beam\*2, Drone Rack C

Cartel ; Hamilcar  
BPV; 82+Drone Upgrades

This package is designed around a simple concept; run in, sending in the drones to eat enemy firepower, then blow them away with the Fusions.

A very Hydran concept, this one may not prove popular with many captains due to the inherent risk in charging straight into the jaws of the enemy. But then again, for a Police ship or Frigate to see this ship come screaming in, weapons hot, they might not take the chance of eating a pair of O/L Fusions at point black range.

Doubling on the turn of attack is nearly a must, both for the power for the overloads, plus reinforcement.

Raiding a convoy, this package does suffer a little. Well a lot. A single drone rack, even a C-rack, isn't really a threat to the freighters, and the Fusion beams require close range, where the forest of defending phasers start to take their toll.

I can't put a stamp of approval on this package, but realize that it actually makes sense from a non-combat perspective. SFB is about the Battles, but I get the impression that this ship uses the Fusions as an intimidation weapon. Here is a pirate willing to get close and get dirty to win, and that may be enough to scare down an otherwise even fight.

Unless they're raiding the Hydrans, who consider that standard doctrine.

=====

By Jim Davies (Mudfoot) on Thursday, November 08, 2007 - 06:46 pm: Edit

Why take a fusion when you can take a gat? The gat does more damage at any range you're interested in, for much less power, and can soak up some defensive drones as well.

You're right that it would be hopeless against a convoy, when you want P1 and disruptors.

=====

By Jon Berry (Laz\_Longsmith) on Thursday, November 08, 2007 - 09:26 pm: Edit

Take a fusion when you can't get a Phaser-G.

This package was deliberately made to be sub-optimal. Yes, there are better things to be put in the mounts, but this is what the ship has.

=====

By Jon Berry (Laz\_Longsmith) on Tuesday, November 13, 2007 - 12:59 am: Edit

((I'm not ignoring this, School Work is catching up to me, and taking its toll. Next up should be the SLV/OFT/OPT.))

=====

By Jim Davies (Mudfoot) on Wednesday, November 14, 2007 - 09:43 pm: Edit

None of which belong in a fight anyway, really. But that said:

OFT/OPT are likely to be doing an Insider Job in a convoy assault, so they want crunch, ie plasma-F to nail the escort or a gat/P1 to hack into the freighters. Neither is blessed with enough power to make much use of a photon or HB. Drone-C would be OK, depending on the year.

SLV has no spare power and is generally just going to want defence, so phasers, G-rack or ADD.

=====

## HYDRAN TACTICS

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Monday, March 05, 2007 - 06:31 am: Edit

On another level.....

You are the captain of a Hydran Ranger-class cruiser, with your full loadout of Stinger-1's.

It is Y140, and while responding to a distress call from a freighter, you get jumped by a Lyran CL with 2 FF's for escort. Everybody is WS-3 (you were figuring it was a trap, and you were right.), its a semi-floating map (you can't go farther than 45 hexes from said freighter, and if a Lyran ship does its considered to have disengaged by distance), and EW is in use.

Small freighter in 2215, no SSD required (its warp/impulse engines and weapons are non-functional , the Lyrans get no points for shooting at it, they are trying to kill YOU).

The Lyran have 5 turns to try and whack you, then nearby fleet elements arrive and blast them (assume 2 more Rangers show up on Turn 6).

No terrain (other than the freighter.)

Discuss.

=====

By Larry E. Ramey (Hydrajak) on Monday, March 05, 2007 - 10:23 am: Edit

R10, gut the CL. Its too small to take 18 + 2 fusion beams and wrecking it killing it (or at least shooting its engines off) will pretty much eliminate the only unit that can seriously threaten you.

Start recovering them and reload them to blow the FFs at leasure.

You will likely need a speed change from 12-24 eventually but you will need to stay at 12 for a bit to get the stingers on board. It is unlikely they can even hurt you at R8, but you may lose a few fighters.... You don't want to go to R3. If you can jump from 4-2 you might die. Though once you wreck the CL, the ESGs of the FFs tend to do more fighting with each other than you.

Stingers are going to own these ships with EW in play.

Hi Mike!

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Monday, March 05, 2007 - 07:07 pm: Edit

\*throws the obligatory Asian school girl to the Tentacled Monarch as required\*

Addendum to above (dagnabit):

Lyrans have full complement of T-bombs (this was a TRAP, dontcha know) you (as the Hydran commander) don't have ANY.

Quit whining, you have mobile NSM's, they're called Stingers....

=====

By Michael Lui (Michaellui) on Monday, March 05, 2007 - 07:19 pm: Edit

Mike

Too easy. You have to have the Hydran complete some kind of mission, otherwise he could just run around the map for 5 turns staying away from the Lyrans and dropping his fighters if they start getting too close.

Maybe that the Hydran has to rescue people off the freighter while fending off the Lyrans? The Lyrans disabled the freighter to use it as bait (let it call for help) and may not destroy it until turn 5, right before they leave (after all, they may have already killed a FF that showed up and want to add a singleton Ranger to their tally). The Lyrans will not get any points for killing the freighter but the Hydrans will lose a level or two off of their victory conditions.

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Monday, March 05, 2007 - 07:21 pm: Edit

Lyrans having T-Bombs doesn't change the scenario in any measurable way.

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Monday, March 05, 2007 - 07:39 pm: Edit

Its a tactical exercise, not a 'balanced' scenario. Just like the 'Jump The Hood' scenario is more of a tactical exercise for the Klingon player than a 'fair fight'...

Andy: I imagine it would make the Hydran commander think before superstacking his fighters, I betcha.

Hokay, based on Mike Lui's suggestion, the exercise is amended as follows:

There are 10 crew units on the freighter that must be rescued before turn 6 (the freighter is boobytrapped and will blow up on Impulse 1 of turn 6). The freighter has no shuttles, transporters, or shields.

Lyrans forces are the aforementioned CL and 2 DD's. They have their full load of T-bombs.

You enter the map from 01xx map edge, speed any, WS-3. The Lyrans enter on Impulse 16 of Turn 1, any map edge, speed any, WS-3. Yes, this means they can come in behind you...

Once you have rescued the freighter crew you can disengage...or not.

=====

By Michael Lui (MichaelLui) on Monday, March 05, 2007 - 07:57 pm: Edit

Hold on, the Ranger only has 2 transporters. Make it 4-6 crew units. Or 10 crew units and you get more points the more you get off (minimum 4 (or maybe 6) to not lose outright).

Quote:

There are 10 crew units on the freighter that must be rescued before turn 6 (the freighter is boobytrapped and will blow up on Impulse 1 of turn 6).

None of those Lyrans had better be slower than 28 if they expect to make it home alive.

=====

By Larry E. Ramey (Hydrajak) on Tuesday, March 06, 2007 - 10:07 am: Edit

Shhhhhh Mike.... Never shall different message boards mix! Anyway, I agree with Andy. A full load of T bombs will stop me from overrunning and blowing you up, but I'm really not into that. I want to shoot at R10 and gut the CL.... tbombs really aren't going to stop that. The only real threat to the Hydran is R15 disruptor shots wittleing the Stingers down and a R3 Blast from all those Ph-2.

The R15 doesn't scare me too much since EW is in play and the FFs don't have any energy to spare. EM + a few points of loaning from the Ranger do a pretty good number on the disruptors.

R3 is death on a stick for the Ranger. However, R4-R2 == lots of dead kitties. A full load of tbombs makes this more doable and something the Hydran needs to avoid like the plague. The CL simply should not survive to make it R3.

The other thing the Hydran needs to be concerned about is ending the turn inside R8. The Lyrans would be (I think) quite content to park and blast with 6 OV DIS and reserve phasers and ESGS to kill the stingers.

All this adds up too is: the Hydran owns R10, and probably loses badly inside R8.

Thats my take.

=====

By Ken Humpherys (Pmthecat) on Tuesday, March 06, 2007 - 04:54 pm: Edit

Looks interesting.

If I were the Hydran, I would r0 the freighter T1. Drop 2 shuttles to rescue crew, then launch my St-1's at r4 to create a mobile screen I can duck behind when I come back to the freighter. T2-3 tease the Lyrans hoping to make them chase me through the fighter screen. Return to the freighter to pick up crew. Rinse and repeat. T4-5 pick up shuttles and injured or unarmed fighters. Continue to duck and run. I will take some damage but not much.

If you look at BPV's and score based on them it is a victory for the Hydran just living through this. Score internals on 2 or more ships and he wins a Tactical Victory even if he is crippled and loses all his fighters. Marginal Victory is his even if he does no damage to the Lyrans.

I would score it like this:

0-3 Crew rescued - Tactical Loss

4-6 Crew rescued - Marginal Loss

7-8 Crew rescued - Draw

9-10 Crew rescued - Marginal Victory

Each Lyrans ship Damaged = +1 Victory Level

Each Lyrans ship Crippled = +2 Victory Levels

Each Lyrans ship Destroyed = +3 Victory Levels

Being Crippled = -1 Victory Level

Being Destroyed = -2 Victory Levels

You can get an Astounding Victory but you will have to hurt a lot of Lyrans in 5 turns. Each pass on the Lyrans should get you +1 victory level if you hurt a Lyrans each pass.

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Tuesday, March 06, 2007 - 05:26 pm: Edit

10 crew units. It's intended to be tough. And the Lyrans FF's were replaced with DD's.

Mr.Humphrey's chart for victory conditions is suitable...

\*gives Ken a cookie\*

=====

By Michael Lui (MichaelLui) on Tuesday, March 06, 2007 - 08:28 pm: Edit

Oooo, DDs. Much harder now with more R22 disruptors. Hmmm, lets see.

The Lyrans, if they're smart, will come in on the short side of the map running for the freighter as well. Possibly they'll "set up shop" there and kill any shuttles that we will launch. They will also drop a few T-bombs in the area so they can make our fighters cautious. We will have to make sure when firing that we do not kill any of them because their explosion may destroy the freighter.

Okay, we're not going to be saving any crew units here so we'll go for they destruction of as many ships as possible. Take the range 10 shot to kill the CL and then recover, rearm, repeat if possible. We have to kill at least one for Marginal and anything else is gravy. Just have to make sure that we don't get crippled/killed as well.

=====

By Larry E. Ramey (Hydrajak) on Wednesday, March 07, 2007 - 10:21 am: Edit

Ouch.....

DDs are a problem. Its not the R22 DIS, its the extra power.

Send 2 shuttles to Freighter, send freighter shuttle to you. Speed change from 12 to 28. Snag the Freighter in tractor. Run. Transport crew units at the non-combat rate. Start next turn at 12, Drop Tractors during EA, launch 2 shuttles from Freighter (crowded shuttle bay) tractor land the shuttles. Speed change to 28 on T2.14. Disengage.

They can't catch you. You can't fight them.

Do I get a cookie?

=====

By Michael Lui (MichaelLui) on Wednesday, March 07, 2007 - 04:03 pm: Edit

Nope. The freighter doesn't have any shuttles. And you can't change speed from 12 to 28. Max double or +10. However, transporting the crew at non-combat rates is a really good idea. I probably wouldn't have thought about that. Although I think that you're going to have to drag that freighter around an extra turn if you want the last ones.

Don't forget that the Lyrans have the option of starting on ANY map edge on impulse 16. That includes behind you. And you only have a 15 point rear shield and 18 on the 3 and 5. Your plot gets you 10 hexes away from them when they come on map, if you change speed on I8 and if it was legal. At a 12/24 you get 9 hexes away from them, and they get closer when you tractor the freighter and because they are going faster too. They only have to plot a speed 29 to move 15 of the last 16 impulses.

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Wednesday, March 07, 2007 - 06:00 pm: Edit

Michael. If the Lyrans show up behind the Ranger, then they'll have to fight through nine fighters to get their shot - that will degrade their firepower sufficiently for the RN to finish its mission.

=====

By Michael Lui (MichaelLui) on Wednesday, March 07, 2007 - 07:20 pm: Edit

You're still forgetting that the Lyrans decide where they're going to start on impulse 16. They can watch what you do for 15 impulses before deciding where to be placed. They can still place themselves off the Rangers #3 or 5 shield without worrying very much about the fighters.

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Wednesday, March 07, 2007 - 08:59 pm: Edit

\*looks at Hydrajak\*

You want to trade the nookie for a cookie?

Hydrans are weird.

I was wondering how long it was going to take for somebody to think of tractoring the freighter...or using transporters at non-combat rates.....

=====

By Larry E. Ramey (Hydrajak) on Thursday, March 08, 2007 - 10:13 am: Edit

Thats right, I can't go 12-28. But Mike said the Lyrans show up at R45. So I don't care. R45 is a LONG way away. If I'm clever I can effectively change from 12->28. 12 while tractoring the Freighter -> 28 without the tractor.

I'm married now Mike, I'll take the cookie, its safer.

Andy,

I don't think a CL and 2 DDs are going to be all that impressed with 9 St-Is. Sure, you will do some internals on the CL, then all 9 stingers will die. I wouldn't even launch them.

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Thursday, March 08, 2007 - 11:08 am: Edit

Larry. The point of the 9 ST-Is is that the Lyrans don't have the firepower to avoid getting hurt by them AND do internals through your rear shield on the same turn.

=====

By Michael Lui (Michaellui) on Thursday, March 08, 2007 - 02:20 pm: Edit

Hydrajak

Mike didn't say the Lyrans showed up at R45. He said:

Quote:

You enter the map from 01xx map edge, speed any, WS-3. The Lyrans enter on Impulse 16 of Turn 1, any map edge, speed any, WS-3. Yes, this means they can come in behind you...

That means he can show up at Range 0 right behind you if you never move from your starting hex.

Quote:

If I'm clever I can effectively change from 12->28. 12 while tractoring the Freighter -> 28 without the tractor.

Yes, but you must start the turn at speed 28 or have the freighter already tractorred and have been going speed 14+ on the previous turn. Your previous post had you starting at speed 12 without a tractor established to something big enough to slow you down.

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Monday, June 11, 2007 - 09:46 pm: Edit

Continuation of Hydran R10 Fusion tactics.

Paul. IME, I have found that ship defenses rise at an exponential rate as range closes sufficient to kill sufficient charging Hydran fighters to make such attacks risky.

I have found far greater success using the R10 tactics where the majority of the fighters can be reloaded for further attacks. At the enemy force doesn't want to close with the Hydran force, they are forced to snipe at the fighters at range. Due to the intrinsic benefits of fighters at range, the enemy force loses capability at a faster rate than the fighters die. The tactic is especially deadly due to the presence of Hellbores in Fusion fleets (i.e., it is less effective prior to Y172 and even less so prior to Y158).

=====

By Paul Scott (The\_Rock) on Monday, June 11, 2007 - 09:57 pm: Edit

The problem I see with this is that it is necessarily true that about half (sometimes a little more, sometimes a little less) of a Fusion force's value is in its fighters. If the fighters fire at 10 and (presumably) turn off (or HET off), the opponent will not have fired anything yet. We are on a fixed map (per original post). Now, while Hydrans can launch fighters all at once, they cannot land them quickly - and landing them will be required to rearm them if - again as you originally suggest - you are to repeat this.

All of this seems like a great way to lose either a bunch of fighters - or possibly ships - after the opponent takes his lumps with your R10 fire.

My suggested way to resolve this (as usual) is for you to pick a fleet of Hydrans and it's opponent fleet. You can do your range 10 thing and we'll see how it works out. I'll then play the Hydrans as I suggest (keep closing to 3 or better with the fighters before firing) and we can compare which results are better.

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Wednesday, June 13, 2007 - 12:49 pm: Edit

This I'd like to see.

I know how deadly the r10 fusion shot can be en masse, but I've beaten fusion-only fleets that do it by closing the range and pumping OL's (and drones) into the Hydran force.

With a Lyran fleet, I just popped ESG's and rammed (after eating the fusions).

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Wednesday, June 13, 2007 - 03:40 pm: Edit

Mike. As I've beaten the "charging" Hydrans by giving them Range 3 with a shift and killing the fighters with ph-2s and ADDs. Either strategy is beatable if you never adapt to enemy tactics. Yes, there are times when using the R10 tactic, you have to make a carefully timed charge and close to win. Conversely, there are times when using the close tactic that you should take your distance shots, rearm and come back with the situation is improved.

However, I have found the R10 tactic far more flexible in this matter as you decision point usually occurs BEFORE you have taken significant losses.

Regardless, a fight between Paul and I won't prove anything. He's better enough than me that playing either side, he would likely win. You don't argue chess with Kasperov on the chess board.

re: Lyran ESGs. Far less problematic post-Y172, when I'll have sufficient HBs to down your ESGs; before then, yes, the Lyrans have the edge.

re: Klingons. The key is to rotate the fighters so that you always have 33-50% out and armed to cause devastation against charging opponents. That, and saving the ships to answer such attacks. Not perfect, but when the Klinks are faced with "take damage and disengage or charge and risk losing entire force", they usually choose the former.

=====

By Paul Scott (The\_Rock) on Wednesday, June 13, 2007 - 06:44 pm: Edit

I am not sure that works. You are good enough to tell me I am wrong, but not good enough to prove it on the map. I think you have to pick one and go with it. ;)

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Wednesday, June 13, 2007 - 06:57 pm: Edit

What Paul said.

'Debate' means nothing. Only success on the battlefield has any meaning.

I knew someone who had proved, mathematically, that an S8-legal 1200 BPV ISC Eschelon fleet (Y185) with max number of PPD's was 'unbeatable' on a floating map.

I took 600 BPV of Klingons and proved him wrong.

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Wednesday, June 13, 2007 - 09:21 pm: Edit

The only test of such tactics is who wins, with equal BPV and equal player skill level. Were Paul and I to play, it would be less about the tactics used and more about who is the better player, therefore proving nothing.

=====

By Michael Lui (Michaellui) on Thursday, June 14, 2007 - 12:49 am: Edit

The better player USES the better tactics.

=====

By Richard Wells (Rwwells) on Thursday, June 14, 2007 - 03:47 am: Edit

The merits of a tactic are not necessarily equivalent to the ability to successfully implement the tactic. Even the cleverest tactic can fail if a key speed change is set to occur 1 impulse too late.

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Thursday, June 14, 2007 - 08:24 am: Edit

RWW - exactly!

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Thursday, June 14, 2007 - 01:00 pm: Edit

\*shrugs\*

And? Pay attention to detail, or lose. Next time you'll probably make sure that key speed change is on time; I know I would. And have.

And win or lose, actually fighting out a battle on the map is 100% better than 'debating' it on a BBS.

And I find that regardless of tourney prowess, 'Ace' players have the same problems everybody else does when running fleets.

So take Paul's offer to fight it out, and take notes....the worst that can happen is that you'll improve your SFB skillz, and hey, you have a 50% chance of beating him as of Right Now.

=====

By Sandy Hemenway (Firemane) on Friday, June 15, 2007 - 11:10 am: Edit

Been awhile since I posted - but this is a topic near and dear to my heart -- Hydran strategies.

Back in the 80s, I played Hydrans almost exclusively in our local campaign. As I was learning the game (and getting my head bashed in for 3 years), I started keeping records on the scenarios. I had a diary of 30+ engagements with different opponents, fleet makeups, etc. I then sat down and started running numbers on results in relation to MY strategies and fleet makeups.

What I discovered about \*MY\* performance was this:

1) R10 massed fusions led to mediocre results at an incredibly high rate, (something like 90% of these cases were close to draws).

2) Fighter nose-pack, (swarm of fighters leading in my ships be 2-5 hexes), had \*BY FAR\* the highest success rate \*AND\* the highest kill rate of any strategy. However, this ALSO carried an occasional debacle, (though the rate at which this occurred was VERY rare).

3) I found very little in the way of useful info on fighter percentage of BPV - or # of HBs per fleet, etc. Basically, very little in the way of identifiable pattern - with the exception that if the percentage of fighters got extremely large, then forced disengagements soared, but actual kills dropped to next to nothing.

In the end, I concluded, that based on MY abilities, R10 fusions were safe, but rarely resulted in kills - and by and large were boring engagements for me. The fighter-nose pack typically led to winning more often and by larger amounts, with the extremely rare devastating loss to spice things up.

Mind you - every player has different strengths and weaknesses, but I believe the methodology is valid. Mix up

your tactics, keep a diary, and when you've got a sufficiently large cache of info to examine - attempt to discern patterns that might lead to improved results for you.

=====

By Alan Trevor (Thyrm) on Friday, June 15, 2007 - 11:44 am: Edit

Sandy - Question:

Were these games floating map or fixed map?

=====

By Sandy Hemenway (Firemane) on Friday, June 15, 2007 - 01:00 pm: Edit

All games were fixed map.

However, smaller games were 1 map, while larger were 2-4 maps, (mostly 2).

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Friday, June 15, 2007 - 04:21 pm: Edit

Size of map is a definite factor in this discussion. The charging fusions will be far more effective on a single map than a 2x2 configuration.

My experiences are in a 2x2 configuration where there is more room to maneuver.

=====

By Paul Scott (The\_Rock) on Friday, June 15, 2007 - 06:35 pm: Edit

Map \*size\* should not be relevant (within the limits we are talking about here). At appropriate fleet speeds and position (speed at or near 30, everything in one stack), you would need an open (floating) map to make the range 10 thing work. Plus, the fighters \*must\* all have WBPs, so they can shoot and still run at speed 30.

What should happen is that the fighters get R10, fire, and take one ship out of the equation for the enemy (that ship will lose a shield and likely take some internals, so it would pull off). The very next impulse, the fighters must HET away, or be caught (in two impulses) at range 8. The Hydran ships have presumably kept some distance and are appropriately prepared to merely turn off to keep outside of Range 8.

If we assume that happens, it is possible for the fighters to all eventually land (though there should be some impulse 25 mass phasers to take out as many fighters as can be reasonably assured at range 10 with WBPs, without dipping into power needed to continue moving speed 28-31 next turn).

At this point, if the map is not completely open, the Hydrans are done with R10 and run fighting. They can keep running and rearm their fighters, but the next time those fighters are launched (this time without WBPs, since they will be inside range 8 before they can fire), they will be engaging closer than 8.

All the opponent need do at this point is kill as many fighters as possible, put out whatever seekers it has (if any), and turn and run.

Since a running to rearm its fighters Hydran fleet can at the very best only hope to gain 1-3 hexes per turn (and most likely they gain 0 hexes per turn), no matter how big the map is, it is a losing proposition for the Hydrans.

If for some reason, the Hydrans are fighting a speed restricted force (like old-style roms), then the map size matters, because the Hydrans could gain 8 or so hexes per turn - a large map then allowing them to run and turn around. In any other situation, the map size just doesn't mean much.

The above is a best case scenario for teh Hydran R10 shot. If the opponent is, say, the Klingons with a bunch of D5s, then in addition to everything above, the Hydran force gets to eat disruptors every turn too.

=====

By William T Wilson (Sheap) on Friday, June 15, 2007 - 08:44 pm: Edit

I wonder if everyone is working on the same assumptions. What if the R10 fusions, then piddle around for the cooling/fighter-reloading turn is the opening, then you proceed into a more conventional battle after that. Most of Paul's

objections are just that the R10 thing cannot be done indefinitely, but there doesn't seem to be any major sacrifice on the first shot.

=====

By Chris Upson (Frobozz) on Friday, June 15, 2007 - 09:35 pm: Edit

my mindset seems similar to what firemane describes. plan "a" for me is always range 0 massive overkill. if your opponent knows he dies in an overrun, you typically end up getting your range 10 fusion shot on flank shields, and having a much easier/safer time reloading the stingers.

fold in a modest number of hellbores, so you have a "long term" victory condition, and you can fire half (or so) of your fighter fusions, making the fighter rearming time much easier.

non-WBP stingers on an open map against a very fast opponent (D5s) are nothing but terrain, imo. very angry terrain, but terrain. my stingers will hold their fusions til the opp runs to range 2 or all the stingers are dead, and i will trust the hellbore ships behind make their sacrifice worthwhile.

=====

By Paul Scott (The\_Rock) on Friday, June 15, 2007 - 10:48 pm: Edit

There is a major sacrifice. Your positioning is all screwed. You are left running away from the opponent while recovering your fighters (what is left of them, since WPB will be needed and there is no STM at range 10). Then when you re-launch them you are starting from range 10ish and they can't do anything for 8 impulses. Most of them, therefore will die before firing on second launch.

It is just much better (again, assuming a closed map) to lead with them and intend on closing. If the opponent fires first, then he will be the one turning off. You can then fire and reload while chasing, rather than being chased. there really is very little to be gained by taking that first shot.

=====

By William T Wilson (Sheap) on Friday, June 15, 2007 - 11:16 pm: Edit

If you are still at R10 when you are ready to launch the fighters the second time, you'll save net damage launching them facing away from the enemy with WPB on since P1s do more than 2x damage inside R8 compared to R9+. Also, if the fighters use EM, the enemy will not be able to fire effectively outside R8 without expending a lot of power for ECCM. You'll also have considerably better control over the positioning. It's still of course possible that your enemy will shoot them and then some will die before getting the second shot, but then, the enemy will have fired their weapons at long range right before a bunch of fully loaded Hydrans charge them. The net damage exchange may still be favorable.

Note, I am not convinced the R10 opening plan is actually better, I just don't think it is all that bad.

=====

By Paul Scott (The\_Rock) on Friday, June 15, 2007 - 11:38 pm: Edit

It is still the same basic problem. The ships and the fighters are all heading away from the opponent. So you launch your fighters with WBP and EM. Assuming you have not run out of room, you are now stuck giving up your fighters completely if (after waiting 8 impulses) they HET or turn back into the enemy, while the ships continue trying to maneuver.

You are just putting yourself in a very poor tactical position that will require some significant sacrifice (fighters, speed, lack of ability to fully engage - something) - all for the benefit of hurting one ship. I don't see how you make this a winning move without substantial cooperation from the enemy.

=====

By michael john campbell (Michaelcampbell) on Saturday, June 16, 2007 - 01:01 am: Edit

Sandy:

Great to hear from you again.

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Saturday, June 16, 2007 - 12:36 pm: Edit

My success with range 10 has been to fire 33-50% of the fighters at range 10 and land them, while I continue to close with the enemy (albeit not at speed 28) - I have had success with this even without WBPs, on 2x2 maps. If the enemy charges, they are still facing at least half of the fighters and ALL of the ships so won't be closing to ship killing range (i.e., fighters 3-5 hexes in front of ships). On a 2x2 map you can chase your opponent around at speed 14-16, mission-killing a ship every turn that you get range 10 (which on a 2x2 is practically impossible to prevent). As the anti-fighter fire will be against a 2 shift (sans Scout support), it will have limited effect.

=====

By Paul Scott (The\_Rock) on Saturday, June 16, 2007 - 03:42 pm: Edit

Well, at least we found the fundamental disconnect. A fleet moving at speed 14-16 on a 2x2 map is of no threat at all. Your fighters would simply never see range 10. My fleet (which will be composed of ships with identical operating parameters - and very likely will just be all the same ship, command ratings allowing) will be in a single stack and will always move between 28 and 31. Assuming I have disruptors, I will have as many armed as I can that allows me to maintain those speeds. My stack will move to range 13 (to avoid STM) of your fighters and fire 4 disruptors at each fighter (until I run out of disruptors to fire). You will lose some (at least one, probably a few) fighters. Some others will be hit with three. Those that were hit with three, will get 2 p-1s the next impulse. All, in all, you will lose some fighters, I will take no damage (although moving that slowly, your ships should at least fire all its p-1 and p-2s at one ship, causing some damage).

In the end, I will do this every turn until you realize that speed 14-16 is not an acceptable fighting speed, since you just lose a couple fighters every turn and I take little to no damage in return.

14-16 is acceptable on a single map (though why you would fire anything at 10 still escapes me), but on a map the size you are talking about, it is impossible.

My game plan is very dull for everyone involved and it takes forever. Understandably, perhaps your opponents in the past have been unwilling to do something like that. These dynamics are one of the reasons I don't really enjoy SFB above a small squadron level, unless played on a single, fixed map.

=====

By Alan Trevor (Thyrm) on Saturday, June 16, 2007 - 04:11 pm: Edit

Paul,

In your 10:48 pm post from 15 June you said "... there is no STM at range 10". I'm confused. The chart in E1.7 Small Target Firing Modifications (page 116 of the MRB) clearly indicates that fighters do get a Small Target Modifier of +2 at range-10. Did you mean range-9? Or am I missing something?

=====

By Paul Scott (The\_Rock) on Saturday, June 16, 2007 - 05:44 pm: Edit

I did not look it up. From my memory, I thought it was 14. If it is 10, then it is 10. In that case you'll have to shoot through it.

=====

By Michael Lui (Michaellui) on Saturday, June 16, 2007 - 08:26 pm: Edit

You must be thinking double-sized fighters.

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Saturday, June 16, 2007 - 10:10 pm: Edit

Paul. Um - exactly which ships are you using that can fly around at 28-31 and still shoot? Granted, D-5s could do that and fire 4 disruptors, but would then have no ECCM, and no phaser recharge energy. Against the 10 ECM my fighters will have, that is not exactly a frightening prospect. You'll have a tough time getting less than a 2-shift and it will cost you to get it to 1.

Plus, avoiding R10 on a 2x2 assumes the Hydrans are a single stack. With even a 5 hex spread, you simply can't avoid the range 10 shot, especially considering your 5-6 turn mode at those speeds.

=====

By Paul Scott (The\_Rock) on Saturday, June 16, 2007 - 10:58 pm: Edit

Well Andy, yes the D5 (and if I am playing Klingon, I don't know why I am not playing a bunch of D5's - they are broken ships after all :). Additionally, the D7 can run at speed 28 and arm 3 disruptors.

Your ECCM is immaterial, since it cannot cause a 4 shift. At range 15 to my target fighter(s) ( which will be range 18-20 to your ships), you just are not damaging me. If I need to fire 12 disruptors, 20 disruptors, whatever, to kill one fighter - so be it. You lose a fighter, I lose nothing. Your speed prevents you from doing anything about it. If it takes me 30 turns to kill all your fighters, no problem (more likely, of course, we all go home because it is boring or you change your tactics once I establish my ability to do this).

As for your spread out fleet (really bad idea, btw. It looks ugly; no one likes it, but the best formation for any (maybe an exception for old style romulans) fleet is to pretend it is one giant ship and all be in one hex, going the same speed and facing the same direction.), if I am 28 and you are 15 I am gaining 13 hexes each turn on you. The map you have suggested (2x2) is huge. There would be absolutely no problem never giving a slow moving fleet range 10. If you like, we can do an easy test on SFBOL. No need to play a game - I put one peice on the map and move it 28-31 hexes each turn. You put several peices on the map moving 15 each turn. We "play" for say 10 turns. If you can get any of your pieces to Range 10 of my piece then you win. I don't know any other way to prove you are wrong (maybe board consensus), but I know you are wrong.

=====

By Chris Upson (Frobazz) on Saturday, June 16, 2007 - 11:35 pm: Edit

against a pure fusion fleet operating at speed 15, sure D5s are an answer on an open map, but any hellbores in the hydran fleet will really have their effect magnified in such an engagement. 3 disruptors per hellbore is not a large advantage in a saber-dance environment, when the hydran ships have 15+ extra discretionary power.

of course, if i feel like playing twelve hours for a game result that is indistinguishable from a truce, i will probably break out my Diplomacy set instead of playing a fleet action on an open map.

=====

By Michael Lui (MichaelLui) on Sunday, June 17, 2007 - 12:07 am: Edit

Paul, there's a small discrepancy with your example. All of those Stinger-2s have phaser-Gs. They are range 15 and will have the same chance of hitting your ships as you will of them. You shoot 8 disruptors and hit with one on a "1" for 3 damage while if you narrow salvo the phaser-Gs, they are shooting ~9 and hitting on a "1" for 4 damage. Basically, for the BPV, you can shoot 8 disruptors for every 8-9 phaser-Gs (the Stingers must have ships carrying/reloading them).

But you do have a point. The Klingons will just cruise around until they get tired of the Stingers sandpapering their rear shields and the Hellbore armed ships exacerbating the effects of the stingers' gats. If the Klingons can't kill enough stingers to balance the damage they're taking from the gats and hellbores, they just leave.

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Sunday, June 17, 2007 - 06:57 pm: Edit

And that's not even counting Happy Drone Fun, like mass Starfish launches.....I can almost guarantee there would be a D5D/D6D in that Klink fleet of Pauls'.

And shatterpacks.....

=====

By Paul Scott (The\_Rock) on Sunday, June 17, 2007 - 07:24 pm: Edit

Michael, Andy said all of his fighters will be at 10 ECCM (which I will just ignore and take the 3 shift, or maybe put up 2 ECM and take a 2 shift). They can't be doing that without EM, so they'll have a 2 shift as well. Makes R15 p-3s kind of difficult to target.

=====

By Michael Lui (MichaelLui) on Sunday, June 17, 2007 - 07:43 pm: Edit

If the EW model stays back at range 18 while the rest of the fighters are at 15, the rest of the fighters will have 6 ECCM as well as 10 ECM.

=====

By Paul Scott (The\_Rock) on Sunday, June 17, 2007 - 08:05 pm: Edit

I think you can guess the life expectancy of such a small, single target. In such a case, the entire fleet destroys the EW fighter at R22.

If you completely surrender initiative, all your gadgets will not help.

Chris,

Pretty much my point. When one player uses tactics guaranteed to at best achieve a draw, everyone should just stay home (or play a different game).

You spend all this time setting up the game, then you just plod around hoping your opponent will throw himself into your guns. Not much point I would think.

=====

By Michael Lui (MichaelLui) on Monday, June 18, 2007 - 05:12 am: Edit

Quote:

I think you can guess the life expectancy of such a small, single target. In such a case, the entire fleet destroys the EW fighter at R22.

And the other solution is to have all the fighters loaded with EW pods and the ships a couple hexes behind landing them ECCM. Same effect. An all day battle that either side will leave when things start going against them and they don't HAVE to win it.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Monday, June 18, 2007 - 09:34 am: Edit

If Paul can take an all D5 fleet, the Hydrans would be insane to not do the same "cherry picking" and buy an appropriately select bunch of ships.

The Hydrans shouldn't launch fighters until they have a chance of getting to range 10. This is another example of 1) Broken fleets (see SPPs rant about all CW fleets vs the ISC) and 2) a faulty assumption that BOTH fleets have to fight RIGHT There, as opposed to in the vicinity of some important bit of real estate...

=====

By Sandy Hemenway (Firemane) on Monday, June 18, 2007 - 09:46 am: Edit

Having played most of these tactical sets multiple times, I stand by my opening salvo: the R10 massed fighter fusion gambit is not a "losing" gambit, but a means to push the results away from extremes toward mediocrity.

Mind you, I have (on one occasion), taken a Cavalier and Traveler into a scenrio against a Gorn fleet with terrain being Gravity waves -- fired one massed fusion shot, landed most of the fighters, re-armed them and launched them for a 2nd shot. (The Gorn, convinced my CAV was disengaging went after the Traveler, which I sent off on a suicide tango).

The downside was that I only managed to get that 2nd fusion shot one impulse before a gravity wave took out the entire fighter squadron.

The most basic principle in play with Hydran engagements with significant fighter forces is pretty basic. From the OPPONENT perspective, in order to survive the Hydran over-run, they \*MUST\* get at least two broadsides at the fighters BEFORE decisively engaged. With VERY few exceptions, NOBODY can knock down an entire Hydran fighter swarm in a single swat. The R10 fusion option SIMPLIFIES the issue for the enemy. As noted above, the enemy will get his multiple shots at the stingers, reducing their numbers (and threat) without the worry of the overrun.

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Monday, June 18, 2007 - 05:37 pm: Edit

What I prefer about the R10 thing is that the Hydrans will, at the least, score damage to the opponent ships, at the cost of some Fighters. If the overrun attempt goes badly (or even evenly), the Hydrans suffer ship losses as well.

From a campaign perspective, using econ cost and fast construction rates for fighters (i.e., not using 6 month turns, but something that shows that ships take multiple turns to produce), it is a strong strategy as it, ultimately, requires the enemy to charge in to cause permanent damage (which removes the normal advantages they would get when defending against an overrun - such as multiple impulses of R3 ADD shots).

=====

By Sandy Hemenway (Firemane) on Tuesday, June 19, 2007 - 09:50 am: Edit

Andy,

Just so you'll understand. The vast majority of those Hydran games I am talking about were played in a campaign setting where ship losses were felt - where it did take time to rebuild (and repair) ships, etc.

The aggregate results from my play were VERY clear. My ability to kill enemy ships SOARED when employing nose-pack/overrun strategies. My repair costs jumped -- and I did lose some ships. But the overall ratio of ships killed to ships lost was MASSIVELY better for me when playing aggressively. Simply put, when following fighters in, the enemy fleets simply didn't have enough fire power left over after knocking down stinger swarms to have enough to destroy the ships.

The most common result was: fighters dead - multiple enemy ships dead -- some Hydran ships damaged.

The more passive R10 strategies resulted in fewer raw losses or Hydran ships, yes. But it also took the number of enemy ship losses nearly to zero as well.

So, the balance question is - in a campaign setup - is killing 3 enemy ships to every Hydran ship loss a desirable goal? Though I don't have the numbers with me, if memory serves, my ship killed to lost ratio when employing nose-pack strats was actually closer to 6 to 1. The R10 results were much closer to even, (though the raw totals were drastically lower).

Obviously, player ability comes into this as well. A novice is more likely to gaffe on the overrun and get FUBARed more often, while the R10 mitigates the danger to both enemy and self.

=====

By Loren Knight (Loren) on Tuesday, June 19, 2007 - 10:08 am: Edit

Sandy H.

That is the tactic that seems to be at the core of the Hydran doctrine. One wonders how they manage to recruit pilots.

Recruit: "So, you're saying that I WILL be shot out of the sky?"

Officer: "Of course but don't look so worried Laddy. You got an escape mechanism and we'll come 'round and pick you up."

Recruit: "But what if the fleet doesn't win the battle?"

Officer (stern voice): "Look boy, you do your job and we'll do ours and everything will be fine. I'm beginning to think you have something against Free Mating."

Recruit: "Free Mating?"

Officer (big grin): "Only after every victory."

Recruit: "Oh... OK then. Where do I sign?"

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Tuesday, June 19, 2007 - 10:20 am: Edit

I would suggest that LONG TERM threatening to make the overrun will make the other side hesitate and play more conservatively.

He has to decide whether to trade long range alphas or risk having you come zooming into close range knife fighting range. Mixing up the strategies might be optimal, especially if you are playing the same opponent all the time.

=====

By Michael Powers (Mtpowers) on Tuesday, June 19, 2007 - 11:01 am: Edit

Loren: As I understand it, with the invention of Remote Control in J2 it was "discovered" that most Hydran fighters were actually being flown that way.

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Tuesday, June 19, 2007 - 11:39 am: Edit

Bah. Real Hydrans use pilots, not PS3 consoles.

\*snorts\*

=====

By Loren Knight (Loren) on Tuesday, June 19, 2007 - 11:42 am: Edit

"Stinger Ace II" had record sales in Y172 AND was subsidized by the guilds for the Academic version (which was ice cheap).

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Tuesday, June 19, 2007 - 05:01 pm: Edit

Sandy. It sounds, though, like your campaign used smaller map sizes, which gave your opponents less time to kill charging fighters. I strongly suspect that in an "always 2x2" environment you would have different results.

=====

By Sandy Hemenway (Firemane) on Wednesday, June 20, 2007 - 11:11 am: Edit

Andy,

While I suspect that you are correct - a change in the board size would have "some" impact on the results - based on my real world experiences, the "perception" of board size influence on results does not jibe with the actual results.

Some of my greatest victories were in the larger frays with multiple boards. And I had occasional debacles on small boards.

But, in the end, I'm basing my judgement NOT on general theoretical back and forth - but on actual game play. Is board size a factor? Sure. But it was not remotely the single deciding factor that overwhelms everything else.

In the end, I believe player ability is easily the most important factor. I don't expect every player grabbing a Hydran will end up with a 6:1 kill ratio employing nose-pack strategies. My point is that the \*ONLY\* way to figure out what works best for any given player is to attempt multiple strategies in multiple scenarios. Then, analyze the results. The RESULTS are far, far, far more important than the theoretical discussions. One can take the results, examine them and attempt to get at the "why" in hindsight to adapt and improve.

It took three years of getting my head handed to me on a weekly basis before I had enough data to sift through and actually start identifying patterns and adjusting my play.

Individual playing strengths and weaknesses vary. Scenario parameters vary. Racial opponent pairings vary. Every player and every group has its own unique traits. But that is irrelevant. What is relevant is in order to improve, one HAS to be willing to examine one's philosophies, tactics, strategies and methodologies and at least entertain the concept that there may be ways to improve.

In the end, my Hydran nose-pack stats were what led me to my Kzinti tactics that I used in '88 to win my Hat. My turn 1, 10-drone stack became my Stinger substitute. It never would've happened had I not begun reviewing three years of weekly arse-kickings.

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Wednesday, June 20, 2007 - 03:18 pm: Edit

Sandy. My views are also based on real-world experience, of similar length and scope. Given the variables involved, we each developed tactics that worked in our environments.

=====

By Vincent Ferrara (Vmferrara) on Monday, November 19, 2007 - 07:15 pm: Edit

One range 10 tactic that's worked for me in the past was to pick a mixed hellbore/fusion fleet that is more heavily stacked toward hellbores. I run the fighters in to range 10, with the ships 5 hexes behind. I then fire everything except the hellbores and ship-mounted gatlings. If you have enough Ph-1, Ph-2, and fusions at range 15, they can actually put a dent in something, especially combined with range 10 stingers. If the fleet is large enough, I might even split the fire between two targets. In the impulses after the fighters HET, I'll use the hellbores to Mizia the ship(s) with the wounded shield(s) while I close with the fighters to recover them. Having so many weapons to reload makes the "Sir Robin bravely ran away" turns a bit tricky, but at least you don't have to deal with drones, ADD's, and T-bombs at knife-fighting range.

After (finally) reloading and turning around, I might have the fusion ships lead the next charge, followed by the fighters and hellbore ships, just to mix it up and maybe confuse the opponent's planning a little. The whole point of all this is to preserve the hellbore ships as long as possible while using the fighters and fusion ships to draw fire and to create as many downed shields as you can before they die. It's been my experience that opponents really WANT to kill the hellbore ships, but they can't afford to ignore the fusion ships and fighters when they are much closer.

=====

## ANDROMEDAN TACTICS

By Robert Russell Lender-Lundak (Rusman) on Sunday, February 04, 2007 - 03:10 am: Edit

Where was the Maggot Interceptor published?

I believe I have seen the Andro PF's in SFT but can't remember about the Maggot.

=====

By Robert Russell Lender-Lundak (Rusman) on Sunday, February 04, 2007 - 03:20 am: Edit

Where was the Maggot Interceptor published?

I believe I have seen the Andro PF's in SFT but can't remember about the Maggot.

=====

By Tim Longacre (Timl) on Sunday, February 04, 2007 - 05:07 pm: Edit

They are in the same SFT the PFs were in, just a page or 2 before the full 6-PF SSD.

=====

By Robert Eddy (Tar\_Zhay) on Friday, April 20, 2007 - 01:14 pm: Edit

Just to verify a tactic I am using with my andro fleet.

I can beam out a satellite ship and the displace it with the same ship on the same impulse.

Or is there something I'm missing?

=====

By Paul Franz (Andromedan) on Friday, April 20, 2007 - 01:42 pm: Edit

Yes, but why. You can launch a SatShip via Displacement without using a transporter.

=====

By Scott Tenhoff (Scottt) on Friday, April 20, 2007 - 01:53 pm: Edit

Range of getting the Sat ship out would be my guess.

You transport it 5 hexes then displace it further.

SOP would probably be the easiest answer. What step is transporting SatShips and firing DisDevs.

=====

By Paul Franz (Andromedan) on Friday, April 20, 2007 - 09:44 pm: Edit

To be honest the times I have tried this approach, I have died due to the lack of power afterwards. Of course, this has been against high speed seeking weapon opponents. So it might work if the mothership only needs to move speed 15 or so.

I prefer to use the pre-deployment option and come running in with the SatShips deployed and guns blazing. And then use the Motherships to quickly save the crippled SatShips. Though this is still a challenge.

=====

By Geoff Conn (Talonz) on Saturday, April 21, 2007 - 01:22 pm: Edit

Yeah. I don't see a good reason to use a disdev to slingshot a single satship out (assuming you have more than one) simply because it violates the concentration of fire doctrine.

Sure, you may be able to catch someone's down shield but why isn't the satship in play already??

=====

By Paul Franz (Andromedan) on Saturday, April 21, 2007 - 03:56 pm: Edit

The only time I can see the use at all might be with use of the Eliminator or Terminator.

Paul Franz

=====

By Geoff Conn (Talonz) on Saturday, April 21, 2007 - 07:01 pm: Edit

Yeah I guess that could be kinda nifty.

=====

By Tim Longacre (Timl) on Sunday, April 22, 2007 - 03:33 pm: Edit

I once did something similar to what Robert is asking about in a base assault (ISC BATS). Basically, I wanted the MAM my INT was carrying to soak up/take the BATS' phaser firepower so my INT could close-and-hose without getting gutted. I beamed my MAM out then DisDeved it to R1 on IMP32 of turn 2 of this particular game.

It was a shame to lose the MAM that way, but the base went down later on turn 3 and I suffered no internals to my INT.

=====

By Scott Jackson (Wittybanter) on Wednesday, May 30, 2007 - 03:31 pm: Edit

I am doing a base station assault this Saturday. We decided to try an equal BPV battle (I know that there are scenarios on this, but we wanted to try a straight up BPV battle with a fixed target). He is taking Feds, and I want to get more exposure to the Andros. I have played them in some duels, but for an action like this what would be a good combo? We both have 300 BPV to spend w/ 20% commanders - he has to fit his station in that of course.

I am thinking a Ravager and a Mamba, although I also am thinking about learning more about Sat ships interaction. The base has me outgunned from up close, so I was thinking some mid range TR strikes to drop a shield and then close for the kill.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Wednesday, May 30, 2007 - 03:51 pm: Edit

A base with NO attrition units, minefield or ships? OOh, tough. Just pick your favorite range (don't forget the EW issues) and fire away. Tac to perform the dump and you should be fine.

=====

By Jim Davies (Mudfoot) on Wednesday, May 30, 2007 - 05:02 pm: Edit

Assuming this is a post-Y175 BS, it has a BPV of about 154+drones, leaving something like an NCL, FFG+Pol or F18 squadron.

If it's the ship(s), stay out of R17 (effective P4 range), displace any enemy ships out of under the base's guns and kill them. Recuperate, then kill the base.

If the fighters, use T-bombs to kill drones. Don't close with the base until the fighters are dead.

Take lots of T-bombs and BPs to get the most out of your transporters, but I guess that's obvious (there's not much else to spend COs on). As soon as you feel you can close in, ring the base with T-bombs set for SC6-7 so his own drones and shuttles will set them off.

EW will be a pain throughout, unless you can persuade him to waste power.

=====

By Scott Jackson (Wittybanter) on Wednesday, May 30, 2007 - 05:08 pm: Edit

Thanks. Out of interest, do you think this scenario favors one side over the other (the 300 BPV station/attacker fight)? We were thinking of adding a 10 turn limit on it, which would shake things up a bit.

Mike: Re-read my post. he also has 300 BPV to spend (though he must pay for the station with that), and he has shown that he really likes Fed fighters so I expect some expendable firepower cruising around. I agree if the base was by itself it would be a cakewalk.

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Wednesday, May 30, 2007 - 05:12 pm: Edit

You're going to need two things in as much abundance as you can get: TRHs and EW support. If he's fighter heavy, you'll want some T-bombs too.

But you do need a scout in the battle, or else he can just have his way with you EW-wise.

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Wednesday, May 30, 2007 - 05:24 pm: Edit

Can you bring in independant SatShips, or do you have to bring them in the hanger?

If you can, I'd recommend an Exploiter backed up by an Eel. Weighs in at 284 BPV, gives you 4 TRHs, 4 sensor channels, and the power to use 'em.

=====

By Ken Kazinski (Kjkazinski) on Wednesday, May 30, 2007 - 09:57 pm: Edit

Remember that he could have an additional 36 shuttles.

=====

By Tim Longacre (Timl) on Thursday, May 31, 2007 - 01:57 pm: Edit

Too bad you couldn't go for 15 more BPV, an IMP with a small energy module is one tough customer with or without EW support.

All-in-all, I like Dales force, although I would also add a MWP if he'll spot you the extra points (BPV cost, it is cheaper EPV wise to the point of being allowable) and you can bring in SatShips independent of motherships.

If you can have independent units, you will want to keep the Eel and MWP together (for mutual protection) out at range 20ish while the EXP goes in under heavy ECM to do strafing runs against the mobile units.

Once they fall, regroup, recoup, and one-shot the base.

Finally, remember that you can lend 6 ECM AND 6 ECCM to any ship other than the scout so long as you have the power and channels to do so.

=====

By Scott Jackson (Wittybanter) on Friday, June 01, 2007 - 05:12 pm: Edit

I wonder how a single ship would fare? An Intruder with an energy module for example.

The exploiter seems like a good idea overall, and I agree that having scout power may be a really good idea for a number of reasons. I will post the results when the battle is complete. Thanks all!

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Friday, June 01, 2007 - 06:41 pm: Edit

The big problem an Intruder (alone) would have is EW. He would have to remain outside of range-15 to guarentee only suffering a 2-shift on his fire; if entering within loaning range,

he could potentially suffer a 3-shift on fire (Base generates 6 ECM, self-loans 6 ECM, and loans the INT 6 OEW).

If I were the Fred, a PAM would definitely be part of my forces (adding 6 AWR & 6 BATT), and an MRS too (to help with the EW-fu).

=====

By Richard Sherman (Rich) on Friday, June 01, 2007 - 07:21 pm: Edit

Dale,

The heck with that! Make it an HPM (15 power and 9 BATT)!

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Friday, June 01, 2007 - 07:47 pm: Edit

May not be available depending on the year of the battle. But, yeah.

=====

By Scott Jackson (Wittybanter) on Monday, June 04, 2007 - 12:18 pm: Edit

Well, I went with a different type of fleet than I expected and it seemed to work. I took a Ravager carrying a Terminator (I really wanted to try out sat ships). He had the station and a Fed HDW (w/ mine racks). It basically came to his escort getting a ways out from the station to lay mines and I disved in close to him (about range 14 from the station still). Hit 2 NSMs that were in the same hex on the way in, and did about 15 internals to the HDW. Transported the TER behind his ship near the end of Turn 1 after doing some panel tricks to get energy into it. By impulse 32 it was 2 hexes from his HDW and could fire on 1 of next turn. He conceded the game as his escort was going to die and then it me with 9 turns to pick the range and kill his station.

My thoughts are that 300 BPV is too low to play this at. We are going to round up a friend or 2 and give an 800 BPV a go.

=====

By Joe Stevenson (Alligator) on Sunday, July 22, 2007 - 01:15 pm: Edit

Where might I find the latest consolidated Andro MSC? Is it in any of the recent CLs?

=====

By Robert Russell Lender-Lundak (Rusman) on Thursday, August 09, 2007 - 01:17 am: Edit

Joe,

I am probably posting this too late but try to pay a visit to your local gaming store and pick up a copy of the Master Ship Chart (Module G2).

It has almost every Andromedan ship save for a relative few that were released in some old Starletters and Starfleet Times issues and perhaps a couple from a Captains Log or two.

=====

## SCENARIO TACTICS

By Martin Read (Amethyst\_Cat) on Thursday, February 15, 2007 - 02:57 pm: Edit

SH2.0 The Surprise Reversed is, as far as I can determine, almost painfully easy to beat Tony Stocker's score at.

The Fed can use consumable items (a Type IV-M explosive drone, the two precharged eighteen-point suicide shuttles allowed by WS-III, and three T-bombs bought as Commander's Options) to inflict a great deal of damage on the Romulan fleet; even if the Romulan player plots TACs instead of movement, and TACs after every T-bomb detonation, every ship in the Romulan fleet will take 15 internals.

Combined with the Federation CC+'s fearsome single-turn direct-fire capability, it is reasonably practical to kill the WE and BH outright, cripple two of the other three ships, and significantly damage one.

Have I missed something, are the terms and conditions of the scenario incompatible with Captain's Edition SFB, or is it really supposed to reduce to a relatively simple exercise in analysing the Federation ship's available resources and filling in its turn 1 EAF?

=====

By Richard Sherman (Rich) on Thursday, February 15, 2007 - 07:50 pm: Edit

Yeah, it's a pretty easy scenario. Think of it as a trainer for players that have progressed beyond "beginner" level, but aren't quite "veterans" yet. The purpose of the scenario is to teach a player how to get the maximum offensive potential out of his ship in the shortest amount of time.

If you want a little bit more of a challenge, replace the Romulans with Klingons (D7, D6, F5C, F5, E4, or similar). The presence of disruptors presents a bit more of a challenge.

If you want the "veteran's" version of this scenario - a REAL challenge - try "Death of the Star Cougar" in module R7.

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Monday, March 05, 2007 - 07:51 pm: Edit

The Klingon version, is, of course, 'The Mighty Hood Goes Down', aka The Kobayashi Maru Scenario (as most Fed players call it).

You give a newbie the Klingons and, well, try and not get captured...

=====

By Jeremy Gray (Gray) on Sunday, March 25, 2007 - 10:55 am: Edit

A new question: I'm taking a Federation CLa+ into SM7.0 vs an Adult Space Dragon. My gut tells me that the CL should wade through the opening PI-G and go for an early overload shot on the dragon, then use its good speed to evade and reload. The dragon is limited to speed 25 early and if the Fed can land one photon and hit with phasers for about 28 total damage, he should be able to slow the dragon to about 20 (both photons and a centerlined phaser shot could do around 50 and slow the dragon to speed 17 or so).

Anyone got any additional advice on this one. I'd like to avoid having the CL take too much damage, however I'll take damage if necessary to get this one accomplished. Saving the armor would be awesome (so I don't need to overhaul the ship), but I'm not holding my breath.

=====

By Loren Knight (Loren) on Sunday, March 25, 2007 - 12:47 pm: Edit

Don't be afraid to turn off and take the opening plasma on the side then HET into for you first big shot. Against this opponant you can use you HET for an aggressive move instead of keeping in reserve for an emergency.

You are right about getting it to slow down early on. But you want to preserve your forward shield so you can take a second photon shot.

=====

By Jeremy Gray (Gray) on Monday, March 26, 2007 - 11:04 am: Edit

Absolutely. If I'm going to eat that PI-G, I definitely want to take it on something other than the #1.

I'd love to use my drones in a scatterpack, but unless the dragon gets wounded, I'll just be wasting the drones. Maybe a gambit for later in the game.

=====

By Ezekiel Price Carpenter-Hyland (Admiral\_Zekedak) on Monday, May 21, 2007 - 12:58 pm: Edit

Just played out SH96 "Revenge of the Eagles".

Can someone point out a mistake on my behalf? The Romulans appear to lose this scenario every time as, contrary to what's stated, the Fed CVS Nimitz can easily run them. As such there almost no chance the Romulans can cripple, let alone destroy, the Fed CVS Nimitz turn 1.

Session Report.

The Nimitz dodged the Romulans with a HET and speed 14. The Romulan ships were just too slow (max speed 20 for the WE and 24 for the 2xSNs) to catch up (starting from 21 & 20 hexes away). While the KE Audax could have reached range 5, but this 1-4 hit bracket for plasma bolts was prevented when the FFR Spruance tractorred the Audax (could not be prevented as the Audax used all it's power & most batteries

moving/loading R-torp). At the end of turn 1, all the Romulan ships opened fire on the Nimitz. Damage destroyed the #4 shield, but did not score any internals (10 reinforcement + batteries). While my dice were below average (bolts hitting; 1xF from KE in 6-10 bracket, 1xG from WE and 2xSNs in the 11-20 bracket at range 15, 11 and 12 respectively), only a massive stroke of luck would cause enough warp damage to prevent the CVS from running at a speed low enough to prevent disengagement by acceleration and give the Romulans at least a change to catch up.

What am I missing?

Even if the Nimitz did not HET, the slow speed of the WE and SNs still keeps them far enough away to score seeking plasma hits or expect decent bolt damage (presuming the Audax is blocked by escorts, something that is easy to accomplish). Makes me want to use non-historical ships (WE with 2/3 move rate and SN with 2 extra warp).

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Tuesday, May 22, 2007 - 11:56 am: Edit

I think one thing you may be missing is that the scenario uses a floating map. The Nimitz can disengage by distance or acceleration, but not by cruising off the map edge. He won't be able to leave by acceleration until Turn 3 at the earliest.

Also, I assume you meant 1x R from the WE; WE's don't have G-torps, they have R-torps.

=====

By Ezekiel Price Carpenter-Hyland (Admiral\_Zekedak) on Tuesday, May 22, 2007 - 07:50 pm: Edit

Yep, WE has and R and SNs have the Gs. I just lumped all the torps bolted from the same range bracket together.

Floating map may in fact be part of the problem as the low WE/SN top speeds makes it impossible for them to be effective past a turn 1 plasma pot-shot if the Feds choose to run (and sitting is just plain suicide).

One thing I missed is that if neither the CVS or KE/WE are destroyed, modified victory conditions are used. While this can cut both ways (Feds must be careful about sacrificing escorts), it hits the Romulans harder as they must accumulate more points than they will give up disengaging when Fed reinforcements arrive. Seems like the only way to do this is with massive luck on plasma bolts/phasers at long range as only the KE needs to be held off in a running battle. The target may also be limited to the CVS as killing either the DE or FFR will not score enough.

Don't know about you, but I feel like the Romulans always get the short end (Surprised Reversed, Titan & Unicorn, others). Even when they finally catch someone else flat footed for a change it's impossible for them to kill anything.

=====

By Jeremy Gray (Gray) on Tuesday, May 22, 2007 - 08:22 pm: Edit

One approach you could use if the escorts attempt to block is to bombard the escorts with a ton of plasma (every one you have, including pseudos if necessary) to get them out of the way, then run down the CVS with the KE for an anchor. If you can anchor him and hold him until turn 4, he could be dead as a door nail. It is a high risk strategy, but a CVS trying to run at high speed can't do much else (he only has 34 power), so if he is trying to run hard, and you catch him, he is toast.

=====

By Kevin M. McCollum (Kevinmccollum) on Tuesday, May 22, 2007 - 09:08 pm: Edit

Tractoring a ship doesn't prevent disengagement by acceleration.

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Tuesday, May 22, 2007 - 10:04 pm: Edit

No, but pounding the crap out of him with phasers and T-bombs might. Also, if you're going for this, you could use Suicide Shuttles too.

It would also let you nail him with any plasma you didn't expend on his escorts.

=====

By Jeremy Gray (Gray) on Tuesday, May 22, 2007 - 10:25 pm: Edit

The key is slowing him down so the slower ships can engage before he escapes. A tractor in the middle of turn 2 would accomplish that. After that, it becomes a matter of how quickly you can inflict damage.

Outside of a tractor or a lucky bolt shot, it is going to be hard to kill the CVS if he is intent on simply running away at maximum speed.

=====

By William T Wilson (Sheap) on Wednesday, May 23, 2007 - 06:06 pm: Edit

From the previous page...

" SH2.0 The Surprise Reversed is, as far as I can determine, almost painfully easy to beat Tony Stocker's score at."

Yeah, I concur.

I'd like to spice it up a bit. I am offering to play this on SFBOL (or locally in Seattle area) under the following conditions:

Let's suppose the Federation captain wants to maintain plausible deniability. He knows there is a gap in the sensor network for this sector that periodically lasts for a few minutes. He knows that if there are any survivors, they'll be able to recount what happened. And he knows that if his ship is too badly damaged, Romulan intelligence will figure out what happened. To this end:

\* Use the Romulan force given in the Basic Set scenario setup, rather than the "historical" version with snipes and whatnot.

\* The attacking ship must retreat uncrippled back over his side of the border by the end of turn 3. If not, he loses.

\* The attacking ship must destroy the entire Romulan fleet. Capture is only OK if the attacker and captured ship are both back over the border by turn 3.

\* No matter what the attacker does, all the Romulan ships activate at the end of turn 1.

\* Romulans may not use sublight disengagement.

\* No hidden mines or other optional rules unless agreed here, normal EW is in use, etc etc.

\* Note that the Romulans cannot even lay mines, cloak, or even energize (much less power) their phasers on turn 1 (this is part of the basic scenario setup, but, wow, it hurts).

\* No poor crew (outstanding crew OK)

Attacker can use any one ship from any alpha sector nation (or andromedans, jindarians, etc. but no omega), it doesn't have to be a historical Romulan enemy, it could even be the Romulans (early start to civil war ). No prototype, conjectural, unbuilt variant, etc. Year is 173, same as in the book. Orions have to pick a cartel (any cartel is OK) and use optional weapons legal for that cartel.

Attacker must bid for their ship. I'll play the Romulans against the lowest bidder, unless I'm the lowest bidder, and then the second lowest bidder has to play the Romulans against me. Bid price includes CO's, refits, drone speeds, etc. If you are outbid you can bid again.

I am pretty sure I can accomplish this with the specified CC and some COs, so I'll start the bidding there - let's say 170 total points. (You don't have to say what ship you are planning to use, just what race and how much it costs)

Any takers?

=====

By Andy Vancil (Andy) on Tuesday, July 03, 2007 - 04:53 pm: Edit

I was recently looking at (SH1.0), Sabotage, and wondering how the Fed ship has any chance of winning this. To me it looks like the Klingon should be able to move into the Fed's hex before impulse 25, make the Fed eat a heavy drone and follow it up with 4 OLs and at least 5 P2s, crippling the Fed. If the Fed doesn't blow up when the Klingon fires again impulse 1, he is sure to die on impulse 4 when the scatterpack (slow) drones impact.

Has anyone actually played this one?

=====

By William T Wilson (Sheap) on Tuesday, July 03, 2007 - 05:31 pm: Edit

The Fed has no chance to survive make your time. That is why Kosnett is a legendary captain. (And yet Stocker managed to get himself blown up in the Surprise Reversed! That should also qualify him as "legendary" although not in exactly the same way).

I'm think the scenario predates scatterpacks. It is pretty much a direct copy of the battle from "Elaan of Troyius" and so I think "historical accuracy" is the only thing the battle is going for. It is close to a fair fight with a fully functioning Fed. Vs. an F5, which starts with a WS no higher than 1, it might be a playable if uninteresting scenario. The outcome would basically depend on whether the Fed can get his engines started, and scenarios where one side can't move are usually pretty dull, see the early years Romulans for more details.

=====

By David Crew (Catwholeaps) on Wednesday, July 04, 2007 - 01:02 am: Edit

The historical scenarios in basic set (SH1-4) are all pretty much training scenarios. For an experienced player, they are a cakewalk - but for a newby vs an experienced player, it can at least provide entertainment.

=====

By William T Wilson (Sheap) on Wednesday, July 04, 2007 - 08:13 am: Edit

Not sure if this is the right place but not sure where else to post it.

I am not finding a lot of scenarios involving Andromedans vs. PFs. I would think this would be a pretty common event. PFs were used vs. Andro satellite bases as a PFT/SCS could use its scout sensors to find the bases and then use the PFs to attack, and then conversely, since you never know where Andros will strike, it's likely that PFs will be the only thing around when they do.

Is there some game reason why PFs don't "work" with Andromedans or is it just some coincidence that there aren't any scenarios for it? Or do these scenarios actually exist and I just can't find any?

=====

By Greg Ernest (Grege) on Thursday, July 05, 2007 - 09:02 am: Edit

Coincidence, I believe. But if you don't get other answers before next Tuesday, it's because almost everyone who frequents this board is at Origins.

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Thursday, July 05, 2007 - 12:48 pm: Edit

PF's work great vs Andro's.

Especially Orion PF's...

=====

By Trent Telenko (Ttelenko) on Thursday, July 05, 2007 - 06:23 pm: Edit

What would the tactics be for (SH.24) in light of J2.

The Scenario is a Y187 ISC patrol of a Federation colony confronted by a Federation relief force on a fixed map.

The sides are the following:

ISC -- CS, DD, FF

Federation -- CLC, FFG, LTT + CVL pod (LTV) with 12xF18C.

The scenario special options are as follows:

ISC -- MRS on the CS, full T-bomb stores for all ships.

Federation -- MRS on the CLC, The Federation is limited to Type IF standard drones on all Ships and fighters.

All units are WS-III.

My initial take is that the scenario is heavily weighted anti-ISC simply based on the number of scatter packs and drone control channels in the Federation force.

The Feds have up to five fully loaded scatter packs, one fully loaded MRS and 11 fully loaded F-18C (plus a EF18 EWF), with four F18s on map at scenario start.

There are 12 drone control channels on the CLC and FFG, another 12 on the LTV, six on the MRS, 12 on the EF18 EWF, six on one F18 with a drone control pod. That is 48 drone control channels.

These units could control the 30 scatter pack drones plus launch their own drone to boot.

There are another 10 F18s that can control 20 of their own drones, but only launch 10 Type-IF a turn.

The scenario tactics suggestion is that the ISC take out the LTV first and then deal with the fighters and ships because they only have two PPD versus six photons.

How in the universe are they going to pull that off in the face of 40+ drone launches on the first turn and 17 drone launches a turn sustained for the next three turns?

Now add remote controls from J2 for up to eight of the F18Cs?!!?

Two pulses of 50+ drones on a fixed map spread out over time and space so six t-bombs cannot get more than a small fraction at a time will put the ISC into a world of hurt.

The Feds can use that scatter pack/remote fighter launch threat to force the ISC out of the center of the map.

Then, if the ISC slows down to use a weasal, they eat overloaded photons.

If they stay fast, they will get eaten to death by drones trying to stay out of the map corners.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Thursday, July 05, 2007 - 09:27 pm: Edit

Trent, did you confirm those control channels on the Fed Ships? The CLC and FFG should have 6 (or maybe even only 3) control channels IIRC.

Remote control for fighters eats up control channels for drones, right?

I admit I have zero of my books here...

=====

By William T Wilson (Sheap) on Thursday, July 05, 2007 - 09:59 pm: Edit

I think he meant 12 total between the CLC and FFG. They are both drone armed ships so both have 6 channels, neither has double control though.

Fighter remote control takes up channels, but not very many, it's 3 fighters per channel.

=====

By Kevin M. McCollum (Kevinmccollum) on Thursday, July 05, 2007 - 11:25 pm: Edit

Andy, those old scenarios were actually in the original pocket handbook. prior to overloads, any drone other than type 1 slow, scatterpacks, etc.

=====

By Trent Telenko (Ttelenko) on Friday, July 06, 2007 - 11:35 am: Edit

Micheal,

Federation scenario drone control channel capability:

2 control channels - 10 x F18

6 control channels - 1 x CLC

6 control channels - 1 x FFG

6 control channels - 1 x MRS shuttle

6 control channels - 1 x F18 + Drone control pod

12 control channels - 1 x LTV

12 control channels - 1 x F18 EWF

All but the plain vanilla F18s can accept transfers of drone control from other units.

Only the LTV can handle remote F18s per J2.

This scenario was unbalanced against the ISC due to Federation scatter packs to start with.

Remote control Federation fighters makes it impossible, IMO.

=====

By Richard Sherman (Rich) on Friday, July 06, 2007 - 12:43 pm: Edit

Trent,

Our group has played that scenario twice in the past. Even without remote control (which came after our plays), we found it unbalanced.

Our fix was to change the CS to a CC. The two extra S-torps made it a fairer fight. We debated changing the FF to a DD as well, but didn't.

Another more radical change 1 player suggested (but we didn't want to add more fighters) is to leave the CS in, and change the DD and FF to a CVE and FFA...

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Friday, July 06, 2007 - 12:55 pm: Edit

Or you could give the ISC some casual PF's.....

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Friday, July 06, 2007 - 06:59 pm: Edit

What do the BPVs compare at? I don't have books at work.

=====

By Trent Telenko (Ttelenko) on Saturday, July 07, 2007 - 12:55 am: Edit

Richard,

That sounds more like it. However, it does not fit the ISC dotrinal fleets.

The ISC does CS, DD, FF as their small echelon.

The CA, 2xCL, 2-3 DD, 3xFF and SC as their medium echelon. (sometimes with a CS or CM subed for a CL)

The larger echelon has a DN/BCH/CC, CA, CS, 2 x CL, 3xDD and 3xFF, and a SC or HSC.

Carrier groups are subed for some of the line ships or are added in the above.

The thing I object to in SFB is the way people throw around casual PFs in pick up games.

F&E has casual PFs are a rare thing -- 20 casual PFs four casual flotillas in the whole fleet. The Lyrans have more, 35 in seven casual flotillas.

You should see casual PFs on command cruisers in squadrons, not a couple PFs on a CW and a DW.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Saturday, July 07, 2007 - 08:40 pm: Edit

Actually, in F&E the PFs are abstracted out of a lot of their deployment. Would you REALLY want to allocate several HUNDRED PFs as counters or whatever?

PFs were built "by the thousands."

So you have late war fleets and squadrons where the PFs balance, so they are about ignored. The PFs ON THE MAP are the ones where they make a significant difference (in \$ or combat)... All IMHO of course.

=====

By Ezekiel Price Carpenter-Hyland (Admiral\_Zekedak) on Saturday, July 07, 2007 - 11:25 pm: Edit

In response to the question by William T Wilson (Sheap), the few scenarios including PF's vs. Andros may be due to the fact that Andros lack their own attrition units and can be easily overwhelmed. While this is just personal experience, one game involving Romulans resulted in my Dominator almost being crippled when just one of the little bugger got a volley of 4 unopposed plasma-Fs in at close range on nearly full PAs (3 spilled too). After that, I can see why the Andros would want to avoid anything other than fast raids when PFs are around.

=====

By William T Wilson (Sheap) on Sunday, July 08, 2007 - 04:08 am: Edit

Andromedans have MWPs now which, while not exactly PFs, are close.

Also you may have overlooked the plasma F firing restrictions for PFs - they can't fire all of them at once, or anything close to that.

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Sunday, July 08, 2007 - 06:20 pm: Edit

MWP's don't even come CLOSE to true PF's.

They're more like really big (crappy) fighters.

=====

By Richard Sherman (Rich) on Monday, July 09, 2007 - 12:38 pm: Edit

Trent,

It may not fit the ISC doctrinal fleets, but you fight with what you have, not what you want.

Besides, there's at least one other published scenario that has a CC escorted by just two small ships (remnants from an earlier battle). I think it's called "Eat my Dust." (Scenario Book 2?)

=====

By Ezekiel Price Carpenter-Hyland (Admiral\_Zekedak) on Monday, July 09, 2007 - 06:33 pm: Edit

I guess you are right, firing one plasma-F every 8 impulses is not really rapid succession. As such, volley is not the best word to use. It still trashed my Dominator though.

=====

By Ezekiel Price Carpenter-Hyland (Admiral\_Zekedak) on Tuesday, August 28, 2007 - 06:02 pm: Edit

It's been more than 2 months, so I feel free to post again...

-Introduction

A while back I reported on Revenge of the Eagles (HS96) and said the scenario is seriously unbalanced. Problem is the Federation CVS Nimitz and her escorts (DE & 2xFFE) can easily evade the Romulan ambush as the WE and 2xSNs simply lack engine power. In my first go the Nimitz only the KE got in a reasonable bolt shot, but the Nimitz took only a trivial number of internals (13) following reasonable dice rolls from all Romulan ships. The KE was then forced to fall back and the Feds easily kept the range over 10 and when reinforcements (CA+, CL+, DD+) arrived. In the end, outnumbered and outclassed Romulans were forced to flee giving the Feds an easy decisive victory (6:1). The only way this could have been avoided was amazing bolt dice (six rolls of 1).

-Revenge Revisited

Here I give the Romulans another chance, but only after significantly upgrading their fleet. Both SNs are replaced with BHs (a & b) possessing enlarged warp engines (total warp is 16), so they can get into range AND fire their plasmas. In addition, the WE was exchanged with a Battle Eagle from the PhD shipyard website (replace Plasma-R with FP Plasma-S and RP/LP Plasma-Fs, movement rate reduced to 2/3).

-Tactical Assessment

At max speed the Romulans can reach range 5 on the Nimitz and get the 1-4 bracket on plasma bolts before she speeds away, but doing so would give the Feds an EW advantage all round and force the BHs to load just one PL-G. In addition, all Romulan ships would also have to simultaneously enter a tiny area of space that could be packed with Fed T-bombs. As such, the Romulans opt for shots in the 1-3 bracket.

-Set Up

Everyone takes T-bombs for commanders Options (learned later). The WE and BE hold a WW. Fed reinforcement die roll is a 6 (they arrive turn 7).

-Turn 1

All Romulans move speed 27 and load plasmas. All Federation ships move speed 14 and pull immediate HETs to direction-D. With the Federation flying straight, the Romulans must cross the 1927-2524-2825 line to reach a 1-3 bolt bracket. The FFEs and DE maneuver along this line while all Fed ships use transporters to scatter T-bomb markers. While hidden mines could be anywhere, transporters drop more markers along the Western side, visited by only one ship (an FFE). The KE & BE could have avoided this -line of death- by using reserve warp power, but thought better. When the BE hits range 16, the Nimitz activates 6 ECM. The KE and BE fully counter on battery power while the BHs get down to a -1 shift with batteries & 1 point allocated power. Five F-4s (rails empty) take up positions behind either end of the minefield. The Romulans aim towards the middle and a BH pulls ahead to

steamroll. A wave of 8 drones meets it ahead of the line. As they are closing at speed 47, T-bombs are dismissed in favor of phasers and all are destroyed (12 P-1s needed). The Fed escorts regroup behind the carrier except for one FFE wide to the West. The lead BH enters the minefield and detonates 3 T-bombs on #6 shield (5 dead armor). Fire from three fighters 2-3 hexes away scores 5 more internals; 2 phasers (empty), 2 hull and a warp. No more mines are struck as the Romulans move through. The Feds hold their fire except for the remaining fighters, which do a couple of points on the other BE's #2. Impulse 32, the Romulans open up on the Nimitz with all the plasma they have plus a couple of phasers at range 7-8.

-Plasmas

KE @ 1-3; R & F

BE @ 1-3; one F for 8.

BHa @ 1-2 (EW); zip

BHb @ 1-2 (EW); one G for 10

-Phasers

Only the KE can fire, and scores a couple of solid blows for 13 points.

-Results

While the KE's gunner is slated for promotion, overall damage was as expected (i.e. average). The Nimitz uses 4 batteries (2 on reinforcement, 2 on shield repair) and took 37 internals including 6 warp, 2 impulse, 1 photon, 2 P-3s, 2 right side P-1s, 5 empty fighter boxes, Aux Con, 2 battery, 1 trac, 1 tran and all 14 hull. The Nimitz's maximum effective speed was reduced to 22, and though it could still try and run while the escorts/fighters cover, there is little incentive in doing so as reinforcing the #4 and/or turning would hamper attempts to leave the Romulans behind. The Federation also now has the initiative with loaded weapons/fighters and no plasma threat.

-Conclusion

The scenario appears to have been fixed as the Romulans were able to prevent the Nimitz from evading. With average reinforcement arrival the Romulans should be able to pull off one more round of plasmas for a possible win. Sadly, a ship not in the Romulan armory (the Battle Eagle) was needed to allow them any chance of completing a sneak attack mission which typifies their Eagle class. While Hawk class ships could have been used instead, the flavor, if not the title of this scenario, would need to be changed.

=====

By William T Wilson (Sheap) on Thursday, August 30, 2007 - 03:33 pm: Edit

OK, I looked at the Combining of Arastoz in module, uh, I don't remember if it's S1 or S2. I think S1.

If you only cared about delivering the cargo, you could just let the monster join up, then evade it. It's too slow when combined to do anything interesting because it just can't catch you. However, for maximum victory points, you also need to destroy the monster.

With a plasma ship the monster is easy. It won't evade plasma torpedoes and, even combined, can't do enough damage to them to save itself. Just tow the freighter out of range and pelt it to death with plasma.

With a Fed/Hydran/Lyran cruiser it also seems pretty beatable. Blow away one part of the monster (it's only 100 points) before it can do anything. If you use the freighter as bait, you should be able to decoy two parts of the monster away, allowing you to kill a second component before it can join up with the others. The last two parts will probably join up, but the freighter is fast enough to evade them for at least a little while. You can go ahead and slug it out with that part of the monster - you won't be able to kill it in one shot, but you can probably kill it before it can kill you. A 2-component monster is not any tougher than its component parts individually, and moves slower.

The Arastoz monster doesn't have MCIDS, but is able to use its main weapon against seeking weapons. In a D&D ship, I would rather see MCIDS, which at least you can overwhelm with scatterpacks. D&D users have to expose themselves to the largest amount of monster firepower, meanwhile their

drones are all but useless. Only drones with external armor will really be of any value as unarmored drones will all be destroyed (but at least the monster won't evade them). But you can probably only have a couple of those.

Using the Fed DD, you'll be in trouble against a full strength Arastoz; your ship is just undersized for the fight. You start at WS-1, and it takes you three turns just to get your weapons armed. You can probably kill one piece of the monster in three turns with just phasers and maybe one photon, which you do have power to arm, however, you'll take a lot of damage this way, and it's not really any faster than charging weapons for three turns and then doing the 100-point clobberize on one part of the monster.

=====

By George M. Ebersole (George) on Thursday, August 30, 2007 - 04:01 pm: Edit

hmm. Interesting. I think I started off at WS-3 the last time I played it. I can't remember much else about it. Maybe I'll whip it out this weekend.

Thanks for the post, William.

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Friday, August 31, 2007 - 12:35 pm: Edit

Zeke....did you think of upgrading the WE to a KE instead of using a conjectural ship?

How would that affect the scenario?

And what about using Snipe-B's instead of BH's?

=====

By Ezekiel Price Carpenter-Hyland (Admiral\_Zekedak) on Friday, August 31, 2007 - 07:53 pm: Edit

Thanks for your input. I considered the WE to KE upgrade, but it seemed odd to have 2 command ships in such a small battle force. I also had some concerns about ships selection keeping this scenario a craps shoot (more torps with lower damage = consistent results). The R-torp/S-torp exchanged would (presuming it hit) have jumped internals from 37 to 47. I considered (calculated) how much damage the CVS would need to take before it would have to make a real choice about what to. The extra 10 points would take away that choice, but I'll concede that it's probably not a game buster (a lot depends of Fed reinforcement roll). As such, having 2xKEs might be an option for play balance.

As for the SB-B's, they could keep speed like a BH, but lacked badly needed phasers and power for EW. They also would have a real hard time staying in the fight to finish the job. Even the Tactics Manual describes them as a fire & flee ships as they cannot reload while under cloak. Also, they may be unable to load their G-torp and get into a decent bolt bracket, but I'll leave that to you for checking on. Again, they might be used as a balance option.

=====

By Jeremy Gray (Gray) on Friday, August 31, 2007 - 08:09 pm: Edit

Keep in mind, a KE could be used as a rank-and-file heavy cruiser per its R-description, despite the "Command Cruiser" designation.

As for SN-B vs BH, I completely agree. The SN-B has awesome firepower, but it is trapped between its cloak cost and power required to load three torps. As a Rom player, I would prefer a BH in almost every case...few torps, but better power, the ability to make good use of the cloak, and cruiser-like durability. IMO, the BH is one of the best size class-4 ships out there. So good infact, if given the choice between an unfitted KR with Gs and a BH...I'd take the BH.

=====

By Ezekiel Price Carpenter-Hyland (Admiral\_Zekedak) on Monday, September 03, 2007 - 08:23 pm: Edit

I ran the calculations on the SN-B vs. BH power and found that the SN-B would not be able to do all three of the following.

-Arm the plasma-G

-Fly fast enough to get to range 10

-Pay 3 points of ECCM to go from a -2 to a -1 die roll shift

In terms of odds for damage the best bet would be to focus on speed and ECCM, giving the SN-B bolts with 2xPI-F @ 1-2. Seeing as the BH get the same odds with 2xPI-G, they are the better choice.

=====

By William T Wilson (Sheap) on Tuesday, September 04, 2007 - 01:17 am: Edit

Well, ECCM always sucks for small ships. But you can release the plasma to its own guidance and get 3 ECCM for free.

The SN-B is a very small ship with a huge power shortage and ECCM is just not something it can afford. If you need ECCM on the SN-B (which you might, if you have to bolt; it does have a lot of plasma torps), your only real choice is to have a scout lend it. Other choice would be to plot speed on one turn to get into range, then stop over the turn break; but then you'll probably get killed.

=====

By Ezekiel Price Carpenter-Hyland (Admiral\_Zekedak) on Tuesday, September 04, 2007 - 02:30 pm: Edit

Sadly for the Romulans there is just no way to avoid using bolts in "Revenge of the Eagles" as the Federation can keep the range open until the fighters are armed and reinforcement ships arrive. I think play examples like this do well to explain why the new Hawk ship lines are not "one shot wonders" (i.e. you wonder how to get in a shot).

In a campaign I'm currently running (see attrition ship tactics), Snipes were passed over in favor of Seahawk-As. While this little Hawk gets bad press in descriptive write-ups as being unable to function in late-war settings, it clearly is better than the Sn-A/B in most circumstances. This is particularly noticeable when PF are around as they have more power (w/packs, about same w/o), no cost housekeeping and a lot of free EW points.

=====

## FLEET TACTICS

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Wednesday, March 07, 2007 - 09:56 pm: Edit

I'm going to regret this.

Take MJC's 'scenario' from above.

There are 3 Ground Mining Stations (GMS) in hexsides A,C,and E. There is a GWS (Ground Warning Station) in hexside B. A GMG (Ground Military Garrison) exists in hexside F. The GMG has 30 extra boarding parties, and 3 tanks, located anywhere on the planet at the defending players option.

Each GMS also has a GBD1 (Ground Based Phaser-1) in its hexside. They may be linked for power grid purposes, at the defending players option.

The colony has a set of 5 DefSats in orbit, as well as a ComPlat and a SAMS. Placement is at defending players option.

The Kzinti's arrive with a CA, 2xYCS, 2xCL, 3xYFF, speed max, WS-3, enter 01xx mapedge.

Planet in 2215, fixed map, anybody moving off map has disengaged. Defense forces at WS-3.

On turn 5 a Fed GCA arrives, 42xx map edge, speed max, WS-3. On turn 8 3xYFF arrive, same as GCA. No further Fed forces arrive after that.

Kzinti has the usual 20% for Commanders Options. The Kzinti may not replace more than 50% of his initial drone loadout with typeIV/V's.

Fed ships have 10% for CO, colony defense units may not use CO.

The Kzinti has 3 possible missions. Before the scenario begins (but AFTER he has spent his CO) he is randomly assigned ONE of them.

1) Devastate the planet. He must destroy ALL ground facilities, as well as the SAMS and the ComPlat.

2) Raid the planet. He must destroy all orbital facilities (including the DefSats), and raid (capture and hold for 96 consecutive impulses) each GMS.

3) Complete BOTH missions 1 AND 2.

Fed wins if Kzinti loses.

\*waits for somebody to Push The Button\*

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Thursday, March 08, 2007 - 07:54 am: Edit

You need to adjust it a bit as the Attacker can't accomplish #2 (and #3) because DefSats can't be targeted unless they fire. That just means that the defender will refuse to ever use one of the DefSats and be guaranteed the win.

=====

By Jeremy Gray (Gray) on Thursday, March 08, 2007 - 08:29 am: Edit

Keep the mission selection a secret from the Fed player. If he doesn't know, he can't just sit on the defsats.

=====

By David Crew (Catwholeaps) on Thursday, March 08, 2007 - 07:03 pm: Edit

Doesn't help - you sit on one Defsat, and pretend it was never there (winning you #2 and #3 by default). Use the other 4 to help you in the 1/3rd of cases when the mission is #1.

...and if you get around that - the Fed in #2 will send his BP's all to ONE GMS - he has no reason to defend all three. It then becomes a long Grinding ground action. (Hint: The Kzinti should destroy the GMG as the first thing they do, regardless of objective).

If the Kzinti destroy the GMG, Kzinti win methinks. They have to be careful of the defsats, but without mobile ships for 4 turns the Feds don't have much chance methinks.

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Friday, March 09, 2007 - 03:35 am: Edit

Ragglefratz.

The Kzinti mission is kept secret from the Fed until after the battle.

Forgot about the DefSat thing; assume that once the GMG is destroyed/captured, any inactive DefSats self-destruct instantly.

As for the long, grinding, ground battle....the Kzinti better buy lots of extra marines, then, hmmm?

=====

By eric jimerson (Lord\_Errock) on Monday, June 18, 2007 - 03:53 pm: Edit

Posted in wrong topic - deleted

=====

By William J Gauthier (Emperorvortia) on Friday, November 02, 2007 - 12:44 am: Edit

Here's a good question.

In a Patrol Scenario using an entire 12 unit fleet, what is the best way to include Carriers/Fighters? Is it always best to attempt to get the maximum amount of Fighters or does a large number of carriers become detrimental, and what carriers are best to use? A single CVA in command of an otherwise conventional fleet? A CVA & CVS? An Interdiction Cruiser which can stand off and let the rest of the fleet work?

=====

By Larry E. Ramey (Hydrajak) on Friday, November 02, 2007 - 10:39 am: Edit

Drone, Plasma, or Stingers?

It makes a big difference.

What race? Some races get HORRIBLE escorts (Kzinti) while some races get escorts that are God's Gift to the Fleet. Fed DEA, All the Hydran escorts, Heck, I like the Lyrans with the ph-1s!

=====

By William J Gauthier (Emperorvortia) on Friday, November 02, 2007 - 10:47 am: Edit

Well, let's here for each. I'm just interested what the consensus is. It seems to me that more than one carrier would tie down too many ships reloading fighters to make for an effective fleet,

but I have absolutely 0 experience on this issue, so I thought I'd see what everyone else had to say.

=====

By Alan Trevor (Thyrm) on Friday, November 02, 2007 - 11:17 am: Edit

To expand on Larry Ramey's point about race; it also matters because some races have much better fighters than others. The Tholians have generally the worst general-purpose fighters in Alpha Octant. But they're also the least expensive, and that makes them cost effective in certain specialized roles. So if I'm trying to build a 12-ship Tholian fleet, I might not include any fighters at all. Or I might include a carrier if, given my assessment of the mission and the probable threat, I believe there will be something useful for them to do.

=====

By Kerry E Mullan (Nomad17) on Friday, November 02, 2007 - 11:34 am: Edit

Well I have limited carrier experience only having played 12 or so battles with full fleets. Most of the time it is best to go with a CVA and either a CVS or BCS if available. Certain races excel at carrier things(fed, hyd) while others are average.

Normally I see the 12 fleet as the follows:

CVA +3 escorts, CVB, BC, 5 CAs(prob a cov, or other drone platform as one), CA scout.

For drone ships the theory is to launch drones with spacing and have enough DF to crush a ship every 2 turns.

As well due to time period for non feds casual PFs should be in attendance.

For a Hydran fleet maximizing stingers does not actually require as many dedicated carriers. So I usually go with the following:

BB, Pal or ID+3 escorts, 2 rangers, 4 dragoons(or IRQs), plus the CA scout. Adding in casual PFs and or replacing one cruiser with a tender can also be helpful.

For hydrans: I use PFs as drone clearers and then the fighters gats to assist as well, fleet following 2 hexes behind until it is time to speed change to crawl ahead of em.

I am just trying to reach 2 ranges in mass. Range 10 with fighters, and R8 with fleet elements. When 30-40 or so stingers can get an unshifted shot on a target at R10 the fusions alone will blow up most cruisers. As this force has like 60 stingers plus PFs casualties may make it only one ship blown and a second crippled.

Note for drone and hydran fighters reloading may not be needed as the fighters can easily overwhelm ships defenses and allow both the fleet and fighter to reach close range. It is hard to stop the hydran force when there are 2 rangers coming in fast with erratics going and scout ECM, and 60 fighters coming in right behind that. As each ranger can reach range 1 and cripple another ship with the follow up hells and fighter gats its a tough nut to crack.

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Friday, November 02, 2007 - 12:48 pm: Edit

Personal preference, YMMV:

In a Patrol Scenario using an entire 12 unit fleet, what is the best way to include Carriers/Fighters? Is it always best to attempt to get the maximum amount of Fighters?

I go for the most fighters I can get for the least number of required escorts. This leaves more command slots for combat-variant ships while still giving decent fighter strength (~12). May add another carrier if it's one of the rare ones that doesn't require escorts. If the year allows, a PF Tender or a Heavy Scout Carrier (counts as a PFT) may be added in.

Until Fast Drones/WBPs/MegaPacks it's tough to run your opponent down so you don't want to count on the fighters as your main striking arm and instead as a support element of your fleet. If you're attacking a fixed target, like a StarBase, fighters are excellent. Bring as many as you can.

..or does a large number of carriers become detrimental..

Yes. Most carriers, excluding BCVs, Hydrans, and a few others, don't fight as well as the hull they are based on.

Combined with the escorts also losing heavy weapons, too many carriers+escorts results in losing a lot of direct firepower. You also tend to be protective of the carriers, which limits their ability to do damage directly. (After the AFT HULL is gone the SHUTTLE boxes go next.)

...and what carriers are best to use? A single CVA in command of an otherwise conventional fleet? A CVA & CVS? An Interdiction Cruiser which can stand off and let the rest of the fleet work?

I prefer then non-SC2 carriers since you're giving up the DNS firepower to get it. (Though, once you have MegaPacks that's less of an issue since the fighters become fast and harder to kill.) Also, the larger carrier groups usually take longer to launch/land than the same number of fighters from several ships.

=====  
By William J Gauthier (Emperorvortia) on Friday, November 02, 2007 - 03:37 pm: Edit

K. Mullen Says "CVA +3 escorts, CVB, BC, 5 CAs(prob a cov, or other drone platform as one), CA scout."

I'm pretty sure you can't deploy a CVB without escorts. a fleet with a CVA & a CVB is going to have 5 escorts, which means you only

have a grand total of four actual combat vessels. I could be wrong, but I would think that a fleet with that many escorts is going to have seriously reduced firepower, and is going to be putting a lot of pressure on it's 36 Fighters to make up for the 6 or so ships worth of heavy weapons which aren't getting fired.

=====  
By Michael Lui (Michaellui) on Friday, November 02, 2007 - 06:12 pm: Edit

William  
It would be a better question if you added dates to your question. Like "What are your choices for Y168, Y175, Y180?" or something like that as YIS dates are different for all the races and some will not have any CVs or poor CVs.

Also, a few other things:

1. Do you care how much these fleets cost? In F+E you get some really nasty CV fleets because you never worry what your BPV is, but in SFB you generally have to balance what you take versus what your enemy might be bringing in AND do it on a budget.
2. What is/are the target(s)? An open space battle is going to have a different selection than a base battle or one that you have a specific objective.
3. Are you using S8? One fleet above has a BB AND a CVA in it.
4. Have people just post their favorites races as, since you said you had zero experience, you may get mixed up when people post several ideas and for different races.
5. Might want to require Battle Groups if you want to see anything smaller than a CA that isn't a required escort.
6. Dates will also determine availability of fighters.
7. Other limitations: Do you really want to see a fleet composed of 2xCSV (1 as the free scout) carrying 6 Stinger-Ts each (12 ST-Ts), 9 X-Rangers carrying 9 Stinger-Xs each (81 ST-Xs), 1 LBX with 3 more ST-Xs and Mega-packs on everything? This is legal if not really ever seen. Think carefully on this section.

=====  
By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Friday, November 02, 2007 - 06:31 pm: Edit

Quote:

... 2xCSV (1 as the free scout) carrying 6 Stinger-Ts each (12 ST-Ts), 9 X-Rangers carrying 9 Stinger-Xs each (81 ST-Xs), 1 LBX with 3 more ST-Xs and Mega-packs on everything? This is legal if not really ever seen.

-----  
Actually, not legal. You forgot the escorts for the CSVs (actually, this is the "VED" for the Hydrans) and that the

fighters on a formal carrier in the "free scout" slot count as a ship for command rating purposes.

But, nevertheless, you were making a valid point.

=====  
By Michael Lui (Michaellui) on Friday, November 02, 2007 - 06:49 pm: Edit

CSVs can take the PFT slot and/or the free scout slot and be unescorted.

The "free scout" CSV is really there to help reload the other CSVs fighters. I'm not sure, can it keep its fighters "inactive"? It was the biggest thing that they have that can reload them and has decent EW capabilities.

Otherwise you can always put an HDW in that slot with SS in the weapons options and 6 Stinger-2s. Hmmm, can you swap out the NWOs for reloading boxes for HF's without it being considered a CV?

=====  
By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Friday, November 02, 2007 - 06:53 pm: Edit

IIRC, as long as you have less than 8 fighters (more for Hydran?) a HDW is not considered a formal carrier.

=====  
By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Friday, November 02, 2007 - 06:54 pm: Edit

"CSVs can take the PFT slot and/or the free scout slot and be unescorted."

I don't think taking either slot removes the requirement for it's listed escorts. (But I'm willing to be shown a rule that says so!)

=====  
By Michael Lui (Michaellui) on Friday, November 02, 2007 - 07:04 pm: Edit

Where's the updated S8 rules?

=====  
By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Friday, November 02, 2007 - 07:07 pm: Edit

<http://starfleetgames.com/sfb/sfin/S8.htm>

=====  
By Michael Lui (Michaellui) on Friday, November 02, 2007 - 07:33 pm: Edit

S8.34: ..... "CSVs" (w/SS and 6 Heavy Fighters) count against the PFT limit.

If it counts against the PFT limit, it doesn't have to be escorted. Better yet, the HDW can configure the NWOs as Stinger-2 bays, carry 10 and use all of them (along with a Stinger-E and at least 1 Stinger-H), and still be in the FS position by S8.49. It would just have to count the 10 fighters against the 3 squadron limit under S8.323, but they still wouldn't take up a Command slot.

=====  
By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Friday, November 02, 2007 - 08:03 pm: Edit

"If it counts against the PFT limit, it doesn't have to be escorted."

That's the part I need a rule on.

=====  
By Joseph R Carlson (Jrc) on Saturday, November 03, 2007 - 11:25 am: Edit

I think (S8.31) answers the question. Carriers must have their listed escorts. Exception (S8.315); flexible group rule.

(S8.311) Some carriers are listed having no escorts and may operate as such. Example Fed NVH.

=====  
By William J Gauthier (Emperorvortia) on Sunday, November 04, 2007 - 08:28 pm: Edit

Michael Lui says "It would be a better question if you added dates to your question. Like "What are your choices for Y168, Y175, Y180?" or something like that as YIS dates are different for all the races and some will not have any CVs or poor CVs."

That may be true, but I'm really just trying to get a general feel on how people use Carriers in their Fleets under S8.0, so any time is fine.

"1. Do you care how much these fleets cost?"

Not really. I'm not looking to play them, at least not exactly as stated. I'd simply like to get a feel for how many fighters/carriers/escorts most people like to have in their forces.

"2. What is/are the target(s)? An open space battle is going to have a different selection than a base battle or one that you have a specific objective."

If there is a difference in the type of fighter support taken, then please, by all means tell me how you'd vary your Carrier selection because you are making a Base attack.

"3. Are you using S8? One fleet above has a BB AND a CVA in it."

Yes, and I did notice that the individual in question was suggesting a number of illegal things.

"4. Have people just post their favorites races as, since you said you had zero experience, you may get mixed up when people post several ideas and for different races."

Well, I have zero experience running games at fleet strength (12 ships on 12 ships). I've played enough and read enough to know the differences between most of the races.

"5. Might want to require Battle Groups if you want to see anything smaller than a CA that isn't a required escort."

I understand that there is a rule for this in F&E, but it isn't in S8.0. Something to the effect of taking more smaller ships allows you to take more ships overall and some such. If people typically use them, they can feel free to post fleets using them, as my main goal is simply to get the feel for how many carriers/fighters/escorts are being used in the fleet.

"7. Other limitations: Do you really want to see a fleet composed of 2xCSV (1 as the free scout) carrying 6 Stinger-Ts each (12 ST-Ts), 9 X-Rangers carrying 9 Stinger-Xs each (81 ST-Xs), 1 LBX with 3 more ST-Xs and Mega-packs on everything? This is legal if not really ever seen. Think carefully on this section."

Well, I am getting from that example that you could have a fleet with two Scout Carriers, and that's useful. As I said, I'm not planning on using these fleets, simply getting a feel for how people use fighters with their fleets.

So, rather than sink this into a mire of rules debates on S8.0, does anyone else have any good examples on Fleets with carriers? So far I've gotten a Tholian player who only rarely uses a single carrier, a player who tosses as many carriers as possible into his fleet to the point of (I assume) unintentionally violating S8.0, and a player who generally strives to get as many fighters on as few and as small a hull as possible (I'd assume we're looking at CVP or CVD, or maybe a pair of single Escort CVEs or CVLs.) Anybody else? So far, the brightest idea seems to be the paired CVEs or CVD.

=====

By Michael Lui (Michaellui) on Monday, November 05, 2007 - 03:40 pm: Edit

Well in that case, leaving aside the CSV question for now, use 1 LBX, 10 RNXs, 1 HDW with the NWOs converted to Fighter bays and the WOs as Special Sensors, and Mega-packs on all the fighters.

This gives you:

1. 1 Hydran "Non-True CV" in the FS position (per S8.49 and S8.322/3) to satisfy the CV requirement (the fighters count against the 3 squadron limit by S8.323 and are still usable as Hybrids by S8.322).

2. 2 Stinger-HM

3. 1 Stinger-EM

4. 7 Stinger-2M

5. 93 Stinger-XM

6. 11 X-ships to finish off anything the fighters leave for them.

Yes, this is an obnoxious force. It is bringing 103 fighters to the fray, more fighters than any other races CV fleet can even get within shouting distance of, and ALL of them are carrying Phaser-Gs. And the 11 X-ships are just icing on the cake.

And you would normally never, ever, ever, ever see this force on a SFB map.

=====

By Alan Trevor (Thyrm) on Monday, November 05, 2007 - 04:07 pm: Edit

Michael Lui;

I'll have to check my rules to be sure. But I'm about 80% sure that that isn't an S8-legal force. I believe that under S8 (but perhaps I'm mistaking it for a different rule/limitation) a "pure-X" force can have a maximum of 3 X-tech heavy cruisers and 3 X-tech light cruisers. Light cruisers can sub for heavies, so 2 CAX and 4 CLX would be a legal force, for example. But you've got 11 X-tech heavies in your force, and as I say, I'm about 80% sure that's not legal.

=====

By Michael Lui (Michaellui) on Monday, November 05, 2007 - 04:26 pm: Edit

Actually S8.48 allows the entire force to be composed of X-ships. However I'm not sure if the "free scout" also has to be an X-ship, so you may be right about it being illegal, just not the way you thought.

But I put a question in the Q+A section for it.

=====

By Alan Trevor (Thyrm) on Monday, November 05, 2007 - 04:33 pm: Edit

Michael,

I know you can have a force composed entirely of X-ships. The limitation (if I'm remembering correctly) is on the number of X-cruisers. An 11 ship, all X-tech, force would have to have at least 5 SC4 ships to be legal.

=====

By Michael Lui (Michaellui) on Monday, November 05, 2007 - 04:41 pm: Edit

Nope. I just looked through S8, Gunner thankfully provided the link above, and the only requirements (when all X) are the same as a "normal" fleet, IE: none.

=====

By Alan Trevor (Thyrm) on Monday, November 05, 2007 - 04:45 pm: Edit

Michael,

Maybe I'm misremembering. I'll check my books when I get home. I would also note that there are sometimes restrictions on fleets that aren't in S8. There's a restriction on how many web casters the Tholians can put in one fleet (doesn't apply in the home galaxy), but it's not in S8. It's in the web caster rules themselves. It might be that there is something similar with X-cruisers, a restriction on numbers allowed in a fleet, but found somewhere other than S8.

Or maybe my brain is just fried.

=====

By Michael Lui (Michaellui) on Monday, November 05, 2007 - 04:55 pm: Edit

If there is a restriction on them it would have to be in the X-module. And it still may not apply to S8, just like using Web Casters in the Tholian Home Galaxy, just specify that the fleet is a Home Galaxy fleet and presto: all the Web Casters you want (but armed with Particle Cannons).

In the case of an X-fleet, since he didn't specify a year, you could say it is Y240 and these are actually obsolete ships that were put together in a fleet for a training scenario in the Hydran Naval Academy.

=====

By Alan Trevor (Thyrm) on Monday, November 05, 2007 - 05:01 pm: Edit

But how do you specify that the fleet "is a Home Galaxy fleet" if your opponent is the Klingons? The rule doesn't say a "Neo-Tholian fleet", it says "home galaxy" (I'll check to make sure on that when I get home) so I think the Klingon player would be well within his rights to call "BS" on that one, since the Klingons never made it to M81.

=====

By Michael Lui (Michaellui) on Monday, November 05, 2007 - 05:03 pm: Edit

He also didn't specify the target/opponent.

And I did say:

Quote:

And you would normally never, ever, ever, ever see this force on a SFB map.

=====

By Alan Trevor (Thyrm) on Monday, November 05, 2007 - 09:23 pm: Edit

Hah! My brain isn't fried!

XS8.48 (Page 381 in the MRB)

"In the case of a fleet composed entirely of X-ships, there can be no more than three heavy cruisers and three light cruisers. Light cruisers may be substituted for heavy cruisers. Size-4 X-ships may be added to or substituted for the cruisers. All X-fleets must operate within the normal rules on command ratings. The Federation may not use more than one GSX; it may use the "free scout" slot but still counts against the limit of heavy cruisers."

=====

By George Duffy (Sentinal) on Tuesday, November 06, 2007 - 12:34 am: Edit

Also, (don't have the rulebook to confirm, but...) somewhere in the (G33.0) rules on HDWs, it says that any configuration that has 8 or more fighters (including Hydrans) has to be configured as a carrier. So you may as well configure the HDW as a Scout (w/ 6x ST-2Ms). Or come up with some other viable ship.

B^)

=====

By Michael Lui (Michaelui) on Tuesday, November 06, 2007 - 03:36 am: Edit

Sentinal

I checked those rules. Under G33.42 if a Hydran ship has 8+ fighters it is a CV. However, it makes no mention of being a TRUE CV, and for Hydrans that makes all the difference. Read S8.49 for more specifics on HDWs and being a True/Non-True/Hybrid CV.

Alan

Dang. XS8.48. Didn't know there was one. Oh well, I guess 8 of the RNxs get to be LNxs. Of course that's still 53 ST-XMs under point 5 above for a total of 63 Mega-fighters, 11 X-ships, and 1 Non-True CV scout.

BTW, I proposed this for the X-ships. If I wanted the maximum number of Mega-fighters I'd go with the IC (40), 2 MKEs (16), 1 DWE (2), 7 RNs (63), and 1 HDW (10) for a grand total of 131 Mega-fighters and 3 squadrons of CV fighters. That breaks down to 2 squadrons on the IC and 1 on the HDW. The ICs squadrons come out to 1 regular and 1 OS.

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Tuesday, November 06, 2007 - 07:52 am: Edit

Michael Lui. In G33.42, by Carrier, they mean TRUE Carrier. By default, a Hydran DWH is a carrier; this rule is to indicate at what point it gets "promoted" from Hybrid Carrier to True Carrier.

=====

By William J Gauthier (Emperorvortia) on Tuesday, November 06, 2007 - 12:00 pm: Edit

Laying aside that with any Hydran fleet you are bound to have massive amounts of fighters, and that this fleet is in no way typical, does anyone else have some fleet carrier doctrines to share?

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Tuesday, November 06, 2007 - 12:40 pm: Edit

William. With any fleet, you have to develop an overarching strategy. Are you going to swarm them with drones? Are you going to overrun them? Sabre Dance with them? etc. Within that overarching strategy, you have various fleet tactics to determine: how will you deal with the enemy seeking weapons? how will you prevent them from overrunning you? how will you deal with enemy fighters? etc.

Fighters are merely a possible tool to choose from that help support your overarching strategy or that can be the core unit responsible for implementing a fleet tactic. Taking fighters, "just because" will hurt more than it will harm. Taking fighters to help your "overwhelm with seeking weapons" or "overrun" strategy, or as an element of your Fleet Drone Defense or Fleet Overrun Deterrent tactics is smart unit selection.

=====

By Alan Trevor (Thyrm) on Tuesday, November 06, 2007 - 01:11 pm: Edit

I think Andy pretty much nails it here. The first question you have to ask is "Why take fighters (as opposed to spending the BPV and command rating slots on "big ships") at all?" Once you know why you want fighters for that particular battle, and how they fit into your overall gameplan, then you can determine what specific units best support the plan.

=====

By Scott Tenhoff (Scottt) on Tuesday, November 06, 2007 - 01:22 pm: Edit

Andy P, the Hydran DWH is the Hellbore-DW w/o fighters.

So do you mean the DWF w/ 2 hybrid fighters or DWV w/ 8 true fighters?

Just keeping things straight.

=====

By John Carroll (Jcwl) on Tuesday, November 06, 2007 - 01:50 pm: Edit

For the Hydran, fighters are their seeking weapons, and have been a major part of their tactics. I guess he could try a Hellbore heavy, fighter light fleet, but he would probably still have fighters.

=====

By Michael Lui (Michaelui) on Tuesday, November 06, 2007 - 05:42 pm: Edit

Andy

Normally you'd be right. However we are using S8 here. And S8 distinguishes between Hybrid CV, Non-true CV, and True CV for HDWs. Under S8 a Hydran HDW with up to 11 fighters is a Non-True CV and must count its fighters under the 3 squadron limit, but can use them from the FS position as Hybrids. For that matter, any other races HDWs can do this as long as they only carry 7 fighters or less.

F+E actually supports this too. 308.533 allows up to 6 FACTORS of Hybrids to be used from the FS position and HDWs are the only ships currently in the game that can reach this amount. They just adjust it for SFB to count under the 3 squadrons.

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Wednesday, November 07, 2007 - 07:52 am: Edit

Michael Lui.

There is a discrepancy between G33 and S8 that needs to be cleared up.

=====

By Kerry E Mullan (Nomad17) on Wednesday, November 07, 2007 - 08:37 am: Edit

Michael per S8.32 and .321 hydran hybrid ships fighters are not counted for this restriction as are any other races ships and HDWs who carry 5 or fewer fighters. It does not specifically state what the hydran HDW would be, but as it is a non-true-carrier it should fall under a hydran hybrid which means the fighters are not counted against the limit.

Yes this means hydran forces can have large numbers of fighters.

=====

By Larry E. Ramey (Hydrajak) on Wednesday, November 07, 2007 - 11:26 am: Edit

I suggest you read "Day of the Eagle" comes early.

There are multiple carrier actions in that campaign.

There is multiple kibitzing and they Dale and Jeremy explain why they are doing what they do.

You get to see stand off fighter doctrine (F-18s) vs strike fighter doctrine (G-II/G-III). (Now against a Klink I might view F-15s as

strike fighters... 12 gats is nothing to sneeze at, but Jeremy tended to use them, rightfully in my opinion, as defensive units allowing his prox photons to tear up Dale)

I guess my point is.... people don't play 12 ship fleets using SFB. It is a pretty crap system for a battle that large. It is a REALLY crap system for 12 ships + 24 drone armed fighters. It is REALLY REALLY crap for 12 Kzinti ships and 24 drone armed fighters vrs a Klink fleet that brought 6 G1s and 12 ZV whatever.... please kill me now.

Anything over 5-6 ships a side and I want to cry. And outlaw different ships going different speeds.

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Wednesday, November 07, 2007 - 11:31 am: Edit

Thanks for the plug, Larry.

The system Jeremy and I use in "Day of the Eagle" (which is also used in "The Farthest Stars", btw) isn't original - we cribbed it from the Star Fleet Battles Campaign Designer's Handbook. The Flexible Command Rating system (FCR) has proven itself to us time and again. We use a multiple of 4 instead of 5 to slightly reduce the fleet sizes to our comfort zone - you get between 5-7 ships, and typically not more than 12 fighters. Hydrans can bring 18 easily, and you \*can\* bring more, but you start losing command efficiency and pay more "slots" for the fighters past the break point of 12 (18 for Hydrans).

It keeps the battles fast, fun and actually playable. At least to a couple guys in their thirties with wives and kids and jobs.

=====

By Larry E. Ramey (Hydrajak) on Wednesday, November 07, 2007 - 01:35 pm: Edit

Hydran fighters aren't bad.

They either get shot up, or shoot once. If they shoot once, the battle is usually over.

=====

By Richard Sherman (Rich) on Wednesday, November 07, 2007 - 02:12 pm: Edit

Oh, c'mon Larry, that depends on what range they shot at:

Range 15 - "I'm annoyed."

Range 10 - "Hey, they crashed in my shield!"

Range 8 - "Now I'm REALLY annoyed! Fire overloads..."

Range 3 - "Ow! Quick...keep shooting before those fusions recycle!"

Range 2 - "Abandon ship! All hands, abandon ship!"

Range 0 - [KA-BOOM!]

=====

By Michael Lui (MichaelLui) on Wednesday, November 07, 2007 - 03:25 pm: Edit

Andy

That's why I put a question in the SFB Q+A section for it.

=====

By William J Gauthier (Emperorvortia) on Wednesday, November 07, 2007 - 05:07 pm: Edit

"The first question you have to ask is "Why take fighters (as opposed to spending the BPV and command rating slots on "big ships") at all?" Once you know why you want fighters for that particular battle, and how they fit into your overall gameplan, then you can determine what specific units best support the plan."

Forgive me if I seem brisk, but posing a question to a question, isn't an answer, it's sophism. I understand what you are saying, but that doesn't answer my question. I am looking at what sort of carriers are included in people's fleets, I'm not particularly looking for a single ultimate solution to how to use fighters, because obviously there isn't any. Perhaps you could give me some examples of how you use Carriers to benefit your fleets in drone defense, overrun, drone swarms, etc.

=====

By Larry E. Ramey (Hydrajak) on Wednesday, November 07, 2007 - 05:34 pm: Edit

Well.... fighters carry lots of little phasers. Those are generally useful defensively.

Drone armed fighters can carry RAILADDS. Those are pretty useful and stopping stingers....

Type IV drones are real good at shooting down drones.

So that covers defense.

Stingers, are not fighters really. They are a fleet adjunct. Hydran tactics revolve around stingers so its not like you really do anything different just because you have a CV in your fleet. Either you know how to run Stingers already, or you are a crappy Hydran player and are going to lose. The tactics manual has some good articles on how to fly strike fighters (Stingers. G-II/G-III/ A-10). Actually in my opinion Hydran CVs are sort of crap because the fighter groups are SO huge it is nigh impossible to land and reload them.

Drone fighters are simple to use. Shoot drones. There you go. Using them effectively is just like shooting drones effectively. I don't recommend sending in Drone fighters close to the enemy... its too dangerous in there. They can finish off wounded enemies and its a lot safer. There is much to be said for using the Stingers in a Hellbore fleet in such a manner. The only key to drone fighters is don't empty all your drone fighters at once unless its going to be a big win for you. Nothing is more embarrassing then getting overrun while 200+ BVP of your fleet is trying to reload. That is why Fed Escorts are so excellent. Ready racks in the escorts == faster turn around time on reloads.

SUP is a unique ship. It carries 8 very deadly medium range strike fighters, but they simply can't hurt any ship that can maneuver. Its just not hard to avoid a plasma-D/F. However, the power curve on a SUP is HUGE, and often in a large ship you will have a Sp-F or FH-F. This leads to the obvious tactic of anchor. I watched a SUP anchor a KRX once. It wasn't pretty. The SUP was crippled at the end of the KRX's convulsive fire spasm..... then the 4 PI-F and 4 PI-D and 2 S and 2 F hit it..... Too bad the boom couldn't detach. The SUP is a credible ship to pull off a suicide anchor with. It is big enough to survive the enemy alpha and 8 fighters following it in will kill you. It can't pull off the Hydran tactic of "anchor then launch" because:

- 1) doesn't have the massive C HULL to protect the shuttle boxes

- 2) Doesn't have launch tubes

- 3) G-II/G-III take 16 impulses not 8 to fire after launch.

The problem dude.... you have asked an open ended question. A CVE or AuxCV guarding a convoy from pirates has a different job than a CV as an independent squadron or a CV as part of a 12 ship fleet. It depends on what and who you are fighting. Before booster packs strike fighters can really struggle against fleets with speed. They are deadly vs bases or slow units.

See the current battle in "Day of the Eagle". Jeremy is using 12 F-15s to OWN the center of the map and prox Dale to death. Dale can outrun the F-15s, but then he gives up with power curve advantage and the Gats are owning his plasma (read: Dale has to bolt). Obviously a good plan by Jeremy so far. It would be a different game if there were booster packs involved or PFs/Interceptors on the map. In that era, the power curve of the CVB platform that hosts the F-15s would REALLY hurt Jeremy as he attempted to speed up and close with Dale. (PFs are really harsh on Fighters that can't get up close) Dale is going to hate life if he ever has to go on the defensive. Jeremy will bury his bases in drones and sit at R30 and prox him to death. Dale's choices will be "cloak or die" and "cloak and die". Its "cloak and die" for sure once the F-14s with IIMWs show up. Its death 2\*3 points at a time, but the once locked, nothing stops a dogfight drone.

Anyway.... the answer in SFB is ALWAYS, "It depends" Once you do A, I'm going to do B,C,or D to react. You better anticipate all 3 and have a counter to my counter or you are going to die. h

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Wednesday, November 07, 2007 - 05:37 pm: Edit

Richard Sherman. In fleet battles, range 10 results in "Holy #@\$\$#! He just took out a Cruiser!"

William Gauthier. I guess our point is that you can't look at Carriers in such a singular light. For example, if you are taking a lot of heavy firepower ships, a carrier without heavy weapons will often work; if you are short on heavy firepower, you may want to take a Strike Carrier. I can, for example, envision cases in which I would use every carrier published.

As for examples of usage, you can use your typical Drone Fighter Carrier to steadily cycle fighters out to launch their drones in a wave and return to rearm. With careful planning, you can set-up a steady wave, turn after turn, of drones. I have used Hydran fighters, especially in Hellbore heavy fleets as a combined overrun deterrent and seeking weapon defense by deploying them among or just in front of my ships, allowing them to use (or threaten to use) their gatlings and fusions to good effect (fusions are quite good at drone defense, with ECCM support). I have also used Hydran Fusion fleets that charged the enemy with nothing but reinforcement and tractor energy and then swarmed them with fighters after I reached them. The options are, literally, infinite, and depend a great deal on your constraints (year, bpv), your opponent, and your personal playing style.

=====

By William J Gauthier (Emperorvortia) on Wednesday, November 07, 2007 - 09:38 pm: Edit

So, when using a Carrier to defend your fleet, is it typical to use a single carrier or multiple, and what size Carriers do you use?

When using a Carrier to launch strike fighters, is it typical to use a single or multiple carrier, and what size Carriers do you use?

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Wednesday, November 07, 2007 - 10:08 pm: Edit

As has been pointed out, there's not set value for any of these things.

The utility of a carrier has to do with the year, circumstances, and personal preference.

The number and type of carrier is less important than your overall fleet tactics, which includes fighters (if any).

=====

By William J Gauthier (Emperorvortia) on Wednesday, November 07, 2007 - 10:43 pm: Edit

Not to belabor the point, but I was looking for examples, not rules. I was simply interested in the type of Carrier fleets people typically run in their full Fleet strength games.

For example, one of the above people says that he likes to cycle drone fighters out for drone launches. That's great. My question is, does he typically take all 36 fighters to do so, or less, and what Carriers does he use to get them there.

I don't mean to be irate, but I can't see why I can't get a more specific answer now than "It depends". Obviously, the first three people who answered had little trouble giving specific examples. One said he likes to take as many carriers as possible, one said he doesn't use fighters at all unless he really needed to, and one said go for multiple small Carriers or one really big Carrier so as not to waste all your command slots on escorts.

I PERFECTLY UNDERSTAND that the utility of all these suggestions is situational. The guy who barely takes fighters is Tholian and finds their fighters of limited utility, the man who tries to limit escorts is trying to maximize the offensive capabilities of his fleet, and the guy who wants as many carriers as possible was attempting to spam out drones. I am perfectly capable of comprehending in their descriptions the limitations and tactics they are describing that leads them to select these fleets, so I don't know why suddenly now that this subject is on page two I can't get a straight answer.

Apparently, either I am not communicating effectively, or I am gravely misunderstanding what is being said. In any case, if I can't get a straight answer to my above question, would people

kindly answer me this: Is it a bad idea to run a full fleet force which maxes out Fighters, specifically using a CVA+CV(S) and escorts? It seems to me that against a conventional all standard combat variant fleet it would be at a severe disadvantage, maybe with the exception of Kzinti/Fed fleets.

=====

By Michael Lui (MichaelLui) on Wednesday, November 07, 2007 - 10:55 pm: Edit

Again, you're still not understanding.

Think of it like this:

What WW2 force would you take to assault a city like Phoenix, Arizona in the middle of the summer?

What WW2 force would you take to assault Hawaii?

What WW2 force would you take to assault Stalingrad in the winter?

ALL 3 of these questions have different answers. You're asking us what force we would take and the answer is still "It depends".

=====

By Andrew Dederer (Drewster) on Wednesday, November 07, 2007 - 11:21 pm: Edit

It's not a question of good or bad. Fighters are roughly balanced per BPV. Now the more limited room there is, the tougher the fighters are (plasma fighters on a floating map are pretty meh).

What maxing out fighters WILL do is warp your tactics to suit them. This is only fair, you've dumped 2-3 cruisers worth of points in them, not to mention changing some of your little stuff to escorts. Taking 36 drone type fighters is much like adding multiple drone ships, you ARE going to build much of your plan around drone waves. Having a bunch of stingers (carrier or no) with a Hydran fleet means you will be pushing the enemy around with a literal phalanx (and hunting for T-bombs left and right).

How dominant the fighters are depends a lot on the year (fast drones and packs = nasty especially if no PFs are around, second generation plasma fighters = not so nasty). And as I said before, the situation (base assault = nasty).

Fighters aren't necessarily worse or better, but they ARE different. More raw firepower (in separate packages), less flexibility in engaging (lots of range issues, except for drones).

=====

By William J Gauthier (Emperorvortia) on Wednesday, November 07, 2007 - 11:37 pm: Edit

Okay, let me break this down as much as I can then.

\*For each race (or each race you feel familiar enough with)

\*Year Y179

\*Having a fleet consisting of a DNH, a BCH, a SC (standard SC4), 4 SC 3 vessels, 5 SC 4 vessels.

\*That the Scenario is a S8.0 Patrol Scenario, under all the rules therein, in a battle with a similar 12 unit fleet of unknown composition (no base).

\*What ships, if any, would you replace with Carriers/Escorts.

=====

By Ken Burnside (Ken\_Burnside) on Thursday, November 08, 2007 - 01:39 am: Edit

Are we playing with full EW rules, or just EM/natural sources? (I'm assuming full EW rules).

Is the map fixed or floating?

My first carrier would be an HDW-as-Hybrid, assuming it's allowed.

If I'm flying Feds, I'll replace a CA with a CVB if my opponent allows it. I might replace an NCL with an NVH instead; F-111Ms are the shiznitz.

If I'm flying Roms, I'm taking the HDW-hybrid and a SUP and not taking any other carriers.

If I'm flying Hydrans, I'm taking a hellbore dominated fleet and only using integrated fighters, not taking a dedicated carrier.

If the scenario is set in Y180, when I have sabot, I'll consider taking Gorn and ISC carriers.

=====

By Michael Lui (Michaelui) on Thursday, November 08, 2007 - 03:38 am: Edit

1. The Hydrans don't have a DNH in Y179.
2. The Hydrans don't have a BCH in Y179.
3. You didn't set a BPV limit.
4. You didn't set any other restrictions.

Therefore:

1. A RN+ was substituted for the BCH.
2. All the fighters listed below have Mega-packs installed.
3. All of the squadrons have standard deployments of fighter models.

{IC, MKE, MKE, DWE}, 3xRN+, 4xLNHs (1 configured as a Commando ship, 1 configured as a Minesweeper, 2 with 4 transporters in the NWO to help board cripples, and all with Hellbores in the OPTs), 1 LNH configured w/4 fighters in the NWOs and 2 Special Sensors to occupy the "Free Scout" slot.

1. This works out to 88 Stinger-2s, 22 Stinger-Hs, and 9 Stinger-Es for a total of 119 fighters.
2. This also works out to only 27 Fusions, 8 Hellbores, 35 Ph-Gs, 30 Ph-1s, and 35 Ph-2s on the Hydran ships.

Tactics: Standard Hydran, "Close and Hose", but staying out at range 10. Most of the heavy weapons in any Hydran fleet are on the fighters unless they go pure Hellbore. This fleet is good all around without knowing what you're going to be doing or who your opponent is going to be.

1. Plasma: Any plasma opponents are going to have to bolt them. There are too many gatlings in this fleet to hit much with seeking plasmas.
2. Drones: Drones are mostly there to absorb gatling damage. It's possible to hit this fleet with drones as a 12 ship fleet with double drone control on all of them and 48 fighters can control 280 of them. They just can't keep it up for very long. And we still have Wild Weasels on the ships and Chaff on the fighters.
3. Direct Fire Weapons: Prox Photons at range 12 are the only weapons I'd worry about as they have a better chance to hit than others and I don't plan on getting any closer than 10 hexes. However, since there are 3 charges for each fighter Fusion, they can still engage closely after firing the first 2 if necessary.

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Thursday, November 08, 2007 - 03:46 am: Edit

119 fighters... gah. This is why we use the FCR system!

=====

By Michael Lui (Michaelui) on Thursday, November 08, 2007 - 04:01 am: Edit

I never said that it's easy to use. Especially when you have to reload, repair, and/or re-designate squadrons.

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Thursday, November 08, 2007 - 04:17 am: Edit

\*twitch\*

=====

By David Slatter (Davidas) on Thursday, November 08, 2007 - 08:13 am: Edit

Michael

Your fleet is almost impossible, at least by F&E standards. By that year, at most 20% of Hydran fighters will be meagfighters. There is only one IC in the entire Hydran kingdom.

At this stage the Hydrans will be desperately short of RNs. Maybe as few as 2 in the entire kingdom.

Having 4 LNHs in the same fleet is exceedingly unlikely, especially as they are expensive (economically) units. You might get two, so as to allow your minesweeper and commando ship. I will note that it is unsurprising you used them, as you don't know whether you are hitting a base or not. In reality, you probably would know that, and have specialist ships to reflect that.

I'm not even sure that the IC group is legal in SFB. You may find that you have to replace the MKE with a DWE, at least in SFB terms (its legal in F&E).

You should also have a specialist scout there over an LNH. And with all due respect to William, a fleet of this size WOULD have a SC3 scout.

In F&E, a typical alpha-strike fleet will either be majoring on cruisers or on carriers.

IF carriers, you would see something like (adheres to S8 I think but don't know about scout limits):-

IC-MKE-DWE-DWE (1 normal + 1 oversized squad>

VED-MKE-DWE(1 Heavy squad)

[PGG-TR-TR-DWH-DWH] battlegroup (uses 1 less command slot)

NSC in scout box. (DDS if restricted to SC4)

3 scout platforms (PGG, VED, NSC), a reasonable number of hellbores, and a heck of a lot of fighters.

1SC2 hull, 7SC3, and 6SC4

(I added in 2 extra SC3 due to battlegroup, but no BCH/CC in force - this is within command limits if an admiral is present - indeed 1 extra ship could be commanded if a marine major general were present)

In reality, some of those escorts may be older variants - NEC or AH. MKE and DWE availability will be limited.

With Cruisers, and adhering roughly to the SC limit, you would see something like below (adheres to S8? Dunno), and there will still be a scout carrier as shown.. Most Hydran cruiser lines would however have more war-cruiser and heavy cruiser hulls in preference to frigate hulls. Once a cruiser line is committed, cruisers will die, so you may as well have more of them and use the extra firepower.

PAL [TR TR TR DWH DWH DWH]DWH DWH

LE-MKE-DWE(heavy and normal squadron)

(replace with TR, DDS, and DWH if no carrier)

DDS

TG-scout pod

This fleet is a lot lower in BPV than the above (and some DWHs would probably be ships with commando/mine variants or something). But in reality, it never happens. If you were forced adhere to those SC restrictions, and could not have the big carriers above, you would simply use a line of second-fiddle carriers. The bottom line is that most of the hydran DWHs and CWs end up as variants, especially carrier escorts.

The Hydran line that "does" happen in F&E surely flouts the S8 rules. But this is what you would might see in 179 when the cruisers come out to play proper, assuming I am including the entire remaining complement of hydran SC3 heavy cruisers in one fleet.

PAL

DG DG RN RN LB

[TR TR NSC DDS DWH DWH]

Tug-scout pod.

Depening on the availability of new heavy cruisers, that battlegroup may be replaced with 3 heavy cruisers and 2 NSC. With Hydrans, when you show your heavies, you show them all, and make the enemy PAY for bagging one of them - and you can be sure that the enemy will be delighted to kill even one. Of course, S8 assumes that empires don't put all the eggs in one basket like this, so disallows these fleets. But in F&E, by 179, the hydrans will have 3-4 working strong fleets. 2-3 of them will be strung up around an ID/IC/other heavy carrier group. 1 will be the Cruiser heavies, the "shock and awe" fleet.

All that EW is simply to keep the cruiser heavies alive.

Amazingly, the Hydran shock and awe fleet in F&E may comprise of multiple DNs, battletugs, command cruisers, whatever heavies they can scrape up. The idea is to be SOOO massively overgunned that you blast the enemy out of the sky before you lose too many key ships.

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Thursday, November 08, 2007 - 10:07 am: Edit

David. A significant number of SFB players don't care a whit about "what is possible or likely in F&E." I point this out because this is an SFB tactics discussion, not an F&E one.

=====

By William J Gauthier (Emperorvortia) on Thursday, November 08, 2007 - 10:12 am: Edit

If the SC4 restriction is fowling up CVA's escort groups, feel free to replace one of the SC4 ships with a SC3 Escort, and thanks for the input!

=====

By David Slatter (Davidas) on Thursday, November 08, 2007 - 11:35 am: Edit

Even so, Andy, LNHs are rare. So are RNs at that point. Some concessions should be made to the likely make-up of the whole fleet.

=====

By Larry E. Ramey (Hydrajak) on Thursday, November 08, 2007 - 11:45 am: Edit

Not in a player made campaign. They are as rare/common as the player made rules make them.

Of course.... I wouldn't go near that game with a 10 foot pole. Good lord, one turn would take all weekend.

Is the "3rd way in action" by 179?

The Cruelst Carrier fleet is obviously a Fed SCS with a single ship A-20 or F-111 folded into the CVGB. Though a good argument can be made that F-15s are in fact deadlier than a A-10.

A lot depends on hidden T bombs. Dale and Jer do NOT play with hidden T bombs. I think that greatly helps out Strike Fighters. Especially the close range ones like Tholians and Hydrans.

=====

By Kerry E Mullan (Nomad17) on Thursday, November 08, 2007 - 11:50 am: Edit

A comment about F+E and SFB. F+E follows a normal route throughout their wars. For normal SFB following whatever conjectural F+E timeline is not really observed nor thought of as "real".

As such F+E tactics and strategies break down a great deal in SFB and therefore are less than realistic.

For SFB considerations my experience has been in campaigns or point battles. For normal play carriers are taken minimally(except hydran casualties). This is normally due to the escorts hurting on the DF available. In high point battles carriers tend to come in more as they are more "worth it" at that point.

Obviously there are many exceptions to this(base battles carriers become huge, or any static defenses. For any hydran battle maximizing the frs is key).

Normally If I am playing KLI I do Fleets along the lines:

DN/C7 BT 9D5's and a D6S.

Using drones and scatters to divert opponent from closing and firing 50 discr from R15 with phasers backing it. This is normally at 2 different ships for some 70-75 points per ship at R15. This tends to put them near crippled status and separates them from the fleet(drones are targetted on ships other than those I will be firing on). Rinse and repeat.

Mainly as KLI their carriers blow so I tend to just not use them. Hydrans are the opposite. Nearly any fleet over 1500 bpv has a Pal in it. By taking a force of (PAL MKE DWE DE), 2 rangers, 5 IRQs and a scout I can normally maintain 70 or so fighters which just destroy anything within R2 and get 2-3 ships blown once they reach R10. Reloading is really NOT GOING TO HAPPEN so I have em fire at 10 and continue to close. Do some die...yeah in droves. At R10 though few die, after their fire and R8 hits 12-15 die per turn. This is acceptable as my ships are right there so they get to use the stinger threat to keep their damage to a minimum.

One thing to be careful about though is to maintain fighters outside of R1 in fleet engagements. This is due to a single ship can be detonated readily and this kills the fighters there.

Winning one battle with hydrans was just to reach R10 of a Fed BCV and its F111's standing 1 hex to the right and 12 f15s 1 hex on the other side of it. After stingers hit BCV with 180 damage losing 20% of his force hurt.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Thursday, November 08, 2007 - 12:10 pm: Edit

9 D5s?

What no Frigates or Destroyers? How about a battle group of 3 D5 and 3 F5W instead of 5 of the D5?

No PFT? No Stasis ship? No mauler?

Not to be rude, but your fleet as stated is very munchkin.

=====

By Kerry E Mullan (Nomad17) on Thursday, November 08, 2007 - 12:36 pm: Edit

Well as someone once told me opinions are like... hmm always forget that punchline.

True it may be munchkin(totally agree here), but it is a legal force. It does have its weaknesses. Generally I fit everything to BPV so if playing in my normal range of 1500-1800 the SC4 ships tend to get left behind. I think its that whole 58 ints and they go boom thing where the SC3 stick around till the 70-75 internal range. If it makes you feel better then you can consider one D5 to be a F6.

Yes this truly goes against F+E where they purposely attack with 80 ships and include the SC4 ships only for flotsam and damage taking ability. Unlike F+E though, most battles I play do not have such large numbers of ships just the std 12 per side(or equivalent).

Also as my fleet is a R15 DF one aka something along the lines of T1 fire all bearing p1's and std dsir at R15. T2 repeat, T3 no discr and just redo caps +speed to open range if pushed or keep firing if not pushed. T4 etc back on cycle.

Taking a SFG ship or mauler would mean it most likely would not be used. As Unlike in F+E both of these are a little harder to use in SFB or their effect is worse.

The PFT etc for KLIs I would probably just go casual first. As I rarely play over 2500 bpv the PFT just wouldn't fit.

Of course this is very dependent upon race. For any plasma race taking a PFT is KEY as it adds a lot to the force. For KLI not so much.

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Thursday, November 08, 2007 - 01:01 pm: Edit

David Slatter. In SFB, LNHs and RNs are not rare as the "usual F+E flow" has no rule-based impact on SFB fleet design.

=====

By Michael Lui (MichaelLui) on Thursday, November 08, 2007 - 01:58 pm: Edit

Davidas

That's why I put these at the beginning of my post:

Quote:

1. The Hydrans don't have a DNH in Y179.
2. The Hydrans don't have a BCH in Y179.
3. You didn't set a BPV limit.
4. You didn't set any other restrictions.

I like playing F+E as well and know just as well as you do what the Hydran fleet looks like after the fall of the Capital. He didn't ask about a "balanced fleet" or a "realistic fleet" either so I maximized everything I could. Especially considering that the MKEs are "unproduced variants", F+E restricts the LNH to only 2 before Y180 (no such limit in SFB), and there are other F+E restrictions as well.

=====

By Richard Sherman (Rich) on Thursday, November 08, 2007 - 05:14 pm: Edit

You know, I've always had an easy cure for players whom you think are designing twinkie or munchkin fleets:

You design the enemy's fleet, and they design yours. All S8 and HISTORICAL restrictions/guidance must be obeyed. Standard combat ships or combat variants. One ship MUST be a scout/have at least 2 sensors.

Those are games where you see really interesting fleets...

=====

By Kerry E Mullan (Nomad17) on Thursday, November 08, 2007 - 06:43 pm: Edit

Right but richard what is a munchkin fleet to you?

I mean historically the following is what happened. As of Y169 great deals of ships are getting destroyed in combat it is war. Here comes the CW. The CW is the answer to this destruction. Easy to produce in numbers and nearly as combat effective as a mainline CA.

Historically as of mid Y175 SC4 ships are being phased out of fleets and being put into the backwaters on guard duty, patrolling the nether regions etc.

I don't see how someone having mainline ships in a fleet is overly munchkin. I mean next you're gonna say the feddies have to use DNs instead of DNGs once those ships start appearing.

As to having your opponent making your fleet, it is a decent idea as long as you both play somewhat fair. He could make a non-optimal fleet as could you. I mean who wants to play a feddie fleet of: HDW(command variant), tug with 2 cargo pods, 4 CLs unrefitted, 5 DDs unrefitted led by a scout with 10 freighters along to suck up points?

I expect my opponent to field a like tier force. IE feddies having a DNG, BCF, 9 NCLs, and a GS fully refitted. This is mainly due to the forces as of y175 will be seeing a lot of this composition historically. PS don't get me started on the ISC!

=====

By William T Wilson (Sheap) on Thursday, November 08, 2007 - 07:17 pm: Edit

Quote:

This is mainly due to the forces as of y175 will be seeing a lot of this composition historically.

But the thing is, this is not really all that historical. There are simply not that many cruisers. There are lots of DWs built, and plenty of older ships left over, not to mention CAs are still being built. CWs may be easy to build but they do not compose 75% of the fleet. They don't even compose 75% of the production.

Opponent designing your fleet might be a fun exercise but will probably result in pathologically bad fleets instead of munchkin ones.

Flexible command rating is sort-of OK because it imposes a penalty if you have too many identical ships. But I don't really like that either, because there was no such penalty; there just weren't so many identical ships.

Instead it is better to play campaigns and use an F&E style build schedule, not buying ships based on BPV.

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Thursday, November 08, 2007 - 07:52 pm: Edit

Well, in my own campaign (The Farthest Stars), I "stacked the deck" by giving everyone older hulls in their starting fleet, then giving them 1x SC-2 yard, 1x SC-3 yard, and 3x SC-4 yards...

=====

By Richard Sherman (Rich) on Friday, November 09, 2007 - 12:22 pm: Edit

Kerry and all,

It's simple; it's whatever you think it is.

The moral here is that if you're playing with an opponent you don't trust or like...don't play. SFB is a game that is far too easy for people to twist into something seriously un-fun if they want to.

In your example, if I was playing a fleet game of what I call "screw your buddy" and he gave me that HDW-led fleet you designed, my response to him would be, "Hey! Congrats! I surrender, and you win! See ya!"

You have to think of it in realistic terms, "How can I be true to the spirit of a screw-your-buddy-type game, while at the same time designing a fleet I think my opponent can play and enjoy?" It's also true for your own fleet design, "What can I pick that I'll enjoy flying, but that my opponent won't roll his eyes at?"

If all my opponent can think of is the good 'ol DN/BCH with 10 CW and a SC...well....I say broaden the horizons, man!

You always have to find like-minded people to play with. Playing with someone who derives enjoyment from screwing you as hard as he can for a perceived advantage, or "minimaxing" himself is...well, I consider that person to be on "the other side" from me. They've lost sight of what a "game" is to me. I don't argue or negotiate with them; I've been down that road and it leads to nothing but utter frustration because for that type of personality, it's more important to be "right" or "in compliance with the rules" than it is to be what I call "happy." I just walk away and try to find others who think like I do.

Hmmm...all of this makes me miss most of my group in Tucson. It also makes me wish I lived in the same town as Dale and Jeremy! (Haven't had the chance to SFb with anyone in Memphis yet.)

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Friday, November 09, 2007 - 07:00 pm: Edit

Quote:

(Haven't had the chance to SFb with anyone in Memphis yet.

OK, OK. Yeah, I've been a bad "Welcome To Memphis" host.

This weekend is booked, but next weekend (Sat 11/17? Sundays are for football, but I can make exceptions since I have TiVo.) looks good. We'll also be staying in town for Thanksgiving, so 11/22-11/24 works.

12/1 may not as I don't get back from Cincy until late the preceding evening.

Shoot me an email, Rich.

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Monday, November 12, 2007 - 02:41 am: Edit

I've always wanted to bring a Klink fleet that consisted of a HDW with a CR of 10, 10 F6B's, and a D5S, just to see the look on my opponents face.

=====

By Ezekiel Price Carpenter-Hyland (Admiral\_Zekedak) on Monday, November 12, 2007 - 02:49 pm: Edit

I'd expect the expression to be confusion, particularly as the Klingons never built more than a couple of F6s.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Monday, November 12, 2007 - 05:16 pm: Edit

Actually, they built a LOT of F6s, per the CL article. 5 (6?) from scratch and apparently a bunch of vanilla F5s were converted when damaged (like F5Ds and such).

=====

By James Hallmark (Jhallmark) on Monday, November 12, 2007 - 09:54 pm: Edit

CL31 has the article on F6s.

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Monday, November 12, 2007 - 10:05 pm: Edit

Fed FFB's and Klink F6/F6B's got retconned into 'they built/converted lots of them', courtesy of the aforementioned CL's.

=====

By Jeff Laikind (J\_Laikind) on Monday, November 12, 2007 - 11:22 pm: Edit

One last comment on fighters in fleets:

One of the guys I used to game with played SFB back in the Dark Ages of plotted movement. At the time, he and his friends would use quarter turn plotting for SC 4, half turn plotting for SC 3, and full turn plots for SC 2. The flagship would plot at one bracket lower than standard for the size class (A DN flagship would use half-turn plots). Fighters and PFs would use free movement.

And, plots would be done half way through an interval.

In this case, the ability of fighters to react quickly to threats made them invaluable.

=====

By Steven J. Hecker (Stevehecker) on Tuesday, November 13, 2007 - 10:21 am: Edit

Confused yet William Gauthier?

I'll add my 2 cents on this subject.

I dislike Fighters and will avoid taking them.

(1) Adds to the time needed to play the game. Doesn't matter if it is 4vs4 or 12vs12.

(2) Fighters are vulnerable to t-bombs and thus are limited to Defensive roles. Especially with bigger fleets. Exception would be Hydran Fighters.

(3) I do like PFs, so if PFs are available, I will easily opt for them over Fighters.

(4) I may be tempted to take fighters if I am playing Alliance. If I am co-allition, nope.

(5) I will take fighters if I know my opponent is going to have lots of them, like a base.

In a 12vs12 battle, if I am alliance, and PFs aren't available, I'd look to take one CV. If I am co-allition, I'd probably take none.

=====

By Steven Rushing (Swrushing) on Wednesday, November 14, 2007 - 03:10 pm: Edit

"In your example, if I was playing a fleet game of what I call "screw your buddy" and he gave me that HDW-led fleet you designed, my response to him would be, "Hey! Congrats! I surrender, and you win! See ya!" "

yeah for me its a similar notion...

i dont get the people, well not fully, who really really want to WIN by scenario selection and then expect everyone to sit around while for 2-6 hours they get to play out their "win" in excruciating detail."

if your scenario selection process produces a grossly imbalanced foregone conclusion game due to whatever reason including "minmaxey designs vs non-minmaxey designs" then IMO thats a FAILURE not a success.

But you dont need a "screw you" setup to solve it.

Simply go with the 6 year old solution- as in one found to work even for six year olds-

one guy chooses BOTH sides forces and scenario rules...

the other player chooses which side he flies.

that way the goal of the scenario design stage is to produce a game where both sides are fun and balanced equally because its likely your enemy will give you "the worst one".

An alternative is for everyone to design a number of "forces" of given PV and then roll randomly to see who gets what. Since, again, you might wind up with your choice or him with your choice, the "best move" is to build a balanced force.

but then again, the notion of "winning sfb" by scenario design (force selection optimization to produce an imbalanced scenario) is not new and wont be going away anytime soon.

=====

By Michael Parker (Protagoras) on Wednesday, November 14, 2007 - 05:23 pm: Edit

It has been a LONG time since I played SFB's. But to me force selection was alot of the fun of it. I always loved picking hulls I enjoyed flying, I liked warcruisers because they flew better than standard cruisers.. oh not that they WERE better.. but because they were more fun to fly in many cases.

Force Selection isn't bad to geek out on, even if its to try and win. Its just you have to look carefully at the scenario you set-up. Perhaps even doing something like this.

Player 1 "Oh wow, that is a very slick group you have"

\*ponders\* "Mmmmm I did not even consider that" \*looks at his SSD's\* "Look you win, and I will buy you a beer after the game, but man if I am to have a reasonable chance in this I need to switch out this Tug with Light Battle Pod with a BCH"

Player 2 \*looks at the forces\* "Uhhmm well" \*realizes the guys point and for a moment regrets that he will not get to inflict the trouncing he was hoping for\* "Alright, but an import beer man.. none of the generic cans with just BEER on it"

Everyone is happy, and hopefully you have a fun time playing the scenario.

I even liked playing scenarios that were purposefully unbalance, not because I liked loosing badly or winning easily, nor because i thought I was so good I could win in a bad situation. But because its fun sometimes to see what mileage you can get in a bad situation.

=====

## EARLY YEARS TACTICS

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Saturday, March 10, 2007 - 04:34 am: Edit

On another note....

Much as been said of the (relative) weakness of the EY Hydrans and Kzinti due to an almost complete lack of long-range weapons.

One way to counter this is to make sure you are using Erratic Manuevers when closing with the enemy force. If you are not using the EW rules this gives you an +2 shift that the Klink/Lyran/Caryn can do NOTHING to counter.

If you ARE using EW, using EW PLUS generating 3 points ECM will ensure the same effect. When you reach close range (range 10 or less) you can drop the the ECM (and possibly Erratic) to increase speed to finish your attack run. You will be slower, but unless you are on a floating map (you shouldn't be) and the enemy is retrograding, you WILL reach the enemy force with minimal damage from long-range fire.

The Feds can use this to good effect as well, when fighting those saber dancing Klingons in the EY period.

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Saturday, March 10, 2007 - 07:45 am: Edit

Mike Strain. The problem with the EY Hydrans and Kzintis isn't surviving to hit range 10; the problem is surviving to hit range 2 or 3. Their disruptor armed opponents own ranges 4-8 and have superiority at range 3.

=====

By Daniel E. Bivona (Admiraldan) on Monday, March 12, 2007 - 11:59 am: Edit

(You know, someone could really get on Evilmike's nerves and ask if there is an EY version of the cricket bat in this thread)

\*Running for cover\*

=====

By Michael Lui (Michaellui) on Monday, March 12, 2007 - 04:01 pm: Edit

Why not? There's a Sub-Light version of the Cricket Bat.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Monday, March 12, 2007 - 04:42 pm: Edit

Cricket. Sometimes in Afghanistan and Iraq that was all that was on when we were trapped in our villa.

Gosh knows it takes a lot of time.

=====

By Jeremy Gray (Gray) on Monday, March 12, 2007 - 04:48 pm: Edit

OMG, its over here too!

=====

By Peter D Bakija (Bakija) on Thursday, March 29, 2007 - 09:15 am: Edit

So here is a question that I presume Andy can answer, but anyone else with info is good too.

Given that the Gorns don't get seeking plasma for, like, what, 20 years after the Romulans do (y88 vs y104?), how do the y era Gorns fight the Romulans? Like, this isn't a "how do they win?" kinda question, but an actual, from the ground up, what is the basic tactical doctrine of this kind of battle? Granted, I have never, ever played such a fight (we played the heck out of the Western powers Y era stuff during playtest, but never messed with the Eastern powers, and then haven't actually played any Y era games since, well, Module Y came out), so don't even have a basic understanding of the dynamic, but on

paper, it seems like it should be either completely futile or really long and really boring.

I'd think that, say, the Gorns could get 2 cruisers for about the cost of 3 Romulans. The Gorns literally can't hurt the Romulans outside of R5. The Romulans can mask/veil/cloak or whatever, and can launch plasma Rs. Yeah, the Gorns can approach under weasel at speed 4 (what, they get to R20, launch a speed zero weasel, and spend 5 turns closing on the Romulans while being weasel protected), but the Romulans can launch an R torps 1 at a time to kill weasels (even at R20), eventually running one of the cruisers out of weasels, allowing an R torp to hit. If not 2. An R torp will likely mission kill one of the Gorn cruisers (30 internals about?), and even at R0 centerline without any cloak interference, a Gorn cruiser is barely going to do internals to a Warbird (20 from bolts, if they both hit, 20 from P2s=40 damage against a 25 point shield and 5 armor). I might be missing something important, though.

Could someone spell out how a game like this works? Assume an even BPV match up of two Gorn cruisers vs an equivalent BPV of Romulans (maximizing WBs for R torp action), how does the game play out from either perspective?

Thanks,

-Peter

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Thursday, March 29, 2007 - 12:23 pm: Edit

Peter.

1. The Gorns have Ph-2s while the Romulans just have lasers.
2. The Veil and Mask are not nearly as good as the cloak, especially against direct fire
3. Not all Roms have R-torps

One tactic is to play the dance, drawing out and running out plasma while aiming for range 5 strikes.

Another is to take advantage of the Rom turning rate and get behind them, out of arc. The defense against this (facing 3 directions) reduces the Rom firepower.

Another is the crash dive/emer decel to get close and weasel plasma.

Another is to keep a ship back, by the range 20 weasel, and phaser down the plasmas to keep the weasel alive longer.

Another is to just approach at speed 4, prepared to weasel as needed and keep advancing.

The horde of suicide shuttles is another option. If he's launching plasma at them, he's not launching plasma at you and remember, shotguns aren't invented yet. If nothing else, it can force him to "cloak" allowing you to close.

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Thursday, March 29, 2007 - 07:11 pm: Edit

After the Roms 'upgraded' to seeking plasma and the Mask in Y88, the Gorns quickly (YIS Y91) developed their Y-era ships (YCL, etc).

Since I and Ron Abitz apparently did the lions' share of the EY Rom playtesting, I'll add on to Andy's comments. I'll use the setup we did during playtest....1 Gorn YCL vs 2 WWB's. An almost even BPV matchup. Gorn has 4xp2 and 2 (just about useless) plasma G cannon (bolt only, range 5 max); Roms have 2xplasma R torp and 8 (just about useless) warp-targeted lasers. Note that the WWB has 15 box shields all round; the Gorn has 18-14-12 (nose-flanks-rear). Note that with only 18 power and a 2/3rds MC, the Gorn's top battle speed, assuming full phaser caps and holding 2 G-bolts, is 18 after spacekeeping.

If you MUST fight 1-on-1, the Gorn YFF vs a single WWB is, BPVwise, an even matchup.

Things to remember:

Sublight Roms almost NEVER use active fire control. Good Roms will have D19 MEMORIZED. Aside from gaining ECM/range benefits (which are lost if he Masks; D19.312) there is the power savings.

Sublight Roms ALWAYS use Reserve Impulse power; if he needs to subtac, he can, and if he never tacs (but decides to move a hex) he can do that too.

Sublight Roms DO have their PPT's.

Sublight Roms rarely bother with WW's, the Mask is cheaper (and you never run out).

Sublight Roms, whenever possible, use the fullblown EW rules. The closer the Gorn gets, the less useful Mask becomes.

As a Romulan, there are both advantages AND disadvantages to 'superstacking'. Plan carefully.

Gorns NEVER 'superstack'.

Sublight Roms DO have their NSM's. They have range-ZERO triggers, and under the normal rules are NOT hidden when laid. Having said that, they can still be very bloody useful.

Expert/daring/insane Gorns will sometimes not power their shields during EA, instead relying on reserve power to raise them if necessary. This is usually referred to as 'flying naked', or 'The Gorn Strip Tease'. The power saved is almost always used for speed. This is one of the VERY few times a Romulan payer will think about using Active Fire Control.

Some Gorns won't bother arming G-bolts, again, to gain more speed.

Gorn EY ships do not have safe HETS.

Gorns rarely waste power on SS's; Gorn ships have little power to spare, and the Romulan Mask tends to make them of little use in any event. And in EY, control range is 25, NOT 35. In any case, every shuttle used as a SS is one less for use as a WW.

Good Gorn players have the R-torp chart MEMORIZED.

Expert Gorn players use mid-turn speed changes.

Great Gorn players consider their tractors better weapons than their G-cannons.

One tactic worthy of mention I and Ron Abitz developed was dubbed 'The Plasma 2-Step'. It involves arming ALL your shuttles as WW's, and then judicious use of 4/14 speed plots in the following turns to close the range. Properly executed, it can get the Gorn to range 5 (or less) facing Romulans with (hopefully) empty plasma tubes.

Gorn-Rom battles in the EY tend to last MANY MANY turns; however, the turns tend to play very fast (until the Romulan wants to make the Gorn sweat and starts calling for impulse-by-impulse; this usually indicates the Romulan is about to launch plasma). Lots of psychology involved, VERY 'submariney' as one person called it. If the Gorn makes just ONE error, he tends to eat Hot Plasma Death. The Roms can usually make SEVERAL errors and still keep the Gorn at bay.

Note that in battles vs G-torp Roms (Snipes and Hawks) the pressure eases up TREMENDOUSLY on the Gorns; the R-torp in EY is a terror weapon, pure and simple.

=====

By Peter D Bakija (Bakija) on Friday, March 30, 2007 - 09:02 am: Edit

All very interesting. After looking through the book last night, the Gorn YCL costs 60 and the Romulan WWB costs 33. So you got about 1 Gorn CA for every 2 Rom WB. The Gorn has 2xG Bolt and 4xP2. The Roms have 2xR torp and some lasers (numbers scale up as necessary)

It looks as if the Gorns can freely ignore AFC and probably even shields to gain speed early on, but if they hope to avoid the R torps, they really have to move slow. The Mask simply breaks lockon, so at R0, the Mask has zero effect on the Gorn's firepower (except for suicides).

I'd figure the optimal plan would be drop a weasel at range, like, 22, approach at speed 4, and if they kill the weasel with a torp, launch a second, and then rush to R0 after both R torps have been fired (if you are approaching under weasel protection, the PPTs are irrelevant). But even then, when the Gorn gets there, it can't do that much (~40 damage assuming centerline and both bolts hit), although that might very well demolish a WWB. But then it needs to get away from the next R torp and not run into a NSM. While getting shot, in theory, by lasers.

It looks as if the most effective weapon the Gorns have vs the Romulans at this point are suicide shuttles (which strikes me as dubious weapon engineering, but I digress...) for a R0 tractor attack, but they have to give up weasels to get them.

-Peter

=====

By Richard Wells (Rwwells) on Friday, March 30, 2007 - 03:13 pm: Edit

Peter: The obvious Romulan counter to a slowly approaching opponent is to back up, use tractor rotations to cover a few more hexes, and lay mines to protect the facings the Gorn is initially approaching in addition to sending long range plasma to kill off shuttles. Even running across a T-bomb will hamper the Gorn. With mines preventing overruns on half the hexsides, the Romulans will have an easy time getting coordinated fire on the paths the Gorn can use.

The Romulans have several points of surplus power every turn (unless recharging lasers); expect that power to be used for tractors or weasels as needed. The Romulan using TAC-Tractor rotate-TAC over a turn break can pull many targets into arc.

=====

By Peter D Bakija (Bakija) on Friday, March 30, 2007 - 04:45 pm: Edit

Richard wrote:

>>Peter: The obvious Romulan counter to a slowly approaching opponent is to back up, use tractor rotations to cover a few more hexes, and lay mines to protect the facings the Gorn is initially approaching in addition to sending long range plasma to kill off shuttles.>>

Very possibly, but I'm unsure when the Romulans can tractor rotate (i.e. for a long time, their tractors are super short ranged). And when they get T-Bombs.

>>Even running across a T-bomb will hamper the Gorn. With mines preventing overruns on half the hexsides, the Romulans will have an easy time getting coordinated fire on the paths the Gorn can use. >>

Also very likely--again, I'm not, like, trying to find a superior strategy here or anything. I'm basically trying to understand the dynamic of a fight that looks like, on paper, kind of an absurd exercise (i.e. moving ships that can't do any appreciable damage outside of R5 against speed 1 ships that have no noticable direct fire but can launch plasma Rs)

-Peter

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Friday, March 30, 2007 - 05:31 pm: Edit

Romulan 'tractor beams' are useless for anything except towing until Smarba.

Peter.....actually, given some luck, the Roms can do long-range bolting.....it's chancy, but it's one of the things that make Gorns sweat.

Here's the other thing that makes Gorns sweat.

Assuming your tactic above...drop a WW t range 20-22 and close at speed 4....one simple thing a Rom commander can do is Not Fire/Launch.

When the Gorn hits range 12 or so, the Roms brings up AFC. The Gorn, if he's sane, will have a +2 shift (4 ECM + 4 more from the WW; vs 4 ECCM from the Roms).

What happens is the Romulan is letting the Gorn in close on the gamble that he can smack the lizard with at least one bolt; if it works, you have Plasma Fried Lizard.....if it doesn't, the Gorn gets some licks in (and usually tries to drag one WWB away from its partner, for individual attention.)

We'd call this 'Romulan Roulette'.

=====

By Peter D Bakija (Bakija) on Friday, March 30, 2007 - 05:48 pm: Edit

Mike wrote:

>>When the Gorn hits range 12 or so, the Roms brings up AFC. The Gorn, if he's sane, will have a +2 shift (4 ECM + 4 more from the WW; vs 4 ECCM from the Roms). >>

Heh. If the Gorn has that much ECM going (i.e. a -2 shift, and why wouldn't they, really), why would the Romulans even bother raising AFC? Might as well simply wait till the Gorns get to R2 (doubles to 4 due to PFC) and fire the Bolts. If you hit with 1 on the 1-2, the Gorn takes 25 damage vs an 18 box shield, doing a few internals, and letting the Gorn get lasered to death (and by "death", I mean, "take about 15 internals"...)

when it centerlines at R1 (I figure it is bad for the Gorn to try shooting at R0 due to bolt feedback). If the Romulans jackpot and hit with both bolts, game is over. If they miss with both, well, they still have the lasers and the Gorn isn't going to be able to kill both WWBs before the next R comes on line.

I'm only looking at the 1 CA vs 2 WBs as it is easy math. All the numbers scale up (2 CA vs 4 WB or whatever--WBs are more or less interchangeable here, although the BHs have considerably less shock and the G torps are much less good against the R20+ weasel).

-Peter

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Friday, March 30, 2007 - 09:16 pm: Edit

Also keep in mind that a speed 4 Gorn can have enough reinforcement to take a single bolted R with no internals.

In some ways, the Gorn WBI (CL21) is a better Rom-killer than the YCL before the Gorns get seeking plasma, with its plethora of ph-3s and 10 boxes of armor. The -1 ships definately make better WW "guards" - the 47 point WCI can put 3 ph-2s and 2 ph-3s into any approaching plasma (better than 4 ph-2s for that purpose).

=====

By Richard Wells (Rwwells) on Friday, March 30, 2007 - 11:14 pm: Edit

Peter: The Romulans have range 1 tractors on the W-series. Sure, its only RA and only Romulans but many tractor tricks are available and quite useful.

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Saturday, March 31, 2007 - 03:08 am: Edit

Pete: You can't use ECCM unless AFC is active; D6.622.

=====

By Peter D Bakija (Bakija) on Saturday, March 31, 2007 - 12:06 pm: Edit

Mike wrote:

>>You can't use ECCM unless AFC is active; D6.622.>>

Heh. Yeah, I realized that at some point between making that post and waking up this morning. But then, I don't use EW much :-)

Richard wrote:

>>The Romulans have range 1 tractors on the W-series. Sure, its only RA and only Romulans but many tractor tricks are available and quite useful.>>

Can the Romulans' Y tractors rotate? That's kinda handy.

-Peter

=====

By Peter D Bakija (Bakija) on Saturday, March 31, 2007 - 12:12 pm: Edit

Andy wrote:

>>Also keep in mind that a speed 4 Gorn can have enough reinforcement to take a single bolted R with no internals. >>

I was trying to figure that out--the YCL has, what, 18 power and 2 batteries (16 wp/2 imp)? If it is moving speed 4, it has:

-3 move (2.66, but I'll ignore fractions)

-2 sheilds

-1 LS

-1 FC (?--it might need ECCM)

-3 weasels (1 is on the map)

-4 ECM

-2 Hold G bolts

So it can have 2 points for reinforcement or something. If the Roms bolt (4 ECCM gives them a 1-2 to hit), and one hits, it will kill the Gorn's #1 and do a few internals, and then the Lasers can make a mess through the hole--heck, if they Roms

just wait till R1, and they exchange fire, the Gorn gets to shoot with 2xG bolt and 4x P2, and the Rom gets to shoot with 2x R bolt, 8x laser, and the Gorn loses the ECM from the weasel. Hmm. Not good plan for Gorn...

-Peter

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Saturday, March 31, 2007 - 01:13 pm: Edit

Peter. Don't bother with ECM or 2 of the weasels and you have reinforcement. Also, range 3 is all the Gorn needs, range 2 at most. If the Roms are masked, then they can't shoot. If they're not, shoot at range 3, outside laser range, and scoot away.

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Saturday, March 31, 2007 - 03:19 pm: Edit

'Can the Romulans' Y tractors rotate? That's kinda handy.'

No. Tractor-W (and S) can only tow friendly/captured units; no rotation, etc.

Roms had Tractor-W until Smarba.

=====

By Peter D Bakija (Bakija) on Saturday, March 31, 2007 - 04:41 pm: Edit

Andy wrote:

>>Peter. Don't bother with ECM or 2 of the weasels and you have reinforcement. Also, range 3 is all the Gorn needs, range 2 at most. If the Roms are masked, then they can't shoot. If they're not, shoot at range 3, outside laser range, and scoot away.>>

Reasonable. Except if you are going to R3 to shoot, you need to turn on AFC (and void the weasel, assuming you were approaching at sp4 with a weasel on the board) to shoot. At which point the Roms launch R torps, that you have to weasel. Twice. Leaving you at 1 shuttle for the rest of the game...]

-Peter

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Saturday, March 31, 2007 - 06:58 pm: Edit

Peter: The PFC range limit is that you cannot launch seekers when \*closer\* than range-5, or fire direct fire when \*farther\* than range-5. How would this prevent the Gorn from firing at range-3?

=====

By Peter D Bakija (Bakija) on Saturday, March 31, 2007 - 10:31 pm: Edit

Dale wrote:

>>How would this prevent the Gorn from firing at range-3?>>

On PFC, you double the range for hitting. So your Bolts fire as if it is R6 for to hit (i.e. hit on a 1-3 instead of 1-4) and phasers fire as if R6 (i.e. they are horrible). I mean, they \*could\* fire at R3 on PFC, but expected damage is, like, 15 points.

-Peter

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Saturday, March 31, 2007 - 10:33 pm: Edit

True, there's that. I thought you were saying they \*couldn't\* fire, not that it was a bad idea.

Yeah, at range-2 it gets better for 'em, no doubt.

=====

By Mike West (Mjwest) on Sunday, April 01, 2007 - 12:28 am: Edit

Mike,

The Romulan still doesn't need AFC. With +4 from the WW, and another +4 self-generated, that is only a total of +8, which is still a two shift. Basically, the Rom can't get it less than 4, and the Gorn can't get it higher than 8. So there is no reason for the Rom to bother with ECCM.

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Sunday, April 01, 2007 - 12:42 am: Edit

Normally that's true, Mike. But the Rom runs max ECCM to keep the Gorn honest, as it were; otherwise, the Gorn uses the 4 off the WW to get that +2 shift. Rom powers max counterjam

to commit the Gorn into spending more power to KEEP the +2 shift.

=====

By Michael Lui (MichaelLui) on Sunday, April 01, 2007 - 01:17 am: Edit

The Gorn CAN get it higher than 8 with PFC. The 2 ECM you get from it is treated as natural and would boost it to 10. I'm not sure if they would have to leave their AFC off for 32 impulses before they launch a WW or the time spent under the WW could count toward it though. At least I'm pretty sure you can add them together.

=====

By Douglas Saldana (Dsal) on Monday, April 02, 2007 - 12:37 am: Edit

What happens if you replace the Gorn YCL in this match-up with an Orion WDR (BPV 61)? Do you still have a battle on your hands or is it an easy victory for the Orions? I ask because Y1 mentions that the WDR's did most of their raiding in Romulan Space (and from Y113-Y118 would still have been opposed by masked ships).

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Monday, April 02, 2007 - 02:25 am: Edit

Romulans die...die...die.

Oh, it takes forever, but eventually the photons batter the Roms into dust.

The Mask is of very little value vs photons/disruptors.

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Wednesday, June 20, 2007 - 12:58 pm: Edit

Ok, new discussion.

How difficult is it for Lyrans and Kzinti to deal with Carnivon ships?

W-era is pretty easy, I imagine, but what are some Y-era tactics to use?

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Wednesday, June 20, 2007 - 03:14 pm: Edit

Only successful tactic I've found is to keep the battles small (3 ships or less per side). At larger sizes, the Carnivons take out a ship every 2 turns. Once you close, neither the Lyrans or Kzintis have any advantages as the HNs and DBs are effective close range weapons.

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Wednesday, June 20, 2007 - 04:45 pm: Edit

How would requiring the Carnivons to use the C5 S8 rules (ie, required to bring 2-3 SC4 ships for every SC3 ship in your fleet) change things?

Being that's supposed to be how they deploy 'historically'....

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Wednesday, June 20, 2007 - 09:40 pm: Edit

Not much. The YDD has 2 DCs - the same as the YCA. Their R15 firepower is a real killer - no pun intended.

=====

By Jon Berry (Laz\_Longsmith) on Friday, September 07, 2007 - 12:34 pm: Edit

Sublight Romulans vs Space Boars. For a peice of fiction I'm writing, I would like general opinions on how that matchup would work.

With thanks;

Jon Berry

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Friday, September 07, 2007 - 01:20 pm: Edit

Space boars 1, ROMulans 0

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Friday, September 07, 2007 - 08:32 pm: Edit

Given that Space Boars have MCIDS, you'd need a Vulture and 10 Warbirds, plus loaded dice, to kill one with bolts before it ripped the Romulans into shreds.  
Ok, if the Roms were allowed to set up their NSM's properly, maybe a Vulture and 7 Warbirds.

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Friday, September 07, 2007 - 09:31 pm: Edit

What are the stats of Space Boars?

=====

By Jon Berry (Laz\_Longsmith) on Saturday, September 08, 2007 - 12:32 am: Edit

Thanks guys. Andy, the Boars are from Y1, which I can't seem to find at the moment. They're the monster of choice for the EY.

=====

By Richard Wells (Rwwells) on Saturday, September 08, 2007 - 01:21 am: Edit

The space boar could simply run away. Die roll of 2 turns it to face away from the Romulans followed by die roll of 1; nothing the Romulans can do will prevent it from getting 25 hexes away and disengaging.

The boar probably won't do that much damage before the random rolls send it off the map. The boar will average about 10 points per attack; maximum is 24. Half the time the boar attacks, it will choose a different ship to attack so damage should be spread out. If the Roms maintain several hexes between each ship, that keeps the boar from attacking every impulse. The space boar requires 200 points of damage to kill or about 10 attacks by a WB using direct fire.

If the boar charges right down the combined group of Romulans, a force of 4 WB should be able to be able to take down a boar if the boar catches all 4 NSMs. In that process, the WBs would take light shield damage from the boar and probably much heavier damage from their own mines. (I expect the Roms to move back into hexes with armed mines; the boar must enter the hex to get the ship which ensures the mine will explode.)

However, flukey rolls that wind up with the boar evading the mines and making repeated strikes to the rear shields of the Romulans will end when the nearly intact boar disengages. The Romulans will be either crippled or destroyed if the boar remains long enough.

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Saturday, September 08, 2007 - 07:53 am: Edit

LOL - shows how much I look at the scenarios

=====

By Alan Trevor (Thyrm) on Saturday, September 08, 2007 - 12:52 pm: Edit

Maybe I'm missing something here (it wouldn't be the first time) but launched plasma in mass seems like it should work just fine. MCIDS fires 3 times per impulse (but only once at any given target) and one firing will, on average, knock about 23 points off a plasma warhead. If a group of Romulans wait until the Space Boar is only 1 hex away and then all fire R-torps simultaneously, a lot of plasma should get through.

I don't play with monsters very often, nor do I like the EY Romulans (though the "standard" Romulans are my second favorite race after the Tholians) so I may have gotten something wrong due to unfamiliarity. If so, what is it?

=====

By Ezekiel Price Carpenter-Hyland (Admiral\_Zekedak) on Saturday, September 08, 2007 - 06:23 pm: Edit

Wow! ADB really gave us a lot to think about in the Y module, particularly in the East where tech matches were commonly at different levels. In a follow-up to Peter's question of how "what's the tactical doctrine" of battles involving Gorns with bolt only plasma and Romulans with Seeking/normal bolt plasma, I've been very curious how other kinds of Gorn/Romulan matches would have been approached by their respective captains.

First a bit of "History"...

Bolt only plasma Romulans with no masking device fought tactical warp Gorns with atomic missile launchers in the later half of the 2nd Gorn-Romulan war of Y62-68, and into the 3rd Gorn-Romulan war of Y90-96 as well. As these W-class ships appear for both sides at the same time, we can only presume mismatches between W and earlier ships would be terrible affairs for the disadvantaged side.

In the 3rd Gorn-Romulan war, both sides would begin phasing in ships discussed in earlier posting; seeking plasma Romulans and range 5 bolt-only Gorns. However, W vs. Y mismatches would presumably be common in the later half of the conflict. While Y-Romulan vs. W-Gorn are presumably an easy win for the Romulans as the Gorns would likely flee, W-Romulan vs. Y-Gorn matches are much more interesting.

With respects the later half of the 2nd Gorn-Romulan war involving bolt only plasma Romulans and tactical warp atomic missile Gorns I would like to propose the following tactical doctrine for a close BPV match-up involving a single the Gorn WCA @ 40 points vs. two Romulans of either SWB and SHK types @ BPV bewtwn 36 and 42.

Gorn fighting instructions...

Atomic missiles have a maximum range of 6 hexes, Romulan plasmas have a 5 hex range, and warp-targeted lasers on both sides have a 2 hex range. As even single G-plasma bolts are hard for Gorns to take and 2 impulse tactical maneuvers can put the Romulans into firing arc whatever, Gorns would be expected to launch atomic missiles at maximum range. The Romulan ships can either laser these missiles or move out of range. Either way, several passes will put a wave of missiles that the Gorn can follow in for a follow-up missile/laser strike with maximum shield reinforcement. Presuming the Romulans hit for only 30-35 points of plasma damage and use their lasers to shoot down missiles, the Gorns can expect to take only a few internals after armor and score range 0 lasers + a couple of missile hits in return for 18+ points. Given the HUGE Romulan shields, repeating range 0 laser strikes and possible additional missile launches while the Romulan plasmas reload for 2 turn should score internal damage on one of the Romulan ships, presuming you can hit the same shield each time, after three solid turns of damage.

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Saturday, September 08, 2007 - 11:42 pm: Edit

Ezekiel. Actually, the Gorns began upgrading their W-ships to phasers and bolted plasma DURING the 2nd Gorn-Romulan War. The SSDs for the upgraded ships are in Captain's Log 21. As for the earlier Gorn/Rom fights you mention..

- it IS possible for the Gorns to get behind the Roms; they can fly behind them faster than they can TAC.

- WBBs and WCAs advancing under weasel protection (+4 ECM) with maximum shield reinforcement and WDDs behind them controlling their missiles can be an effective anti-Romulan tactic.

- Keep in mind that the Rom shields aren't huge during that era (WWB has 10 point shields), so the missiles and WTLs are an immediate threat.

- Romulans need to use their NSMs well and should use reserve impulse to move, if needed (you get a free tac if you don't do anything); declaring speed 1 on impulse 1 is bad unless you're at range.

=====

By William T Wilson (Sheap) on Sunday, September 09, 2007 - 03:13 am: Edit

-----

Quote:

I may have gotten something wrong due to unfamiliarity. If so, what is it?

-----

The original poster didn't specify, but most people seem to be assuming these are the very early bolt-only Romulans. With seeking plasma, you can do some damage.

=====

By Richard Wells (Rwwells) on Sunday, September 09, 2007 - 05:03 am: Edit

For the space boar scenario, using seeking plasma requires the Romulans to be tightly bunched. However, if the plasma fails to kill the boar, the boar will attack every impulse. About 300 points of damage during the turn the Romulans have no plasma to launch will adversely impact any Romulan force. Spreading the Romulans reduces the boar's ability to inflict damage. But spread out Romulans have to rely on direct fire.

=====

By Ezekiel Price Carpenter-Hyland (Admiral\_Zekedak) on Sunday, September 09, 2007 - 07:11 pm: Edit

Whoops, several important errors were made in my assessment. While I might be forgiven for not having Captain's Log 21, I should have realized the shield reductions for early Romulans and their ability to pull only ONE impulse tac/turn (additional tacs could only be made with warp power). This makes getting plasma bolts to connect much harder unless the Romulan ships divide their facing.

Thanks Andy.

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Sunday, November 25, 2007 - 11:12 pm: Edit

Was thinking about this recently.

The Great Klingo-Tholian War.

2x2 fixed map.

Klink fleet of C4, D4x10 enters 01xx map edge, speed any, WS-3.

Tholian BS in center of map, with STR 0 web laid out in a Buzzsaw config. One GBDP (with 360 degree arc) on each anchor asteroid.

3xPC (in pinwheel formation) in same hex as BS.

No time limit, Klinks HAVE to kill the BS to win.

Tholian win if 2/3rds of Klink fleet crippled/destroyed.

Commander's options not in use.

Stalemate rules in effect, as are advanced base rules (no shuttledeck) and full EW.

What can the Klingons do to optimise their attack? Do they even have a chance?

Are the Tholians impregnable? What's their weak spot?

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Monday, November 26, 2007 - 08:21 am: Edit

Weak spot for the Tholians:

1) They can't get the darn web up to strength in any reasonable amount of time.

2)

Weakness of Klingons:

There are HOW MANY GBDP on Asteroids? The P4 on them will gut a couple or three or four D4 a turn.

I have to say the Klinks will charge in with all power to movement and shields.

Get to range zero and fire the wad into the BS.

Probably will lose a few ships and then the next turn the base dies and the Klinks run away from the darn GBDPs...

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Monday, November 26, 2007 - 06:27 pm: Edit

When I played the Klinks, I lost the C4 and 6 D4's. But I got that #\$(^\*ing base.

A big thing was the Tholian shuttles...which DO have their p-3's. The BS really doesn't have enough power to play EW games.

After the base went down, the pinwheel split and went after my surviving D4's. Between the bloody asteroid phasers and the PC's, only 2 D4's made it off the map. Both were almost crippled.

=====

By Ken Kazinski (Kjkazinski) on Monday, November 26, 2007 - 07:17 pm: Edit

Sounds like a good trade. 9 ships for a strategic hex and the loss of a base.

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Monday, November 26, 2007 - 08:05 pm: Edit

Well, in 19 turns, the Klingons can blow up an asteroid from range 22 (P3.45) and can have 23 points of reinforcement (on the D4s) while doing it. At that range, the Ph-4s won't be doing much. [perhaps 15 turns if they throw in some ph-2s]

Take your time, take out all of the anchors, and then it's game over.

Note: I wouldn't want to actually fight this fight, as its more of an exercise in statistics, but...

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Monday, November 26, 2007 - 09:14 pm: Edit

Sadly, with the stalemate rules in effect, you have only 10 turns before you're forced to disengage if you don't cause internals or kill a manned shuttle.

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Monday, November 26, 2007 - 10:40 pm: Edit

Yeah, the stalemate rule and assaulting Tholian bases is like giving the Tholians a 500% BPV advantage.

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Tuesday, November 27, 2007 - 02:11 am: Edit

Depends on the setup and the situation. In this case, yeah, it burns.

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Tuesday, November 27, 2007 - 02:25 am: Edit

TELL me about it.

Frackin' Tholians.

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Tuesday, November 27, 2007 - 09:05 am: Edit

Hmm. Maybe with the help of drones, they could destroy one at range 15 within 10 turns.

=====

By Alan Trevor (Thyrm) on Tuesday, November 27, 2007 - 12:07 pm: Edit

I can't tell you the rule number from memory, But an active web holds the asteroid together even after the asteroid is "destroyed". As long as the Tholians can keep the web powered (which is "indefinitely" within the context of a tactical scenario) the "bag of rocks" held together by the web still acts as an anchor for the web, though I believe any base on the web would be destroyed when the asteroid is "destroyed". And once the web goes down the rocks drift apart and the Tholians cant *re-establish* a web.

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Tuesday, November 27, 2007 - 01:11 pm: Edit

Yeah, you can blast the asteroid, and any bases on it die, but as long as the web is powered, the debris still counts as an anchor.

So its usually faster just to shoot whatever base is on the 'roid.

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Tuesday, November 27, 2007 - 03:12 pm: Edit

..faster but far more painful. Destroy the bases on the asteroids and the Tholians lack the firepower to stop you from summarily blowing up the base.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Tuesday, November 27, 2007 - 04:07 pm: Edit

And bases can get ECM benefits (loaned, generated or natural) while a rock can't.

As I stated before, I don't see the THolians having enough power to get the buzz saw up to useful strength in time. And there was no mention of a minefield to act as a speedbump.

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Tuesday, November 27, 2007 - 07:42 pm: Edit

No minefield, thank God.

Even with range-0 triggers (this is an EY scenario) a minefield would make it impossible, I think.

=====

## ATTRITION TACTICS

By Trent Telenko (Ttelenko) on Tuesday, February 20, 2007 - 07:57 pm: Edit

We had a question about six PFs versus six Fed F18 and six F111.

How about this match up:

Six G-1 with scout and leader. The leader has a shatterpack shuttle loaded and a T-bomb.

His opponent is six Federation F111M with his fighter bays filled with whatever he can squeeze in, AKA drones, fighter pods, T-bombs whatever.

What happens next?

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Wednesday, February 21, 2007 - 10:04 am: Edit

The first issue is what is the objective?

If this is a fighter sweep and their destruction is the mission of the Pfs then they can proceed to dance around the fighters for quite a while.

Without booster packs (or mega packs) the fighters are limited in speed.

The Pfs can snipe with disruptors anyone boosting with packs, and the adds will be effective for a while.

BUT, after the adds run out, there is an awful lot of drones that may require your DF weapons.

LONG TERM, without access to a place to get more drones, the fighters will lose due to the continuing fire or disruptors and phaser 2s.

The PFs do NOT want to go point blank and may tend to reserve a lot of drones for defense.

=====

By Martin Read (Amethyst\_Cat) on Wednesday, February 21, 2007 - 01:31 pm: Edit

Michael: F111M is a F111 with a megapack.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Wednesday, February 21, 2007 - 02:10 pm: Edit

And the F18s?

=====

By Alan Trevor (Thyrm) on Wednesday, February 21, 2007 - 05:33 pm: Edit

Trent hasn't specified whether this is floating or fixed map and whether there is a time limit. In my opinion, a PF flotilla has a huge advantage over fighters in a floating map/no time limit battle because of two factors, EW and shields.

EW: Fighters are limited to 6 points ECM and 6 points ECCM as a maximum (except for terrain/"natural ECM", which wasn't mentioned in this scenario). A PF flotilla with a PFS is limited to 12 points of EW. But this can vary (if the PFs are willing to dump some of their "free" points and use power to make up the difference) from 0/12 to 12/0 or anything in between. This means that the PFs can customize their EW according to the specific tactical requirements in a way that the fighters cannot. If causing damage is most important, the PFs go heavy ECCM (at least 10 points) and their fire is unshifted regardless of what the fighters do. (Note that small target modifier is not cumulative with erratic maneuvers - one or the other but not both. Fighters with 6 ECM and erratic maneuvers have 10 ECM total.) On the other hand, if the PF priority is limiting the damage they take, they can go heavy ECM (7 points for +1 or 10 points for +2) and guarantee that the fighters do have to shoot against a die roll shift. Of course, the PFs would also be shooting against a shift, but that brings us to...

Shields: It takes 14 points to cripple an F-111M, and every point inflicted counts toward that goal. But only damage above a PF's shield reinforcement counts. And you need 12 points that "count" on the same shield before the PF starts losing combat capability. Now suppose our PFs are beyond range-8 from the fighters and the PFs are forcing a +1 ECM shift against the fighters and also shooting against a +1 shift themselves. The gatling phasers are worthless against the PFs themselves (though they will be effective against their drones) and even a full squadron of F-111s will average only 2 points of phaser damage per turn against the PFs. The PFs use their ADDs and drones to defend against the fighter drones, while sniping against the fighters with their phaser-2s, and their disruptors if those are in arc. The PFs do only a few points of damage each turn, but every point counts toward that 14 necessary to cripple another F-111M. The F-111s can only use their phaser-2s against the PFs and don't have enough of them to be effective, considering both the ECM shift and the shield reinforcement. There are some issues involving weapons arcs for the Klingons if the F-111Ms charge and the Klingons try to maintain range-9 or greater. But ultimately I don't think the fighters can do anything (other than disengage and give the Klingons a victory by default) that the Klingons can't counter. Personally, I dislike fixed map games. But a situation like this needs something to prevent the Klingons from simply wearing the fighters down at range over a long period of time. That something might be a slow or stationary target to fight over; perhaps a freighter with very valuable cargo. But in a "pure" floating map/no time limit fight, a full PF flotilla (including PF Scout) has a huge advantage over fighters, even if the fighters have a big edge in BPV. The battle may be long and tedious, but the outcome is usually a foregone conclusion.

=====

By Trent Telenko (Ttelenko) on Wednesday, February 28, 2007 - 06:23 pm: Edit

Alright, since I was incomplete in my set up, let us try this again:

Match up:

Six G-1 with scout and leader. The leader has a shatterpack shuttle loaded and a T-bomb.

His opponent is six Federation F111M with his fighter bays filled with whatever he can squeeze in, AKA drones, fighter pods, T-bombs whatever.

The six F-18 are 5xF-18C and one E-F18 with two EWP, The load out of the F-18C includes two Type-III, three Type-I drone and one fighter pod of any type. These drones can be upgraded and additional pods can be carried. The F-18s have warp booster packs, not megafighter packs.

Set Up:

The Federation fighters are a sweep from a Battlestation that was staged through a forward casual base. They have unlimited endurance in scenario terms. Damaged or crippled Federation fighters do not count towards Klingon victory points. Only destroyed Federation fighters do.

The Klingon G-1 Flotilla was templated in its operations and was caught at the end of its patrol range. The G-1 Flotilla was also raided for stores by a passing DSF unit.

This is reflected by

1) Only its Leader and Scout having commanders points for drone load out (The Shatterpacked shuttle is part of the basic cost of the leader for calculating this) with all other drones in the flotilla being type-I, and

2) a six turn scenario limit on a fixed map. Any G-1s left on map after turn six are considered destroyed via running out of fuel to return to their tender or base.

What happens next?

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Thursday, March 01, 2007 - 11:14 am: Edit

Narrow salvo disruptors and phaser 2s.

ADD any drones.

Kill what you can and leave. Keep your speed up.

=====

By Jim Davies (Mudfoot) on Thursday, March 01, 2007 - 06:14 pm: Edit

I'd imagine the G1s getting crowded into the corner of the map by a vast cloud of drones, while nailing a few fighters with concentrated fire. The scout goes wild, the drones kill it. Melee, general casualties on both sides.

=====

By Kerry E Mullan (Nomad17) on Friday, March 02, 2007 - 02:44 pm: Edit

Well 6 G1's have the following drone defenses:  
36 Adds, 2 discr, 4 phasers usable per turn, 2 special sensors, 12 drone racks, a tractor, spd and shields.

Fighters have:

6 F18Cs 34 drones

6 F111's 66 drones

All have launch restrictions but about 40% can be launched per turn. So normally having around 58 inbound as a large initial wave with a follow-up of 36 more 8imps later. With spd both can be handled(using all phasers and disrupters on the large wave).

Most likely turn one the PFs can reach range 15 and hit the fighters with 10 disrupters. I would probably fire all at one F111 killing/crippling it. Then run up to drones to range of 3 before turning away to kill drones with phasers and adds. The scout adding in its 3 sensor breaks and if the wave can be gathered a tbomb can be used to kill a large amount using drones to kill closer ones.

Next turn will be a run turn cleaning up the drones with all weapons including disrupters as from range 4 its a 66% kill normally this means the following numbers:

10 disrupters 6 kills

20 phasers 10 kills

10 drones 10 kills

Remaining ADDS(prob 15 or so shots) 10 kills

Scout breaking 1 kill + 2 drone kills

Roughly 40 kills without tbombs/shatterpack.

Depending on the wave size using the shatterpack ballistically to clean up 12 of em.

T3 will be more of a knife fight with EW on the PFs side and the fighters having like 20 inbound drones as their stores run dry. Here the PFs will be using drones as antidrone, and p3's for drone defense hitting close fighters with 2 OL and a P2 per PF. Most likely targetting the F11's till they die and using spd to keep outa the F15s range.

T4-5 F15Cs get crushed with clean-up of any crips as the ftrs are outa drones.

=====

By Alan Trevor (Thyrm) on Friday, March 02, 2007 - 02:55 pm: Edit

Kerry,

With all due respect I think you need to recheck both the G-1 SSDs and the PF rules.

Hint - You say "Most likely turn one the PFs can reach range 15 and hit the fighters with 10 disrupters."

=====

By Michael Lui (Michaellui) on Friday, March 02, 2007 - 03:31 pm: Edit

I think you're forgetting a few things.

1. It is a fixed map.

2. Those are F-18s not F-15s.

3. They have warp-packs attached.

4. If the PFs want to use ADDs on the drones, the fighters will be in range of their weapons too. Especially since the fighters will only be a couple of hexes behind the drones.

5. The F-111Ms can use their ADDs against the drones you launch to kill his drones.

6. The F-18Cs will be a couple of hexes behind the F-111Ms with warp packs turned on.

7. F-18s only have 2 P-3s. F-111Ms have 1 P-2 and 1 P-G.

8. You will have a choice of shooting F-18Cs for double damage at a longer range bracket OR shooting F111Ms at a shorter range bracket OR shooting at drones.

9. Choose wisely.

On a floating map the fighters are toast. On the fixed map of this scenario the PFs will have a hard time trying to stay alive. The fighters are more maneuverable than they are, have weapons that are just as good, and just have to pin them in a corner to kill them. The PFs must make the most of their EW advantage to keep shifting the fighters weapons. Unfortunately that also means that their own weapons will be shifted as well since the fighters will have 6 ECM AND 6 ECCM. They only have so much room to play in and the fighters will be trying everything they can to restrict it even more.

=====

By Kerry E Mullan (Nomad17) on Friday, March 02, 2007 - 07:19 pm: Edit

Yeah ftrs have 6 ecm and 6 ecm as long as the EW ftr lives. Ftrs going packed mean that they die/cripple quicker killing the drone output.

Maybe my memory is off. I thought G1's are 2 p2s 2 p3s 2 discr(thought r15 maybe only r10?) ADD and 2 drones.

Going spd 30 with std discr 4/4 EW plus scout loaning 6 leaves like 3 for reinforcement. Outside of range 3 with a shift of 1 DF for ftrs will be pathetic. They still have 12 shield boxes so taking some hits can still have a viable PF.

FTRs go in charging under packs and 4 should die at discr range, the other 2 at r8 from phaser fire.

I assumed the ftrs were going to come into range with packs and then go unpacked to maintain survivability til drones are launched. My assumption was the F111s were going max drones and not following their launches at R2 or less. As a drone platform launching and then following at R5 or so to allow for PFs to have to deal with the drones before a good shot occurs would be my plan.

Normal fixed map is around 2 turns of running being pursued full guns. With judicious use of HETs seeking weapons can be maneuvered around. can the drones overwhelm the PFs...sure. Is it a slam dunk, I doubt it. Ftrs have like 2 turns of drones, F111's 3 although each have the double launch for one turn(ie ftrs have 4 one turn 2 the next, F11's have 6 one and then 2 per).

What am I missing here?

=====

By Alan Trevor (Thyrm) on Friday, March 02, 2007 - 07:45 pm: Edit

Kerry,

re my comments above:

You're "over-gunning" the G-1. The standard G-1 (which seems to be what Trent wants to discuss since he didn't specify a variant) has 2 ph-2s, 2 drone racks, 1 disruptor and an ADD. So the entire flotilla has 5 discr, not 10. There is a variant with 2 disruptors but it loses one of the drone racks. I think (don't recall for certain) that it is designated the G-1B.

And yes, PF disruptors are limited to 10 hexes. Most PF direct fire heavy weapons are limited to 10. The one exception I can recall offhand is the photon torpedo (Orion PF option mount or "conjectural" Fed PF) which is range-12.

=====

By Trent Telenko (Ttelenko) on Tuesday, March 06, 2007 - 09:00 pm: Edit

Assume a standard G-1 flotilla.

If pure variants or a mix makes a bigger difference, state how.

There is an anti-fighter G-1 with two E-racks, for instance.

What happens is there are one or two in a standard G-1 flotilla, all other things being the same?

=====

By Trent Telenko (Ttelenko) on Tuesday, March 06, 2007 - 09:05 pm: Edit

>On a floating map the fighters are toast. On

>the fixed map of this scenario the PFs will

>have a hard time trying to stay alive.

Assume the same six turn limit with a floating map after three turns with direction limits, AKA the Klingons cannot go in one-to-two directions towards Federation territory from the initial map due to fuel limits.

=====

By Ken Humpherys (Pmthecat) on Wednesday, March 07, 2007 - 12:20 pm: Edit

[Deleted, wrong topic]

=====

By Ezekiel Price Carpenter-Hyland (Admiral\_Zekedak) on Tuesday, August 28, 2007 - 04:13 pm: Edit

My esteemed opponent (retired navy corpsman) and I have started a PF campaign using the U9 rules for the K module. The following is a short narrative giving background for the campaign.

Story Line

Following the end of the Romulan Civil War in Y186 and prior to their Pacification campaign beginning in Y188, the ISC launched a major series of incursions against the Romulan Empire. This included targeting of a critical region of space connecting the Romulan Empire with it's exploration zone using primarily PFs in an action later known by Federation historians as Operation Buzz Saw.

The aim of this action was to sever the Romulan Empire from their heavily exploitative operations in the edge of the Sagittarius arm and eliminate this potentially troublesome flank prior to the beginning of major Pacification ventures. Doing this with mainly attrition units appears to have several advantages. First, minimizing the threat to Romulan territory proper was hoped to lessen calls for fleet support, a concern that would be further reduced when Imperial holdings were threatened by regular ISC fleet incursions elsewhere. It was also calculated that remaining tensions between former separatists and the empire would make calls for Imperial unlikely when separatist planets were not directly at risk. Finally, the new PFs would be able to cover the required distance with only modest logistical support, and a large number of flotillas scattered throughout ISC territory were sitting idle following their initial training deployments at backwater bases.

The first 6 months of Operation Buzz Saw included particularly intense action as both ISC and Romulan reserve PF flotillas were rushed to operational headquarters at opposing battle stations and continually deployed. Attrition was particularly high as each vied for superiority. Local fleet elements, though rather limited, were also involved. In addition, several supply convoys and PF support units destroyed and action took place at headquarter battle stations on more than a few occasion.

Campaign Organization

We are following U9 fairly closely using conventional forces (upgraded to 1xCW, 1xDW & 2xFF) & random events with minor modifications. There are also no scout PFs and EM rules have been abstracted to a single die shift (cannot be countered). Other forms of EW have been eliminated, along with PPTs and WWs. We also have limits on variants/Starhawks using published descriptions. Force allocations consisted of the following...

Sector-1 (no random event)

ISC: BATS w/12xFtrs, 2xFF

Romulan: Zip

Sector-2 (no random event)

ISC: 1xDD, 1xflotilla (2x phaser variants)

Romulan: 1xSkH-A, 1xCenturion flotilla (no variants)

Sector-3 (undetermined random event)

ISC: 1xCL, 1xFlotilla (2x plasma-D variants)

Romulan: 2xSeaH-A, 1xCenturion flotilla (no variants)

Sector-4 (undetermined random event)

ISC: 1xFlotilla (standard)

Romulan: 1xSpH-A, 1xStarhawk flotillas (modules unknown)

Sector-5 (undetermined random event)

ISC: Zip

Romulan: BATS w/12xFtrs

Battle Report

Played sectors 1&2. 1 was a free victory, but 2 was a real barn burner. Results to follow...

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Saturday, October 27, 2007 - 08:11 pm: Edit

Are EW fighters worth it?

You get the EW advantages but lose the weapon that the base fighter carries. The EW fighter is great other than it has this "shoot me" sign on it, making it the first fighter targeted. Since it has to be within 3 hexes to loan EW and can't perform erratic maneuvers while loaning, it's not too hard to target. And then "poof" all advantage is gone.

Is it just better to take 12 of the baseline fighter, gaining the extra weapons, and just relying on EW pods for electronic warfare?

=====

By Michael Lui (MichaelLui) on Saturday, October 27, 2007 - 09:21 pm: Edit

I'm a Stinger pilot. Do this:

1. Put any pilot you're having disciplinary problems with in your Stinger-E. Tell him that he's getting a promotion and his record cleaned if he survives just ONE mission.

2. Load all of your Stingers with EW pods. Yes, it does slow them down.

3. Set all the external EW pods to ECM.

4. Set the Stinger-Es internal pods to ECCM. Do NOT turn them on.

5. Close with the enemy under EM.

6. When you get to range 10 (or the impulse just before you get there) drop EW and turn on the Stinger-Es internal EWPs.

7. All the fighters can now fire with 6 ECM and 6 ECCM as the fleet kills your Stinger-E.

8. Run back to your CV or charge the enemy depending on the situation.

PROBLEMS

A. The rules say that the EW fighter may not loan EW while under EM.

No problem, it isn't. The rules allow the EW Pods to generate EW points for the fighter that is carrying them while under EM. That way all your fighters will have 10 ECM while closing.

B. The Stinger-E is a different type of fighter and is susceptible to being IDed at range 12 by a ship and 18 by a scout.

Most scouts trail several hexes behind the rest of the fleet and cannot afford to put out enough ECCM to overcome this jamming combo (After all, they DO like to generate ECM to protect themselves).

C. Scouts can lend ECCM to a "sacrificial" ship to ID the Stinger-E at a longer range.

Kill the sacrifice.

NOTE

These problems also apply to the Tholians and, I think, maybe ISC. ALL other races EW fighters aren't IDed until range 9 for a scout and 6 for a ship unless their EW fighters are actively lending EW to their squadrons.

EW fighters are normally only worth buying if your fighters are carrying direct fire weapons, not drones. IE: Hellbores, Fusions, Photons, etc.

=====

By William T Wilson (Sheap) on Saturday, October 27, 2007 - 09:58 pm: Edit

I will always take an EW fighter over a standard fighter. Even if it gets targeted first, then at least the enemy is shooting it. The EW shift can greatly increase the amount of firepower required to kill fighters and, even given the lending range restrictions, you can still frequently keep the EW fighter in a longer range bracket. Don't forget all the shots that are being targeted on the EW fighter would have been aimed at your fighter squadron anyway. So it's not like you're not getting fair value for it.

That's not to say it's a bad idea to have the rest of the fighters carry EW pods too. After all, the EW fighter probably will get blown up, and then those pods will be handy. Especially handy on fighters that have too many drone rails.

=====

By Richard Wells (Rwwells) on Saturday, October 27, 2007 - 10:00 pm: Edit

If using drone fighters, I would take the EW fighter. The ability to control other fighter's drones helps free those fighters to duck behind terrain or pop chaff or even land to reload.

Hydrans: again, I would take the EW fighter. Sure, it will take damage but at the critical ranges stingers need to cross, the firepower needed to kill the EWF could instead kill 3 regular fighters. Though carrier lending from those rare Hydrans with plenty of surplus power does provide an attraction.

Plasma: Skip the EWF.

=====

By William T Wilson (Sheap) on Saturday, October 27, 2007 - 10:06 pm: Edit

Hydran (and Federation, where appropriate) EWFs get to keep their gatlings, so they are still handy units just for that.

I would probably not trade an F-torp plasma fighter for an EWF but I would have no problem trading in a D-torp fighter. Especially since D-torp fighters do not have a lot of excess rails on which to carry EW pods, so the EWF is a larger share of their total squadron EW.

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Sunday, October 28, 2007 - 07:21 pm: Edit

As a Hydran, I only take EWFs on the larger full carriers, where there are more than one squadron. I have my carrier loan ECCM to one squadron and the EWF handle the other (the power consumption tends to be too much for the carrier to support both squadrons and still protect itself).

=====

By Ezekiel Price Carpenter-Hyland (Admiral\_Zekedak) on Monday, October 29, 2007 - 01:00 pm: Edit

How about scout PFS? Are they worth it? Given that PFs get so much free EW (2 ECM, 2 ECCM, 2 swing), the scout version is 2.5x the price of a normal combat version (100 vs. about 40) and you lose about 1/6 of your firepower, it's hard to see them being much of an asset. Can anyone share a specific example from a game they ran where having a scout PF instead of the extra combat PF was important?

=====

By John Wyszynski (Starsabre) on Monday, October 29, 2007 - 01:33 pm: Edit

Scout PF: If the flotilla is based on a tender with special sensors, I never take a PFS as the tender is a far better EW platform. When going against targets which can't generate enough ECCM, I usually chose a PFS. Ground bases are usually poor at having more than 6 ECCM total, so having a PFS can be critical to getting your PFs into range 5. And anytime you're going up against a target that can generate more than 6 ECM, you'll probably need that PFS, otherwise your fire power will drop by more than 1/6th.

=====

By Alan Trevor (Thyrm) on Monday, October 29, 2007 - 01:57 pm: Edit

Ezekiel Price Carpenter-Hyland;

PFs do not get 2 ECM, 2 ECCM, and 2 swing. They get 2 ECM and 2 swing.

John Wyszynski;

I disagree somewhat about not taking a PFS if you have a tender. I think it depends on the specific situation.

1) The tender may not be an effective EW support platform. The Tholian PFT is the best example of this. (I'm talking about the PC-based PFT. The CW-based tender is fine.) The PFT only generates 14 points of power. If the tender has to take any actions to protect itself it may not have enough power to support the flotilla. This is particularly the case if the PFT has to do a lot of maneuvering since it only has 12 warp engine boxes but (unlike the standard PC) a movement cost of 1/2.

2) I may want to use the tender as a scout to support the other warships in the fleet. Due to the small number of Special Sensors (usually 2) even on CW-based PFTs, I may want to

include a PFS in order to allow the PFT to perform the fleet scout mission.

3) The PFT may be based on an SCS. Most SCSs don't have Special Sensors to begin with. If I want to give the flotilla any EW support, I have to use a PFS.

=====

By Kerry E Mullan (Nomad17) on Monday, October 29, 2007 - 03:10 pm: Edit

Yeah I always take the PWS if able to (ie not a casual flotilla).

The reason behind it are that the PFS can reliably lend about 9 EW plus batt for ew. This is while maintaining spd 20 which allows it to trail behind the main flotilla and maximize their abilities, while making any damage to it hard (as its 10 hexes behind a flotilla).

If facing a lot of seekers especially plasma its wild function can save the whole flotilla as the seekers have to travel those 10 more hexes before impact (plus the 4 or so hexes the PFS can get in those 10 seeking weapon moves). This normally degrades it greatly allowing the PFS to survive it.

if facing one ship that is speedy (a lot of BCH etc) the PFS can paint it with 6 OECM while maintaining its spd easily. Most tenders are great lenders til they get caught due to seekers etc, which the tender doesn't have enough spd or abilities to properly defend against.

=====

By Alan Trevor (Thyrm) on Monday, October 29, 2007 - 03:19 pm: Edit

I believe I made an error in my earlier posting. PFs get 2 free ECCM and 2 swing, rather than 2 ECM and 2 swing. But in any case it's 4 points total, not 6 points.

=====

By Ezekiel Price Carpenter-Hyland (Admiral\_Zekedak) on Monday, October 29, 2007 - 04:44 pm: Edit

PFs get 2 free ECCM and 2 swing, OK.

So I'm currently playing a PF campaign (ISC vs. Romulan), and after playing several battles I just feel 2.5 additional PFs are better than a scout PF. While that exchange could not be made in the campaign, it could be done the way most people play, using BPV to buy units. If you think this is just crazy, please give me some play example where the scout is better. Perhaps there is some difference with scouts when PFs fight fleets instead of other PFs.

Here is an example of my thinking... One side has a normal 6 PF flotilla with leader and scout. The other side has 8 PFs with some shield refits and 2 leaders, but no scout. The scout could force 2 energy to be spent to prevent a -1 shift and/or give one or two PF a shift (possibly even a 2). The other side gets 33% more fire and durability (I count the energy lost to equal shield refits). This would seem to more than offset any potential reduction in damage output. I have trouble with breaking lock-on being that important as PF speeds are regularly 30+ (then again I've never seen a game with 100+ drone counters, let alone been willing to play one).

One possibility may be the wild PF. I've never had a situation where a wild PF would have saved my flotilla, but that may be due to differences in play style. Still, I'd be worried to give the other play any chance to kill my scout as taking out this unit alone should give him the match (its worth 100 points!). I'm wondering if the wild PF scout could be used as part of an offensive tactic to clear incoming fire and allow me to close for a shot. Has anyone ever used them this way with success?

=====

By Kerry E Mullan (Nomad17) on Monday, October 29, 2007 - 07:06 pm: Edit

Well first as PFs are around 45 per the scout player would have one less PF or something along the lines of the following: Leader, 4 normal PFs and Scout against 1 leader 6 normal PFs. Note the non-scout player technically has 2 more combat units.

Maybe I am miss-understanding you post, but the scout lends all EW to the entire flotilla.

So heres an example: 5 pfs fly 7 or so hexes in front of the PF scout. These PFs are running around at spd 30, 2 ecm 4 eccm and erratics. The scout is out generating 9 ew(most likely 6 ECM, and 3 ECCM) for the PFs.

Turn starts and you find out what EW the other PFs are running. Due to this alter what the scout lends to facilitate your shifting of fire while giving you a good shot(most likely 4 ecm and 5 ECCM) giving opponents a 2 shift.

Reach range five and Alpha bolt on one opposing PF and phaser the other. 5 bolts would usually get eitehr 3 or 4 if 3 hit 30 damage means that pf is going to be near powerless. 10 p1's is about 35 damage so PF #2 just got destroyed.

Opposing fire is 7 bolts and some 14 p1's with a shift of 2 means 44 or so damage killing one of yours(most roms will only be 7 p1s schich means your lone PF will be alive but not very functional).

Next turn he has 5 operational PFs you have 4 plus scout. Repeat range 5 run giving you 4 bolts and 8 p1's so doing 4 bolts plus a 2p1 and 5 p1. The bolt target is mostly powerless(27 hit or some 10 ints). The 5 p1's most likely just lost its hull and a shield. His return of 5 plus 10 is 30 damage killing one of yours.

This repeats til in the end you should have a pf and scout against his destroyed flotilla.

As to the wild PF I have only seen them in starbase battles which is a huge benefit. After launching some full fleet plasma from range 15(like 220 pts) the wild PF stretches the plasma out another 10 hexes meaning it takes 0 and base saves on weasels. The scout still has ecm up so any DF from range does little to it.

=====

By Ezekiel Price Carpenter-Hyland (Admiral\_Zekedak) on Monday, October 29, 2007 - 08:17 pm: Edit  
Kerry,

Thanks for the feed back!

I looked at my copy of mod-K. For ISC PFs (which I use in my PF campaign). Economic BPV for a PF is 23 while a scout is 100 (5 to 1). As a player potion for standard PFs would have about a 2:1 advantage, I'll put this aside and presume having a PF scout is critical for finding distant targets or some such. Combat BPV for combat PF is 40 while scouts are 50, which one might just as well call even.

Based on your above example, the flotilla with the scout inflicts 50% more kills. Sadly, I've yet to achieve such results. Based on your assessment, I would guess scout PFs should get a nice boost in combat BPV.

=====

By Douglas E. Lampert (Dlampert) on Tuesday, October 30, 2007 - 03:56 pm: Edit

Combat BPV for scouts is equal to Economic BPV unless the scout is the only unit present on its side. Thus the Scout counts as BPV 100 for purchase of combat BPV if part of a flotilla.

=====

By Ezekiel Price Carpenter-Hyland (Admiral\_Zekedak) on Wednesday, October 31, 2007 - 12:58 pm: Edit

That would mean equal PBV produces a battle involving...

Normal Flotilla

1xPF(leader), 4xPF(combat types), 1xPF(scout).

vs.

2 Understrength Flotillas

2xPF(leader), 6xPF(combat types), 10 extra points.

If all free EW by the non-scout energy is used just for ECCM, they will get a -1 shift. Using the example Kerry gave us, the normal flotilla will kill 2 enemy PFs per turn (which is about what I get in my games). The 2 partial flotillas will fire 8 bolts and 16 P-1s at -1 (unless they spend 2 power each, which I would do even if packs were required). This should produce the same result, i.e. 2 dead PFs. I presume each side would be able to kill 1 PF the following turn. This gives the normal flotilla just 2 combat types against 5 (who fire at -1). Damage output now becomes rather uneven. Also, if the normal flotilla ever fails to screen attacks on the scout (like when they become

outnumbered 2.5:1 on turn 3) they run the risk of loosing the scout and the game even if they manage to kill 2 more enemy PFs than they loose themselves.

So in general I see the scout PF as a liability in the flotilla vs. flotilla engagements. I can only presume that is not the case in battles involving large numbers of regular fleet units in heavy EW environments.

=====

By Kerry E Mullan (Nomad17) on Wednesday, October 31, 2007 - 01:09 pm: Edit

Ezekial

Normal Flotilla

1xPF(leader), 4xPF(combat types), 1xPF(scout).

vs.

2 Understrength Flotillas

2xPF(leader), 6xPF(combat types), 10 extra points.

So 1 PF scout 100 points is equal to 1 PF leader 54 points and 2 normal ones 88 points? I like your math. dropping one PF from you opposing forces makes it 100 vs 54 plus 44 or 98. So it would be:

Normal Flotilla

1xPF(leader), 4xPF(combat types), 1xPF(scout).

vs.

2 Understrength Flotillas

2xPF(leader), 5xPF(combat types), 2 extra points.

As well for the EW calculation you will always have a minimum shift of 2 with erratics or with any flotilla going 4/2 ECM/ECCM as the scout can always lend the full 6. As the scout gets to decide where his 8 or 9 points goes after the opposing forces declare the EW it is generally simple to arrange the shift of 2.

=====

By Alan Trevor (Thyrm) on Wednesday, October 31, 2007 - 02:03 pm: Edit

Ezekiel Price Carpenter-Hyland;

With all due respect, I think you're neglecting an important point. *How did the PFs get to the fight in the first place?*

With very few exceptions, ships can't carry more than 6 PFs. And PFs don't have much strategic range independent of their tenders. Your "Normal Flotilla" requires a single PFT for strategic movement while your "2 Understrength Flotillas" require a PFT and a "casual" PFT with mech links. That requirement for an entire extra ship makes it a much more expensive proposition, regardless of the costs of the flotillas alone.

=====

By William T Wilson (Sheap) on Wednesday, October 31, 2007 - 03:54 pm: Edit

You can't just have one leader for every 2.5 standard PFs instead of one leader for every 4 like there actually are.

In addition, the only place you could really base something like this would be on a planet, and in that case, you would always need a PF scout because in that case the scout probably has your only long range sensor capability.

There's more to it than just points...

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Wednesday, October 31, 2007 - 04:04 pm: Edit

In a campaign in which the PF is the basic combat unit for purchase and deployment, I would agree that the PFS is of less value - perhaps having 1 per 3 flotillas, for use in larger battles would be the route to take.

However, in a more "standard" setting, carrying capacity is a significant factor. In that situation, a PFL, PFS, 4 PF is far more effective of a combat formation than PFL, 5 PF. This significant delta is where the EconBPV of the PFS comes into play, for balance purposes.

In what sounds like your situation, however (which sounds like a theoretical inter-system conflict with nothing but PFs), unless the scout capabilities of the PFS has any significant operational/strategic advantage, I would stick with the standard combat PFs

=====

By Richard Sherman (Rich) on Wednesday, October 31, 2007 - 04:11 pm: Edit

Andy,

In a campaign, that makes sense to me, as alot of those PFs you build are going to get farmed out for casual use.

All praise the mighty mech-link refit!

=====

By Ezekiel Price Carpenter-Hyland (Admiral\_Zekedak) on Thursday, November 01, 2007 - 06:06 pm: Edit

Nice discussion here...

I agree with everyone about flotilla composition. My point with the scouts was trying to get feedback on they can be used to their full potential (in BPV terms), something I have been thus far unable to do.

Couple of quick things...

Mod-K states that flotillas can be composed of as few as 3 PFs (which would include 1 leader per 2 other PFs). This holds true in the U9.0 campaign, which I'm currently running (details are posted in this board on Tuesday, August 28, 2007). This campaign forces you to use groups of standard flotillas until enough casualties rack up for other configurations (like you have 3+ leaders w/o other PFs). Also, the K-mod repeats a couple of times that most PF activity is centered on planets/bases, making use from tenders comparatively rare. This is also true in F&E despite the removal of unending sweeps of open space by opposing forces (most flotillas sit idle).

My conclusions regarding scout PFs...

PFs do not have the same tac intel capacity of regular ships, and the easy way to deal with this was to add scout channels on one PF/flotilla. Some, but not all, of the benefits from this are represented in SFB (the rest laying somewhere between SFB and F&E). Still, they are an interesting option to have available, particularly given their WILD side.

=====

## BATTLE REPORTS

Archive through March 21, 2007

Star Fleet Universe Discussion Board: Star Fleet Battles: General Tactics Discussion: Battle Report Forum: Archive through March 21, 2007

By Gord Whitney (Gord) on Sunday, February 25, 2007 - 11:26 pm: Edit

My regular opponent, Bruce, and I played (SG11.0) The First of Its Kind. He played Fed, as the defenders. He had a base station in a radius 2 planetary orbit, a FF and an FRD (containing an unfinished DN the Feds were scrambling to make ready to launch). I played Klingon, bringing in two D7Bs and a D6DB as the attack force.

I brought my ships in nineteen hexes from the FRD, thinking there was no way the FRD could move from, or be moved from, its starting hex before Impulse 32. So I launched a wave of speed 20 drones from the D6D on Impulse 1.

I now realize the frigate could have towed the FRD-DN combo at an effective speed of two by using impulse power as well as warp power, but I completely overlooked that in my planning.

Fortunately for me, so did Bruce, so he wound up expending a T-bomb to deal with that drone wave.

My D7s closed and fired overloaded disruptors at the FRD doing about a dozen internals.

On turn two, the D6D launched a scatterpack full of ATG drones. The ATG proved to be well advised when the frigate towed the FRD behind the planet and my cruisers lost line of sight to it. Since the ATG drones kept lock-on he ended up shooting down this drone wave.

My ships were keeping the planet between themselves and the base station. Near the end of turn two, they each put two T-bombs in 2314, for a total of six. Then I launched a wave of ballistically targeted drones (ten type I-Ms plus two VI-Ms I'd loaded in the ADD racks of the D7Bs) designed to detonate

most of (or, with luck, all) the bombs in the stack just as orbital motion brought the base station into range of the blast on Impulse 32.

It turns out my execution left a great deal to be desired. I'd beamed the bombs out on Impulse 24, and launched the drone wave on Impulse 28. The base station dropped its shield on 28, and put out a T-bomb of its own that blew up the drone wave one hex and one impulse earlier than I'd intended.

So I canceled my plans to move the D7s into arc of the base for a follow up strike with their disruptors and phasers. Instead, I fired the overloaded disruptors at the frigate on Impulse 31 and moved to keep the planet between the base and my ships on Impulse 32. The frigate lost its #3 shield and took about half a dozen internals.

We had to pause the game at the end of turn two, which allowed me to make a thorough check of the tractor beam rules during the hiatus.

When the FF tractored the FRD I had asked Bruce what the pseudo-speed (for the pair) would be. Bruce replied that since the FRD was at speed zero, the matter was handled under (G7.32) and pseudo-speed didn't really apply. That seemed odd to me, but it sounded like Bruce had done some checking about this in advance. As I didn't want to slow the game down to a crawl, I accepted this at the time, although I did say in passing I was going to have to look at the rule carefully later.

When I did, it seemed to me Bruce had made a mistake. The fact that (G7.32) Towing a Non-Moving Ship and (G7.36) Tractoring a Moving Ship are separate sections can lead a reader to believe that entirely separate procedures are using depending on whether one or both ships have non-zero speeds. Which is what happened to Bruce.

However, since (G7.32) does not define what this other procedure might be, I concluded what was really intended was (G7.32) was meant to describe the basic case where only one ship was moving, and (G7.36) was meant to build on that foundation and deal with the more complicated case where both ships are moving. Bruce agreed with me when I suggested this to him.

We decided to switch to using the proper rule as of Turn 3, which, in retrospect, may well have been a mistake. Switching over like that, especially when we did it, left his frigate more vulnerable than it really should have been. (If we had stayed with the ad hoc procedure we'd started with, the Fed FF-FRD combo would have been able to move earlier on turn 3 than turned out to be the case).

In the interest of full disclosure I must admit I made plenty of rules screw-ups of my own on the first two turns. I spent a number of my Commander's Option points on ATG drones (Limited Availability) in violation of the Klingon racial percentage limits. I transferred some of the (J4.814) deck crews between my ships, because I'd missed the prohibition against doing it. And I made an illegal speed change.

My initial speed plot had me switching from speed 5 to 4 after movement on Impulse 24. During the turn I decided to advance the speed change by one impulse and get the movement for speed 4 on Impulse 24. I completely overlooked that this was a deceleration, which, since you cannot use reserve warp power to perform unplotted decelerations, made it illegal.

I could have gotten another movement point by accelerating to 6, rather than decelerating to 4, for the same amount of reserve warp power. The actual movement would have taken place on Impulse 27, rather than Impulse 24, but nothing of import had happened between those impulses.

Accelerating to 6 would have increased my turn mode from 1 to 2, but since I'd turned on Impulse 24 (or 27 if you like) and slipped on 32, that wasn't a problem.

The complicating factor was my D6DB had stumbled across a hidden T-bomb on Impulse 32 of Turn 2. Even at speed 6, triggering it wasn't guaranteed, but it was more likely than at speed 4. On the other hand, maybe the Feds would prefer it intact, and complicating the maneuvers of all three of my ships rather than damaging only one.

We hadn't rolled for the potential triggering before we paused the game because we hadn't realized a roll would be required. I said Bruce could use whether the D6DB was at speed 4 or speed 6 for the triggering roll. In the event I rolled a six, so it didn't matter anyhow.

As for the other stuff, between turns 2 and 3 my quartermasters 'discovered' a number of the ATG drones I'd requisitioned were, in fact, plain vanilla I-Ms which had been 'erroneously labeled' as ATG drones. The deck crew transfer was negated, since legally it never could have happened in the first place.

Once all that was cleared up, we were actually able to start Turn 3.

The FF was positioned such that the D7s could swing behind the planet, come out the other side and fire on the frigate's down #3 shield without ever exposing themselves to the base's fire. So that is what they did. They also launched SPs at the FRD, although one of the two had to be hoovered back aboard its mother ship to avoid being caught in a T-bomb explosion that wiped out a trio of drones from the D6D.

The D7s regained line-of-sight to the FF (and the FRD, but I was largely ignoring it at this point) on Impulse 8, and basically spent the next seven impulses pounding on it, finally destroying it on Impulse 15 (before it and the FRD it was towing could move on impulse 16). Regrettably, at least from my point of view, it took the bulk of my phaser-2s (at range 4) to accomplish. So I had no direct fire weapons left to work on the FRD.

My D6D had begun the turn at speed zero, using a ph-3 to sweep the T-bomb. Then it accelerated to 10, moving away from the planet while launching some drones at the FRD.

The remaining scatter-pack blossomed on Impulse 16. The Feds placed a T-bomb in the path of the drones. Unfortunately for him he placed it next to the D7s (which were stacked in the same hex). Why unfortunately? The D7s had dropped to speed zero back on Impulse 12, and they had TACs allocated which enabled them to bring their off-side waist phasers into arc to sweep the mine. Which one of them did.

So, on Impulse 19 he launched a speed 5 wild weasel, intending for it to move behind the planet the next impulse.

Before that happened, I crippled it, using a range 3 phaser-2 shot from one of the D7s and three range 7 phaser-3 shots from the D6D.

The crippling reduced the weasel to speed 3, so it did not move on Impulse 20. This allowed me to put a commando squad from one of the D7s aboard it, which succeeded in voiding it.

Bruce's first inclination for a response to that was to launch the FRD's other weasel, but he quickly realized it was still impulse 20, and he couldn't launch another shuttle from the same bay until 21 (by which time the drones would already have impacted). So he ended up using the FRDs phaser-1s and four of the phasers from the base (ph-4 mounts firing as ph-1s) to shoot down the drones.

We had to pause and save the game again at the end of turn 3. During that hiatus, I review the situation and decided to change my strategy in order to try the stacked T-bombs tactic once again. Only this time I'd do it right.

So, on turn 4, I maneuvered my D7s so they were in 2216 facing B at a speed of 3 after movement on Impulse 22. The fun part was earlier in the turn. While they were both moving at a speed of 7, they established a tractor link after movement on 10. This meant they moved on impulse 10 (speed 7), impulse 11 (pseudo-speed 3), impulse 12 (carry-over movement as both D7s were pseudo-speed 3), and, after dropping the tractor link, impulse 14 (speed 7).

The D6D turned around and arrived in 2216 (facing A) on Impulse 28. This time, the three ships put a stack of six T-bombs in 2415 on Impulse 28, timed so they could not go off before Impulse 32. Then they launched a drone wave on Impulse 31, timed so that their first movement would set off the T-bomb stack.

The facing shield on the base station had been lowered on the previous turn to allow for the transport of a T-bomb and never re-raised. So Bruce was able to beam out 2 T-bombs of his own (next to my ships in 2316) and still have the shield up for the big blast. His hope was that some of my drones would set off those bombs instead of my own, but since my ships were close enough and slow enough, I swept his T-bombs with a couple of drones from the D7s before they even became active. That did reduce the number I had available to trigger the bomb stack, so it wasn't a complete loss for him.

The drone wave (and one speed 6 admin shuttle – I set one of the bombs to be triggered by size class 6 units, the others for size class 7) set off five of the six T-bombs, taking out the shield and armor and doing 22 random internals. In three volleys, since all mine explosions are treated as separate volleys.

That took out two ph-3s, both special sensors and one magazine on his D-rack.

The D7s had moved into arc of the (to-be-)downed shield at range 3 on Impulse 32, placing them into position to fire a total ph-2s and the single (overloaded) disruptor each ship had charged into the base station on the direct fire phase. That resulted in another 51 internals. I admit I was a little irked when the damage rolls resulted in him losing only two of his phaser-4s instead of the four I was expecting.

The base got its own licks in, crippling one of my D7s with its phaser-4s on Impulse 32.

Bruce did catch me by surprise at the start of Turn 5, when he launched a wild weasel from the base on Impulse 1 for the ECM benefit. I hadn't allocated any power to EW on the D7s, deciding to rely on loaned ECCM from the D6D's sensor channels. Since the base did have power of its own to ECM, the net result was a +2 shift. This meant I kept missing with my available disruptors (the ones I hadn't fired, or powered, on the previous turn). It didn't work quite as well with my waist phasers, once I TACed to bring some of them into arc. I did enough internals on Impulse 3 to take out two more ph-4s. With the base now down to only three remaining weapons (two ph-4s and a ph-3) and the DN still, in his judgment, at least two turns from being ready to launch, Bruce conceded the scenario at this point.

We both made plenty of mistakes, both ruleswise and tactically. Did I mention my ballistic scatterpack whose entire drones loadout went to waste? I was a wee bit careless with my movement instructions for it, so it moved into line of sight of the base when I had no ships in position to control the released drones.

Even with all the mistakes, we had a lot of fun, and I think we both learned a lot.

=====

By Gord Whitney (Gord) on Sunday, February 25, 2007 - 11:57 pm: Edit

I want to add some comments about the stacked T-bombs tactic I used in the battle described in the the above post. As they are much more about the tactic than the battle, I thought it made more sense to present them in a separate post.

(SG11.0) dates back to the Commander's Edition, so it might be a little late to be filing playtest reports. But I am strongly reminded of the line on the Playtester Scenario Report Form from my old P modules which reads, "Is there a 'trick key' than can unlock this scenario and cause it to fall apart?"

I suspect my T-bomb stunt might be precisely the sort of thing that question was intended to cover. And I say that as the victimizer, not the victim.

The way the scenario worked out convinced me that, when its done carefully, this tactic can be a real nightmare for the defender to try and cope with. Even though my botched attempt from Turn 2 meant I didn't really have the element of surprise going for me on Turn 4 (and had already depleted my supply of T-bombs), I still managed to wreck the base in short order, while suffering only middling serious damage to one of my own ships.

Now, this is not going to be a tactic that can be used by any race – you need a large supply of drone launchers (or, as a possible alternative, expendable shuttles) to pull it off. And even if you have that, stacking T-bombs is not going to work very well against units that aren't moving either slowly or in a highly predictable fashion – but an orbiting base is doing both of those. So, for an attacker who has the drones (or shuttles) to spare it's really not that difficult to hurt such a target - and hurt it rather badly.

Which suggests to me this is a problem in need of fixing.

The first way I'd try to do that is to change the base from its radius 2 orbit to a radius 3 orbit. That would at least mean the drone wave would have to be exposed to fire from the base for at least a brief window before it could set off the bomb stack.

I haven't tried it myself - I don't like to play the same scenario repeatedly in short order - but I'm pretty sure that would be a step in the right direction. I just don't know if it would be enough to correct the entire problem, in and of itself.

=====

By Kenny Bruce (Lt\_Bruce) on Monday, March 12, 2007 - 10:17 am: Edit

Recently had a Y175 duel between a Kzinti CC and a Lyran CA. After a range 15 exchange of disruptor fire, the Lyran stopped about range four from the Zin and prepared for the knife fight. Both sides had max ECM, but the Zin was still moving speed 9. The Zin launched a scatter-pack which the Lyran immediately killed w/an overloaded disruptor. They exchanged fire, with only one overloaded disruptor hit on each side. This pass all but knocked out the front shields but did no internals. The Zin the turned off and ended the turn at range 7. The next turn the lyran remained stationary. The Zin remained at speed 9. The Zin continued forward and launched another scatter pack at range 9, the turned towards the lyran. The lyran weasled against the sp drones, taking collateral on his rear shield. The Zin fired 2 more drones (he was reloading his Cs) and fired overloaded disruptors on impulse 32 (range 4), and the lyran returned fire with UIM, which burned out, though it assisted him in scoring 4 hits. (the zin also got four hits.) This was the first time internals were scored, and the lyran lost an ESG and a disrupter as well as hull and 4 or 5 power. The zin lost a drone rack (he marked a B as his Cs had just been reloaded.) the next turn both remained stopped. The Zin did an alpha strike in return for some lyran phaser 1s (which did not penetrate the reinforced shield), scoring heavy internals. Five hit&run raids lost four BPs but killed 1 disruptor. The lyran was now down to 23 power, the Zin to 35. The lyran offered to disengage, and the Zin agreed, having crippled his opponent and knowing that his front shields were in no shape to chase anybody with 2 operation disruptors, 4 ph-s, and an unused HET bonus. (plus, this opponent tends to self-destruct suicidally right in you face when faced with no-win situations.)

=====

By Michael Lui (Michaellui) on Monday, March 12, 2007 - 04:15 pm: Edit

I don't know, I would have launched the drones from the racks and turned off. He couldn't have outrun your drones since he was going speed 0 the previous turn and he couldn't have caught you either. The Kzinti are great for still fighting without their forward shields. And this was a CC. It has disruptors that bear off the #3 and 5 shields and good arcs on the phasers too. Of course I have no idea what your own internals looked like except for the 1 busted B-rack.

=====

By Jim Davies (Mudfoot) on Monday, March 12, 2007 - 06:48 pm: Edit

On the face of it, the Kzin should have been able to blow the Lyran to bits after that, purely on power. Outside R3 or so, the Lyran won't be able to do enough phaser damage to get through shields and reinforcement, especially if he's having to defend against drones. You'll know if he has disruptors armed because he'll slow down a lot, and a HET to point them at you

will slow him even more. Actually, if the Lyran was crippled, he lost his HET bonus anyway.

Which suggests that the Lyran is trying to disengage at full speed (10), his power use is something like 10 + 4 (HK) +4 (phasers), +3 (ESG), +2 (Trac). Not a threat to anyone.

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Saturday, March 17, 2007 - 02:02 am: Edit

Just flew a pickup battle with a buddy who hasn't played since Commander's Edition. He did pretty well actually! I took a Fed DD (no refit) up against his D7B. The battle went long (we wrapped on Turn 11), but was played in about 2 1/2 hours.

One thing I've noted with a lotta old "Commander's Edition" players, is they tend to favor lower speeds with reinforcement over the "modern" high-speed passes. They also tend to wing off phaser shots - even ph-2 shots - at moderate ranges, hoping to wear you down over time.

=====

By the end, I'd done 10 internals to the D7B, and taken 13 myself... including 3 ph-1 and a Photon. Most of my shields were battered and frayed, whereas the Klink had lost his #2 and #3 shields.

=====

By Jim Davies (Mudfoot) on Saturday, March 17, 2007 - 04:16 pm: Edit

The low speed and reinforcement tactic harks back to the old days of plotted movement where there was no advantage to going fast, and so you had to put the power somewhere. So it was either reinforcement or EW.

=====

By Ezekiel Price Carpenter-Hyland (Admiral\_Zekedak) on Monday, March 19, 2007 - 07:55 pm: Edit

I'm playing out the Klingo-Hydran side of the 4-Powers War a la "Economy of Force" as the Klingons. We start in Y-158. Map is fixed for 3 turns, after which disengagement is allowed even if no internals are scored on opposing ships. My Hydran opponent is a retired navy corpsman with good experience. First two battles went as follows...

Sector 1

Hydran: BTTS w/2xHBM & 12xSt-1, 1xRN w/9xSt-1

Klingon: 1xE4

Battle Report;

The E4 "Tiny Tim" kept to the map edge while everything including the kitchen sink hit him. At least I got close enough to ID base pods w/Tac Intel before going boom.

Synopsis;

E4 lost with nothing to show. My only redemption came when the galley crew jumped into a shuttle and sublight evaded with the sensor logs.

Sector 2

Hydran: 1xKN, 1xLN w/4xSt-1

Klingon: 1xD6, 1xE4

Battle Report;

After the KN hellbores and stinger fusions were fired on turn 2, the Hydran ships split from each other. I concentrated fire on the KN as it was closer and we played high speed tag. He took moderate damage and could have disengaged starting turn 4, but stuck it out and put everything into speed. The LN tried to give support with fighters, but the E4 & drones were able to make an effective screen. On the beginning of turn 5, the KN was dead in space. I turned off while the LN came in and despite my efforts to it set up for a range 2 strike on the rear flank shields of both my ships (what a navigator!). Turn 6 the KN self-destructed for spite while I went sublight and dumped power into shields. Hydran Fire went against the E4, which scored my opponent his first internals (but with bad rolls). Both Klingon ships subsequently tacked and opened up with everything (including a failed tractor). The LN limped off and disengaged free of pursuit.

Synopsis;

KN destroyed & LN crippled (over 50% internals). D6 "Victory" lost 3 1/2 shields but was undamaged. E4 "Interference" took 4 internals.

Comments;

Keeping the escort back a few hexes was an obvious strategy and served well for battle pass fire support and sudden charges. Working out 8-speed drone tactics was a real challenge. Scatter packs were a clear waste of drones, and did not get used. Hydran ships never slowed below 15 anyway (except for a brief fighter docking) and shot down what I did launch just for fun with P-Gs & fighters while doing fly-bys. My only drone hit came from a range-1 launch on a crippled stinger. I cheered more for that one than a 5 of 6 disrupter score!

Sector 3

Hydran: 1xDG (w/3xSt-1 ???)

Klingon: 1xD6, 1xE4

The next battle is again a D6 & E4 combo, but this time against a single DG with presumably 3xST-1s. Commander's options are unknown, except for what I have (nada). I expect a hard fight as payback for Sector 2. Victory, unless my opponent is loaded with options, can be achieved by forcing the DG to disengage crippled (over 50% internals) while having (1) the D6 crippled and the E4 taking internals, or (2) the E4 being destroyed while the D6 takes internals so long as one fighter is killed. I can also win by (3) disengagement so long as I score internals on the DG, kill three fighters and avoid having either of my ships crippled.

I'm going for option (1) or (2) as the DG can cripple my E4 at will. My plan is to fake a "saber duel", but draw his approach and hellbores by firing at range (hopefully bagging St-1s). This will be followed by "The Hook" in hopes of getting a double shot on a rear/flank shield while he recharges. I'll then turn away, getting rear P-IIs into arc while opening range. It's saber duel again, but this time for real (we have open map) until I can manage another pass. I expect to win or lose on this second approach, but allow for mutual disengagement either way.

Any suggestions???

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Monday, March 19, 2007 - 09:38 pm: Edit

Don't forget that with the plethora of Klingon transporters on most of your ships, capture attempts on (relatively) undamaged enemy ships are a real possibility.

=====

By Ezekiel Price Carpenter-Hyland (Admiral\_Zekedak) on Tuesday, March 20, 2007 - 12:04 pm: Edit

True...

However, relatively undamaged Hydrans ships still have AMAZING short range fire power (not to mention stinger fighters). It's possible to put marines on board by staying at maximum transporter range, but I would only do this against fusion armed ships w/o fighters. Trying this against Hellbore armed ships (a DG in this case) is ill advised as falling from range 5+ to 4 greatly increases the damage potential (hit on 9's (5 in 6) for 15, 22 w/o). Unrefitted Klingons are tin-clad against implosions.

If I could get enough BPs on board in one turn to take over the ship and not be at risk from return fire, I'll eat the free lunch. Sadly, this will not be the case against a DG. On the other hand, if such a miss-match were in play, why not save the boys for my next battle and shoot to kill. The enemy ships is likely to just self-destruct, and the marine major is the ship's best pinochle player.

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Tuesday, March 20, 2007 - 06:23 pm: Edit

Read the transporter rules CAREFULLY.

There are all sorts of ways to get lots of BP's on board an enemy ship, even if one of the contributing ships isn't facing the down shield....

=====

By Ezekiel Price Carpenter-Hyland (Admiral\_Zekedak) on Wednesday, March 21, 2007 - 01:00 pm: Edit

OK, D6 has 12 PBs & E4 has 6 BPs. DG has 12 PBs (assuming no extra ones were purchased). If I send all the PBs from the E4 to the D6 using non-combat rates, then use the D6's 5 transporters to send the combined 18 onto the DG in one shot, I'll have a 6 PB edge. With this, I guess the probability of success using advanced boarding party combat is quite low (with the Hydrans trading a control station or two and normal militia activation rates), but I'll calculate the exact probability of success and post it. Let me know if I've missed anything. I'll also see if it's possible to just take over a section of the DG and reduce it's combat effectiveness.

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Wednesday, March 21, 2007 - 01:23 pm: Edit

Using Advanced Boarding Party combat, you will take a reduced number of casualties, as fewer defending BPs will be in the area. This is important as you don't get to "fight back" on the turn that you land (if using non-combat rates).

=====

By Larry E. Ramey (Hydrajak) on Wednesday, March 21, 2007 - 01:39 pm: Edit

I wouldn't worry about going "inside" Transproter range. It is the only place you can win.

R15-11 you might have higher average damage output, but since all his damage is going to go into 1 shield, its pretty much irrelevant. You won't die at this range, but you WILL be forced to leave.

R9-10 The Hydran owns you so badly its not funny.

R8-3 You own the Hydran. Alot depends on drones and stingers and all that but you do have a significant direct firepower advantage.

R2-R0 Off centerline, you likely STILL own the Hydran assuming the stingers are dealt with in a way that doesn't involve 100% of this turns firepower. On centerline a lot comes down to the overload status of the HBs.

The danger here is after the overrun, the Dragon shakes its butt at you and puts 30 points of gatlings into you. This won't feel good and likely wins the game for the Hydran.

I wouldn't be too scared about going close to the Hydran, as long as the stingers are dealt with. (easier said than done unless the Hydran is a moron)

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Wednesday, March 21, 2007 - 03:52 pm: Edit

use the D6's 5 transporters to send the combined 18 onto the DG in one shot

You first MUST have a bridgehead established to transport BPs at "noncombat" rates. Non combat rates lets you send 4 BP per transporter operation, but the combat rate is 1 squad per transporter operation (I was reviewing this last nite and could be wrong)

=====

By Norman B. Schwartz (Dragonman505) on Friday, April 06, 2007 - 08:18 am: Edit

Hello All. My opponent (Admiral Zekedak)is a very good tactician. What he failed to tell you about sector 1 is this. He allocated one, ONE E3 escort to that sector (with my Battlestation in it)! Brilliant. Event though I scored internals on the E3 before it disengaged he won the scenario on points due to the higher BPV of the Battlestation and its protector. Brilliant! I will pay more attention to deployment strategies next time. This was an eye opener. Also, I always buy extra BPs and always post guards. A boarding action with or without the advanced boarding party rules would have been interesting but difficult for both of us. I am glad he didn't try it.

=====

By Norman B. Schwartz (Dragonman505) on Friday, April 06, 2007 - 08:24 am: Edit

Hello Again. The Hydran is/was obviously not a moron. Only one Stinger destroyed and outmanuevered the Klink no mdean

feat there) more often than not by his own admission. I still lost though. Some good luck on his part, some bad on my part and he played an excellent game.

=====

By Kenny Bruce (Lt\_Bruce) on Tuesday, April 17, 2007 - 11:53 am: Edit

I recently played an 'almost' tournament duel (I don't have module T, but I downloaded the Tourney ships. We use them as a balanced group of ships for duels). Rules were as follows: no EW except WWs, stealth bonus, and plasma torps (that's standard I think). We did not use mid-turn speed changes and starting positions were opposite corners of the map.

I was an Orion Tournament Battle Raider and my opponent was the Romulan Tournament Firehawk. I had fusions in my wing-mounts and HBs in my forwards.

Turn One: I moved speed 18, holding one WW and my FBs, my opponent moved speed 27. We ended the turn at range 15, facing each other. My opponent fired 1 plasma S on impulse 32 in order to begin the reloading cycle.

Turn Two: I doubled my engines (not impulse), overloaded the HBs, and moved speed 26 with some reinforcement (5) on the number 1. My opponent kept speed 27. Opponent turned and began a pattern of slips, attempting to stay away from me. Shortly into the turn, he fired another S. I maneuvered to allow the first S to hit my #5 after deteriorating to 22. It was real, leaving 2 in the shield. I allowed the second to hit my #6, but it was a psuedo. At this point (range six, and I had just turned towards him) he launched an S and an F (I knew both were real because the S came from the Launcher that had already fired the psuedo). I let him have the ph-1s and HBs, (1 miss) knocking down the shield (#3) and scoring 4 internals, (2 ph-3s, a tran, and a left wrp). I turned and ran, he pursued. When the plasma were 1 impulse away, I fired ph-3s and HETed so they hit my #6 shield. The shield remained with 12 boxes.

Turn 3: (Turn of my big blunder) I suicide overloaded the FBs (which I had not fired) and planned to charge my opponent, who was about range 5. I was moving spd 30, he 18. However he got crafty and unloaded his shuttles between me and him as soon as I had turned. Then he launched his one unfired F and another hasty loaded in and S launcher. I fired a few ph-3s at them, and let them hit my number 2. I took 5 internals and the dice killed me: HB, FB, 2 ph-s, and Left Warp. I let him have phaser 1s and my remaining FB at range 2, and didn't quite knock down his number 6. I circled and ended the turn range 7 from him.

Turn 4: Kept one of the engines doubled, but moved speed 4. Started another weasle, an ovlod the HBs. Impulse 1 he started to fade and his down #3 was facing me, so I fired (range 7 shot). Both HBs hit, but the Ph1s scored only 7 damage. Then I weasled, and launched 2 standard admin shuttles. Brief shuttle duel between his 2 admins and mine, in which mine crippled both his with neither of mine being crippled. We ended the turn range 1.

Turn 5: I didn't double my engine, hoping for stealth bonus and forgetting about the anchor. He anchored, and I yielded the game.

=====

By Geoff Conn (Talonz) on Tuesday, April 17, 2007 - 03:14 pm: Edit

You might as well pick up module T2000. You're basically playing tourney duels anyways, although you need to know exactly what rules are used and what limitations are in place on ships (max 2 hellbores and no stealth bonus for the orion for instance).

=====

By Ezekiel Price Carpenter-Hyland (Admiral\_Zekedak) on Thursday, May 17, 2007 - 03:08 pm: Edit

An account of the sector #3 battle in the Klingo-Hydran front of the 4-powers War (played with Economy of Force mini-campaign)

Klingons- 1xD6, 1xE4 (neither w/refits, slow speed drones)

Hydrans- 1xDG (no refit, 3x stinger-1 fighters)

Turn 1- Speed; D6/E4 both@19, DG@16

The D6 is in 2228, E4 is in 2229, heading-A. The DG is in 2203 heading-D. The Klingons slip on approach putting the DG right of centerline. Hydran fires two hellbores at about range 12, hitting the D6 with one (re-enforcement allows damage to be dived among three rear shields). The DG then turns to heading-E and fires the other 2, missing with both. All 3 fighters are launched from the DG. The impulse before their fire control comes online, 4 disruptors (2 standard from E4, 2 overload from D6) and 5xP2s are fired on the fighters @ range 7-8 and all three are crippled. The DG continues to move off and turns to heading-F. The crippled fighters try and follow. The Klingon ships continue on heading-A towards the fighters. Two overloaded disruptors fired from the D6 at the DG's 1/2s shield #5 miss. A drone is launched by the D6 at one fighter 2 hexes away. The turn ends with the Klingon ships 7-8 hexes away from the DG, FA arc on shield #5.

Turn 2- Speed; D6/E4 both@10, DG@16

After waiting a couple of impulses for D6 weapon recycling, the Klingons get 5 of 6 ovl disr hits, but just 2 points with 5xP2s @ range 6-7 on shield #5. No re-enforcement or batteries yields 14 internals. Damage includes a hellbore and 2 phasers. As the DG moves out of overload range, two crippled fighters are tractorated by the D6 and both Klingon ships turn to heading-F and begin chasing the DG. Two more drones are launched (one from each ship) at the fighters. One crippled fighter is hit by the drone launched last turn, but then the D6 strikes a mine on Shield #1 and both the remaining fighters and drones targeting them are destroyed. The DG makes a tight turn using slips to heading-B while the Klingons stay on heading-F. The turn ends with the Klingon ships again 7-8 hexes away from the DG, FA arc on shield #3.

Turn 3- Speed; D6@10, E4@7, DG@9

Both the Klingon ships fire all disruptors (overloaded) on impulse 1, hitting with 3 on the DG's 1/2s shield #3. The DG uses all battery power and saves 4 boxes. The DG then HETs to heading-D and misses the D6 with a hellbore (overload). After slipping the other hellbores onto centerline, the D6 is hit with one standard (overload missed). The three rear shields of the D6 are now below 50%. Subsequent phaser fire (4x P2) reduces the D6's 1/2s #2 shield to 4 boxes. Both the Klingon ships launch drones, though the E4 does so illegally. The E4 also falls a few hexes behind. In an unexpectedly rash move, the D6 turns heading-A straight on the DG, but slips off center to have weak #2 shield facing the DG at range 1. The DG turns to heading-C, but the D6 slips again lining up the destroyed #3 shield at range 1 on the R/RR line. The D6 delivers 5xP2's 1/2s and scores about 22 internals while the Hydrans offer no P-G return fire (not powered?). The D6 then tractorates the DG for 1 point (no neg-trac). The E4 turns to heading A and moves in, firing 3 P2s while passing by at range 1 through the down shield #3 for 13 more internals (including both remaining hellbores). The D6 and DG pull at each other while the drones approach. The drone launched by the D6 moves into position to hit the down #3 shield (illegal E4 drone will hit fresh shield #1). The DG turns into the drones ramming the drone fired illegally from the E4 on the #1 shield and allowing the D6's 1/2s drone to strike the fresh #2 shield. At turn's 1/2s end, the D6 and DG face each other on #5 and #2 shields, respectively. The DG is 1/2 rotated into the same hex as the D6. The E4 is 3 hexes behind the DG facing away (A).

Turn 4- Speed; D6@0, E4@10, DG@9 (changed to 0)

The D6 drops the tractor beam and launches a drone, which is immediately killed by P-G fire. The D6 plants 4 overloads on the DG at range 0 on shield #2, crippling the DG with about 20 internals while taking 8 feedback on reinforcement. The next impulse, 5 P2s score 26 more internals, forcing the DG to re-allocate power (now speed zero). The D6 re-establishes the tractor beam. The E4 HETs to heading-D. A suicide shuttle is launched from the DG hits the D6's 1/2s strong #6 shield. The E4 closes to range 1 on the DG's 1/2s #5 shield and hits with 1 overload disruptor and 4xP3s (underarmed P2s) scoring 22

internals. Just a few boxes remain inside the DG. Five boarding parties from the D6 are beamed onboard the DG. The E4 circles around and takes up station off the D6's left flank. Three of Klingon BPs are killed by the 10 remaining DG BPs, which take only one loss in return.

Turn 5- DG successfully self-distrusts when the 2 remaining Klingon BPs are unable to download anti-core breach virus into the Hydran computers.

=====

By Ted Fay (Catwhoatsphoto) on Thursday, May 17, 2007 - 04:04 pm: Edit

Thanks for the battle report!

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Thursday, May 17, 2007 - 04:36 pm: Edit

And the best part is, the E4 lived...

=====

By Jim Davies (Mudfoot) on Thursday, May 17, 2007 - 07:18 pm: Edit

Quote:

forcing the DG to re-allocate power (now speed zero)

?? Were you using Energy Balance Due To Damage or something?

That seemed like pretty shoddy play from the Hydran, though he was unlucky with the hellbores. What was illegal about the E4 drone? Too soon after the previous launch?

=====

By Ezekiel Price Carpenter-Hyland (Admiral\_Zekedak) on Friday, May 18, 2007 - 11:28 pm: Edit

-Long live the E4

I was told the E4 escaped targeting because it was not considered a threat. That argument was laid to rest. I'm starting to really like this ship as a wingman. Using the E4 phasers in P3 mode was also a major discovery for me (duh). This will change the way I fly E4s in the future, particularly as they will be able to move much faster while charging weapons (2 power @ 1/3 movement rate = 6 extra speed).

-Luck on dice

More hellbores should have hit, not just 2/7. Just one more hit, standard or otherwise, would not have helped but two more hits would have resulted in numerous internals on the D6 (including phaser/suicide shuttle damage). It would have also changed my play a lot. Above average rolls were made by the Klingons in the opening volley against the fighters, but overall my rolling was at or below odds. Unfortunately for the Hydran much of this came while the Klingons were at point blank range when rolling all 5s and 6s does not matter.

-Illegal drone launch

All the ships in the 4-powers war pre-refit, and can launch just one drone from every other drone box per turn. For the E4, this means one drone every other turn. While I made an error launching an extra drone from the E4, I believe it made no impact the outcome of the match. No additional damage was done to shield #1 other than that drone, and the D6's drone forced the DG to turn into the drone path to avoid it hitting it's down #3 shield hit. Still, I'll be more careful next time.

-Speed change

We were using the rule that power needs to be reallocated when half is lost to damage. Don't recall the reference number.

-Battle of maneuver

I do not consider the Hydrans play to have been poor, though some mistakes (in addition to rolling bad) were made. My original battle plan was; 1-draw hellbores, hook and charge. 2-saber dance. 3-battle pass and hook again or disengage. The first part of this happened by default when the Hydran turned off. If this was the Hydran's original plan, the fighter should have been launched earlier or held. As a result, I got my double overload shots on the same rear shield (5 of 8 hit) and killed the fighters to boot. After that, the Hydran was just plain caught off guard by my reckless play. I should have paid a

much higher price, and consider myself LUCKY not to have eaten about 50 points from P-Gs and the suicide shuttle on a failing shield. It's amazing how fast things can fall apart, and it happened to go my way this time. Running into the mine was also careless on my behalf. I'm sure the DSF review board will discuss replacing promotion with just commendation because of this and the "dam the P-Gs" attitude.

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Saturday, May 19, 2007 - 12:25 pm: Edit

Ezekial. The pre-refit E4 has no such restriction on drone launch. The limitation, even for larger ships, is that they can only launch one drone per turn (as opposed to one per rack per turn).

A D6 could, for example, launch a drone from rack 1 on turn 1 and another drone from rack 1 on turn 2. Usually, however, you will see an impulse 32 launch from one rack followed by an impulse 1 launch from the other in order to consolidate the launches better.

For the E4, with only one rack anyway, the one-drone-per-turn limitation has no real effect.

=====

By Ezekiel Price Carpenter-Hyland (Admiral\_Zekedak) on Saturday, May 19, 2007 - 04:44 pm: Edit

I'll double check on that. If true it would bolster drone effectiveness, something which has been low in the speed-8 vs. phaser-G environment.

While sector #4 will be much like the "Hood Goes Down" scenario, sector #5 has been vexing as it includes a drone ship.

Sector #4 (I can only win with a capture)

Klingons; 3xF5s

Hydrans; 1xKN

Sector #5

Klingons; 1xD7, 1xF5D (several drones upgraded to type-II)

Hydrans; 1xKN, 1xFF (probably a SAR, unless numerous T-bombs have been purchased)

As sector #5 has about a 45 point handicap (217 to around 170), the Hydrans can win by just disengaging alive (allowed beginning of turn 4). I may be forced to use the D7 as an anchor while the F5D tries to deliver a kill, but if the D7 is crippled in such a maneuver I will definitely lose the battle.

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Sunday, May 20, 2007 - 01:56 am: Edit

The F5D is better suited to be used as an 'anchor' ship, since its 'heavy weapons' are drone racks.

=====

By Ezekiel Price Carpenter-Hyland (Admiral\_Zekedak) on Sunday, May 20, 2007 - 08:52 pm: Edit

This would be a sound tactic, particularly as it does not have disruptors to arm, but the F5D is much easier to cripple. Victory conditions will not allow either of my ships to be crippled if I hope to win the sector. Perhaps I'll just see what kind of fire the Hydrans offer and look for an openings.

=====

By Ezekiel Price Carpenter-Hyland (Admiral\_Zekedak) on Tuesday, May 29, 2007 - 07:19 pm: Edit

4-powers war Klingo-Hydran economy of force mini-campaign.

As the score was 3-0 in favor of the Klingons, and sectors #4 and #6 were all but guaranteed wins for the Hydrans (according to modified victory conditions and tactical situation), we finished off the mini-campaign by playing just sector #4.

Sector #4

The Hydrans bring in a KN with 8 option points and a CU with 9 option points totaling 158. The Klingons fly a D7 with one type VX done and 3 type II drone and a F5D with 3 VX and 7 type II drones for a total of 221. The Hydrans are awarded 63 victory points. As we are playing it, the Hydrans can win the sector by surviving the three fixed map turns and doing internals to either one of the Klingon vessels before

disengaging (allowed on turn 4) so long as the KN is uncrippled and the CU uncaptured).

Turn 1

Speed; Klingon D7-20, F5D-30. Hydran KN-15, CU-15

The F5D moves out ahead of the D7 and while cutting in front after turning to heading-F launch a line of type-II drones target at the KN impulse 13-20. In the process it takes hellbore fire at range 7 & 8. Of the 3 fired 2 hit as standards and reduce the F5D's shields 3, 4 and 5 by 50+%. The Hydrans turn to heading-E, and then F heading for the map corner. The D7, just behind the drone line, reaches range 8 and hits the KN with all 4 overload disruptors on shield #3. The shield is well reinforced, and holds with just one box. The F5D turns from heading-F to A and pursues. At the end of the turn, lines up the KN #3 shield and fires 5 P-2s doing about 17 internals. 2 phasers are destroyed along with almost all the KN's hull. The F5D loses half of its #1 and #2 shield to return fire from both Hydran ships, and it's attempt to tractor the CU at range 2 is repulsed. The D7 and drone swarm hold the map's center.

Turn 2

Speed; D7-23, F5D-30, KN-22, CU-24

The Hydrans are a little boxed in, and the F5D launches one type-II drone at the CU in case it runs for the map corner. The Hydrans both pull HETs to heading-B and run along the map edge in the opposite direction. This prevents them from being trapped, but they run back in front of the D7 and its accompanying drone swarm. The F5D turns with the Hydrans and runs a parallel course a few hexes off. Eventually it pulls ahead of the KN, launching a line of 2 VX and one II drones. One VX drones pins the KN against the map edge, and survives the single p-2 fired. It hits the reinforced shield #2 doing 6 internals, which include a hellbore and the last P-2. The remaining 2 drones are shot down by the rear-arc P-Gs. Meanwhile the D7 moves into the drone line, strikes a T-bomb which takes out some drones, then centerlines the CU at a range of 3 hexes. 4 overload disruptors and 5-P2s deliver about 36 internals through shield #3. It then turns and delivers 2 more P-2s for another 7 internals. The CU is now a crippled wreck. By the end of the turn the D7 is 2 hexes ahead of the CU, both facing-D towards the KN some 7 hexes off. The F5D is itself some 10 hexes ahead of the KN.

Turn 3

Speed; D7-8, F5D-30, KN-15, CU-0

The CU is tractored. The D7 rear hex line phaser hoses with 5 P-2s at range 2 destroying shield #1, then fires 2 more eliminating all but one internal (a phaser). The D7 lobs 4 overloaded disruptors at the empty #3 shield of the KN, but all miss (!). A type-I slow done launched from the D7 is shot down by the CU. The drone launched at the CU beginning of turn 2 homes in, but only succeeds in dropping shield #2. The remaining drones from the turn 1 line get to within a hex or so of the KN, but exhaust their fuel. The KN, seeing it only chance to score internals (and victory on points in this match) fires its hellbore and hits the F5D. Reinforcement again spreads damage among the rear shields, all three of which flicker on the verge of collapse but prevent internals. The F5D then makes a wide turn and runs back at the CU while the KN puts some distance between itself and the D7. The D7 drops its tractor beam on the Cu and the F5D unloads a full spread of type-I slow drones just far enough away to give both Klingon vessels time to clear the impending explosion. As the F5D tried to come about to join the D7 in chasing the KN, it takes a hail of P-G fire from long range. While a hit is made for 1 point, the shield holds with a single box.

Turn 4

Speed; D7-18, F5D-30, KN-30

The F5D finishes its turn and takes another volley of P-G fire from both mounts. These parting shots score 2 points of damage, but even if all 8 pulses hit the #1 shield would have just held. The KN disengages.

Klingons win the mini-campaign 4-2, and much blood wine was consumed. The six sectors played out as follows...

Sector #1 (Klingon victory)

E4(destroyed) vs. BATS w/2xHBM, 12 st-1, RN w/9xST-1

Sector #2 (Klingon victory)

D6, E4(internals) vs KN(destroyed), LN(crippled) w/4xSt-1(destroyed)

Sector #3 (Klingon victory)

D6, E4 vs DG(destroyed) w/3xSt-1(destroyed)

Sector #4 (unplayed, presumed Hydran victory)

3xF5 vs KN

Sector #5 (Klingon victory)

D7, F5D vs KN(internals), CU(destroyed)

Sector #6 (unplayed, presumed Hydran victory)

BATS w/2xPAM, 2xF5 vs DG w/3xSt-1

-----  
The next project may be another economy of force mini-campaign, but this time on the Gorn/Romulan line at the end of the General War (c. 180+). If so, we are considering removing the battle stations in hopes that force allocation will be more even between sectors. Removing the BATS from play would also be consistent with the condition of the front at this time.

=====

By Michael Lui (MichaelLui) on Wednesday, May 30, 2007 - 02:47 am: Edit

With that kind of firepower against them they should have used direct fire hellbores along with their phaser-2s for the first shot to try to drop a shield. 2 hitting would have done 13 plus whatever the phasers would've added in. It may have made the F5D a bit more hesitant to engage and damage would have penetrated when the hellbore was recharged.

#4: Unless the KNs victory conditions are to run away, I don't see why it's presumed to be a Hydran victory.

#6: Again, unless the F5s come out to play, the Phaser-4s will make short work out of the Dragoon. And with the PAMs it has even more power for EW if the F5s want to try to play withing 15 hexes.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Wednesday, May 30, 2007 - 09:04 am: Edit

Sector #1 (Klingon victory)

E4(destroyed) vs. BATS w/2xHBM, 12 st-1, RN w/9xST-1

What? How can you win when you died and none of your opponents did so?

=====

By Richard Sherman (Rich) on Wednesday, May 30, 2007 - 06:16 pm: Edit

Michael:

It looks like he's using the standard victory conditions instead of the modified VC. Not sure that's the best option for a mini-campaign, but it's their game...

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Thursday, May 31, 2007 - 09:03 am: Edit

So you can "win" if you send an E4 to each battle and it "dies gloriously" while accomplishing nothing?

???

=====

By Jim Davies (Mudfoot) on Thursday, May 31, 2007 - 02:32 pm: Edit

It has to survive two turns, by (S2.20). Whether that E4 did survive a ranger and 21 stingers for two turns on a fixed map is open to question.

Likewise the 3xF5 vs KN in #4 looks a bit tricky for the Hydran, though he can probably do substantial internals to one Klink before dying.

#6 would make something of a mockery of the victory conditions, because the Dragoon has no business going anywhere near the base, but can probably survive two turns of the F5s quite easily (probably crippling one or both if they want to fight).

For the next campaign, I'd suggest some smaller bases (SAMS, Complat) or similar target (freighters?) as a focal point to force a battle. With enough VPs attached, it's worth attacking and defending whilst allowing one to preserve warships for round 2.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Thursday, May 31, 2007 - 02:44 pm: Edit

How does an E4 survive 2 turns on a fixed map against even 1 ranger, never mind the stingers.

Ranger gets up to max speed and over runs with 3 fusion. E4 should die.

For that matter, Ranger could just nab the E4 in a tractor, pick down a shield and miza the weapons away. Send in the Marines!

I can't see how anyone (even a super ace) could survive.

=====

By Joseph Riggs (Junior) on Thursday, May 31, 2007 - 03:16 pm: Edit

Yeah, it does seem odd.

Maybe the E4 never left the area (presumably a map edge or corner) he started in, and the Ranger didn't pay enough for movement on the first turn? I'd need to double-check the distance on a map, but if the Ranger started on the opposite end of the map, then it might be possible. And the Stingers would probably be a non-issue in that case until turn 3. Stinger-1s means no WPBs, which means that they probably can't be in range and able to fire until turn 3 under that sort of situation.

=====

By Ezekiel Price Carpenter-Hyland (Admiral\_Zekedak) on Thursday, May 31, 2007 - 07:10 pm: Edit

I believe modified victory conditions were specified in Econ of Force. I'll look it over to make sure we did not make any mistakes. Also, the map should be open (except in base sectors) and disengagement is only allowed once you score internal damage or one of your ships is crippled. If this happens after turn 2, you don't give up VPs. We changed this to intensify combat, fixing the map and allowing disengagement only after turn 3, but without restrictions.

Despite the E4's destruction in sector #1 (after being hit by 12 P-4s, 6-P2s, some 40 fusions and a hellbore), you could say it "accomplished" something. It pinned a heavy cruiser plus all the BATS fighters. This allowed Klingon privateers to grab a load of dilithium from an unguarded asteroid belt. I'll also add that the E4's galley crew escaped by sublight evasion on a shuttle. Not only did they have sensor logs showing tac intel on the BATS, they stowed all the E4's blood wine rations. Sounds like a victory to me!

=====

By Joseph Riggs (Junior) on Thursday, May 31, 2007 - 07:31 pm: Edit

The "accomplishment" in "pinning" the Ranger in place should be simulated by a win in whichever sector the privateers were in.

And it should also be noted that if a group of pirates/privateers really did put in an appearance somewhere nearby, then the Ranger wouldn't be hanging around the BATS if the only enemy ship present were an E4. The BATS own fighter squadron should be more than enough to handle such a small vessel. And, of course, the BATS itself would be more than a match for the Klingon vessel (which MUST move in close since the disruptors on the E4 don't fire very far).

So if something really was going on nearby that required the Ranger and/or the fighters on the BATS, they could have easily been spared.

=====

By Ezekiel Price Carpenter-Hyland (Admiral\_Zekedak) on Friday, June 01, 2007 - 02:43 pm: Edit

You are right. The 450+ victory points awarded to the E4 should not be abstracted to anything unless some rule is built into the campaign allowing one to do so. Therefore, the only possible conclusion is simply that the Klingons win, on points.

As for sending an E4 against a BATS+ship(s), anyone can see this is a classic "soak-off". With a requirement to put a ship in every sector and just 1000 points to spend (average of 167/sector), having any chance to destroy the BATS would require several other sectors to receive token forces. I therefore decided to allocate just 55 points here and spread the remaining 112 points into other sectors, namely #4 & #5.

Interestingly, it was not until later that we realized published victory conditions awarded me victory in sector #1. This also created situations like what I described for sector #5 where a single internal on any Klingon ship would give the Hydrans a victory.

=====

By Joseph Riggs (Junior) on Friday, June 01, 2007 - 02:58 pm: Edit

Yeah, I can understand why you had to send the E4 to that sector under the rules of the campaign. I'm just pointing out that there's not really any logical way to construe it as a win based on anything other than an oddball points situation, since the E4 doesn't pose even a minimal threat to the station.

Mike, Jim - he posted about the E4 match back in March, and it looks like the tactics he used were exactly the ones I described. i.e. keep the ship stuck to the far side of the map for two turns and claim the win since the Ranger can't move fast enough to get within realistic fusion beam range before turn 3.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Friday, June 01, 2007 - 03:50 pm: Edit

How do you get that?

Ranger goes speed 31 the first turn and then 24 or so the second. Where exactly is the E4 going to go?

The map (not with me) is 42 hexes wide? Besides the Base SHOULD have started in the middle (like all the other scenarios since time began) and thus the darn E4 should have been getting smacked by Phaser 4 and Hellbore fire from the get go.

I don't have my books, but what is the expected yeild from the Ph 4 (no shift, the base should always have more EW power) be at max range on map?

PLUS, the base can fire its P2 at max range. I mean it doesn't need reinforcement?

=====

By Joseph Riggs (Junior) on Friday, June 01, 2007 - 04:20 pm: Edit

As I said, it's possible that the Hydran player plotted a slower first turn speed on the Ranger for some inexplicable reason.

If the E4 isn't moving, then it can dump a full six points into ECM. It can also use Evasive Manuevers to further make life difficult for the BATS. The BATS can produce six points of ECCM, but that still leaves the EM to deal with. So on the contrary, I would give the E4 an EW shift.

-----

The map (not with me) is 42 hexes wide

-----

I'm not sure off-hand (I don't have my map handy, either). And if I were the Klingon, I'd make sure that I started in a corner, which would put me a little further away from the base than the presumed 21 hexes.

I suspect that the base IS in the center of the map. He mentions in his write-up that hellbores were used against him, which could only have come from the BATS (since ST-H fighters weren't available). That suggests that the BATS was in the middle as it ought to have been. But if the BATS is in the middle, then I would assume that the Stingers from the base should have been able to catch and gut the E4 before the end of turn 2.

Yeah, the engagement doesn't make a whole lot of sense. I'm going to have to guess that the Hydran player made a lot of mistakes.

And given the results of Sector #3 (Dragoon and fighters destroyed, not even internals on either the Klingon D6 or E4),

I've got a pretty strong suspicion that these errors aren't a one-time thing.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Friday, June 01, 2007 - 05:03 pm: Edit

The BATS can easily generate 6 ECM and loan itself more. Can the E4 even pierce the Rangers 6/1/2 shield with an alpha?

I think the Ranger could take the E4 without even using fusions...

- 1) Speed to catch it.
- 2) Phaser capacitors give 6 (?) P2.
- 3) Save 2 pulses from the Gatlings and give him the other 6.
- 4) Launch the fighters at range 4 or so (so they can catch up to the tractor E4.
- 5) I don't think the fighters would even need fusions either.

Tractor to keep him from running and miza weapons until you can send in the marines

Like you said, I can't see it. And I am NOT a good tactician.

=====

By Joseph Riggs (Junior) on Friday, June 01, 2007 - 05:42 pm: Edit

As I said, look at Sector #3. Based on those results, I'm pretty sure that the Hydran player has issues.

I just happen to have my FC Dragoon card handy... Shield #1 is 33 points. #2 and #6 are 26 each. I don't remember off-hand if the Hydran cruisers get stronger shields post-refit, so those numbers might be the same ones used in the game. Overloaded disruptors would presumably do 10 each, and have a pretty good chance of hitting at close range. So assume both hit and do a total of 20. With phasers he could probably knock down either the #2 or #6 shield. I can't remember off-hand what the phaser suite on the E4 is like (other than it's pretty bad), though, so I'm not so sure about the #1.

But if the Hydran is even half-way decent, then the E4 should only get the one firing opportunity. And most of the internals will end up on the center hull.

Then as you said, tractor him, mizia his weapons off, and board the ship.

=====

By Michael Lui (MichaelLui) on Saturday, June 02, 2007 - 04:18 am: Edit

Since he is using Stinger-1s I would presume that he's playing in an earlier time period. This means that the Hydrans don't have their refits. The Gats are RA and the warp engines are 9 each. That means the best speed the CAs can reach is 28 with impulse.

The rear 3 shields are increased to 26 each with the refit.

Junior

If the E4 isn't moving then it's toast. The phaser-4s just keep pounding away even with a 2-shift. And the BATS can loan itself extra ECCM with its Special Sensors to get rid of the 2-shift if it wants to.

=====

By Ezekiel Price Carpenter-Hyland (Admiral\_Zekedak) on Saturday, June 02, 2007 - 06:17 pm: Edit

Play was set in Y-158, prior to refits for both Hydrans and Klingons (plus slow drones and stinger-1s). Hydran front shields are still full strength. The base was placed in 2215, while ships entered in 2201 and 2230. The map was 42 hexes wide. The E4's speed turn 1 was about 24 while the RN's was like 15+. The E4 stayed outside range 10 from the base, took P-4 fire on 2 shields, but still suffered a few internals. Turn 2 speeds were similar to turn 1, but and multiple flights of stingers shooting at range 10 plus combined BATS and RN fire caused catastrophic damage on the E4. (I said I wanted prisoners! It was a lucky shot, sir! Sound of weapons officer sizzling)

I agree that there is no way the E4 could survive 2 turns, but the rules we played by did not require this. Also, victory conditions would give the Klingons a win even with the E4 being captured. I'll suggest we add the 2 turn requirement to

our next mini-campaign. Funny battles like this can make other engagements in the campaign interesting, but it may not be the best way to run things. Both my opponent and I found playing Econ of Force to be a lot of fun despite the oddities. We believe simply removing the BATS from each side will prevent excessive mismatches/soak-off tactics. Might be interesting to replace them with an orbital platform, small convoy or the like.

=====

By James Hallmark (Jhallmark) on Saturday, October 27, 2007 - 02:14 pm: Edit

The Scenario:

Map: Fixed

1.5 maps with the half map placed along the long edge of the full map. This results in a 42X45 map.

Rules:

No Commanders Level Rules. So no EW, Scatter Pack, midturn speed change.

Setup:

WS3

1 Python and 1 Conquistador (nothing in hanger) in the lower left corner.

1 Fed DNL in Upper Right corner.

1 Planet positioned between the Andros and DNL. The DNL started 20 hexes away and the Andros started 30 hexes away from the planet. The 10 hex difference was intended to prevent the Andros from Displacing past the CPL, doing an HET, killing the CPL and disengaging without consequence.

1 Commercial Platform 2 hexes from the planet

1 Fed 150 BPV ship comes in at the beginning of turn 5 at WS3.

Victory Conditions:

Standard except that the CPL's value is increased to 114. This lets the Andros win if they destroy it and disengage and still barely win if the Python gets crippled but barely lose if the COQ gets crippled.

What happened:

Turn 1:

Fed moved 26, Andros moved 30. Andros displaced beyond the CPL and DNL did an HET and blew up the CPL. The FED/CPL/shuttles fired 6 phasers 1 and 5 ph-3 at the COQ after the Displacement and HET. Then the Andro's followed the DNL on a pursuit course.

Turn 2:

Fed & Andro moved 28. This required the COQ not to load phasers. The Fed/CPL/shuttles fired several phasers at the COQ, 1 leak point. The DNL attempted an HET, which failed but did result in getting pointed forward centerline on the Andros. The COQ promptly panel dumped flooding 30 energy into its batteries. The Andros overran the DNL during the breakdown period and fired phasers doing a total of about 20 internals (and removing its #1 shield). Then the COQ successfully displaced the DNL 6 hexes away with the Andros being out of its FA arc. Then the DNL fired a few phasers that did nothing of consequence and we called it a night, Assuming the Andros could easily win at this point.

Questions:

Was this a balanced scenerio?

Should the FED have taken 2 smaller ships?

Were the starting positions reasonable?

=====

By William T Wilson (Sheap) on Saturday, October 27, 2007 - 06:30 pm: Edit

\* Probably not. The Feds are disadvantaged by no speed changes, and no scatter packs. But the Andros are disadvantaged by no EW. So commander's level \*probably\* didn't matter too much although the game is really only balanced with commander's level rules. However, a complat is basically worthless in combat with no mobility and only a handful of phasers to defend itself with. Meanwhile, you gave the Andros free points if they destroy it, making it even more useless.

\* Anything is better than a civilian ship/base. Generally such units are more trouble than they are worth as they do not live

up to their cost in battle, but are easily destroyed. The Feds probably would have been better off with JUST the DNL. That would have been an uphill, but winnable battle.

\* Yes, but really the problem is that defending a fixed point is not a very easy mission in SFB. You either need a significant BPV advantage or a real defensive unit, like a military base or monitor.

=====

By Michael Lui (MichaelLui) on Saturday, October 27, 2007 - 07:26 pm: Edit

1. The BPV was 304 vs 240. Don't count bases unless they are armed with Phaser-4s or you are using EW and they have a SS.

2. It wouldn't have mattered very much with the BPV discrepancy.

3. It still wouldn't have mattered much even if the DNL started next to the base.

Fixes, choose ONE:

1. Have the Andromedans have to capture the base for some reason. The DNL must drop shields or launch BP laden shuttles in order to stop them. Not easy with displacement capable ships around. (No COs of extra BPs for anybody, can swap BPs for commandos as normal except aboard the CPL.)

2. Have the turn 5 ship start at the base on turn 1.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike\_Grafton) on Saturday, October 27, 2007 - 09:42 pm: Edit

The complat MIGHT have tried to weasel for the EW benefits IIRC, even in the lowliest o' rules levels.

=====

By James Hallmark (Jhallmark) on Sunday, October 28, 2007 - 12:05 am: Edit

The design criteria for this scenario was:

1. Must have 2 Andros with no SSs. I was teaching a player how to use Andro's. I am better at teaching if I play on that player side with the same race

2. Must not take forever to play. So I needed to come up with either an objective or a constraint to accomplish this.

So I put a soft limit on the scenario by having the turn 5 reinforcement. I put the base in to try and constrain the Andro's. They are required to shoot something other than the defending ship and they have to stay near the base long enough to kill it.

I think the biggest flaw in the scenario was that the base was too easy to kill. It needed to be able to absorb more than one alpha strike. A Mobile base with carefully selected pods would probably work.

If the FED DNL has been successful with his HET the result would have been different, although even in that situation I think the base was too easy to kill.

If I had used 2 Pythons and reduced the Fed to a BCJ it probably would have worked better. The BCJ can safely HET.

=====

By Michael Lui (MichaelLui) on Sunday, October 28, 2007 - 12:40 am: Edit

Both of my "Fixes" would still satisfy your requirements. However, here's a couple more:

3. Make the base an Orion BATS. They don't have Phaser-4s, can easily take more than 1 shot, and a DNL cruising through the area and responding to a distress call is a realistic scenario. The Orions aren't stupid, if they see a pair of Andros heading toward them it's easier to escape from Fed detention than from death. You could also make the turn 5 reinforcement an Orion ship.

4. Add a few cargo ships and maybe a Q-ship or two. Basically a convoy that just arrived/ready to depart/hiding there as it's the safest place in the area. And the Andros came here to kill everything.

=====

By William T Wilson (Sheep) on Sunday, October 28, 2007 - 08:23 pm: Edit

Instead of an Orion base, a civilian base station might do the trick. It's big and can take a lot of damage, but not much firepower (about the same as a complat, I think).

=====

By Richard Sherman (Rich) on Tuesday, October 30, 2007 - 10:21 am: Edit

It might have also worked if the CPL was instead a SAMS with a hangar module and 6 fighters. (and one other type of module? Cargo? PAM?)

Still lower BPV like you wanted, but now the Andros have to deal with more fighting units and drones.

Agree that the base can still WW at right moment to make Andro shot tougher, even without EW in play.

You can also force the tempo more for the Andros by using a smaller Fed reinforcement (making it 135 or 140 instead of 150 makes a huge difference to the Feds), but have it arrive on turn 4, or impulse #24 of turn 3.

Keep the DNL.

=====

END OF FILE