

SFB TACTICS ARCHIVES

2008

Copyright © 2008, Amarillo Design Bureau, Inc.

These are the archives of our Discus-BBS tactics discussion, posted during the calendar year 2008. We present these without editing or evaluation, and without any guarantee that the tactics expressed here are legal, practical, or effective.

GENERAL TACTICS

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Friday, September 19, 2008 - 03:20 pm: Edit

A thought occurred to me today. It would be awfully cool to have a searchable database of term papers, so that if you were looking for an article about (say) SWACs, you wouldn't have to manually thumb through each and every issue of Captain's Log.

I know Dragon Magazine put out a CD compilation of their back issues that was a searchable PDF. I'm thinking for term papers ONLY, this would be an awfully cool thing to have and I'd certainly be willing to pay for it.

By Loren Knight (Loren) on Friday, September 19, 2008 - 07:27 pm: Edit

Dale, that's why I would like to see a new tactics manual where some of those papers are made part of the general tactics sections but also many are immortalized in their own section as they were originally printed.

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Thursday, November 06, 2008 - 02:58 pm: Edit

OK, I have a general question for you all.

How do you deal with situations in SFB where the tactically SMART thing to do, drags the game into a long, boring, unfun tooth-pulling contest?

In a campaign battle, where the Romulan cloak or the Tholian web or just playing for the Stalemate rule means a lot of frustration and boredom?

I've had several people suggest the Tholians and even the Romulans should not be allowed in games for this reason. Some players refuse to play in games where they may have to fight cloaks, or webs, or base assaults...

Has anyone found a good solution to this problem?

By Andy Vancil (Andy) on Thursday, November 06, 2008 - 03:50 pm: Edit

For pickup games, it's not much of a problem. Play is less serious and more fun-oriented. If a boring situation develops, people say, "This is boring. Let's just say you won and play a different scenario." It's the campaigns that have the big potential for these situations.

So, the place to solve this problem is in the design of the campaign. If the campaign rules make a stalemate advantageous in some situations, then you'll get players playing for stalemates. If your campaign setup involves bases, then you're going to have base assaults. On the other hand, if you like quick, bloody battles, you can speed things up by using small fixed maps, eliminating EW, hidden mines (and minefields, for that matter), etc.

Personally, I don't see cloaks or web as problems in themselves. Facing a webcaster or two is not a problem. Assaulting a base (or even a pinwheel) surrounded by web, now that's tedious. If your opponent cloaks out, that's no problem because the turn goes pretty quickly and you're either reloading yourself or trying to maneuver on top of him. Spending a dozen turns subhunting against an opponent who

is just trying to force a stalemate or disengage, that's a waste of time.

The problem is not webs or cloaks, but the setup and objectives of the battle.

Many campaigns fall into a basic trap of going into all sorts of details about economics, exploration, shipbuilding, fleet movements, etc., without considering whether the battles that occur under those rules will make fun SFB. An SFB campaign must have a primary goal of creating interesting SFB battles. If it does, the problem you're describing goes away.

By Alan Trevor (Thyrm) on Thursday, November 06, 2008 - 04:08 pm: Edit

Dale,

As it happens, the Tholians are my favorite race and the Romulans are my second favorite. I've never played the Romulans in a campaign (though I have played in campaigns which included the Romulans) but I have played the Tholians several times in campaigns. I don't think it's impossible to make them work in a campaign, but it's very difficult. The campaign designer needs to think very carefully about how he wants to integrate them into the campaign. Treating them as a "normal" race doesn't work.

If the campaign players really hate battles that take a long time to resolve, then the Tholians probably do need to be excluded. Personally, I enjoy long games if the action is interesting. Contrary to your assertion, I don't think an assault on a wedding cake is "boring" or "unfun", but individual tastes will necessarily differ.

I don't recall ever playing in a campaign that used the "standard" stalemate rule. We always used "house rules" to determine when a battle was over for campaign purposes. For example, we played on a floating map, but if Side-A had no units within "N" hexes of the "original" center of the map, Side-B had the option of continuing the fight or unilaterally declaring that Side-A had disengaged. This was coupled with a rule that allowed ships to disrupt an enemy province's economy if unopposed or victorious in battle, and another rule that all units had to pay O&M (Operations and Maintenance) costs each turn and that the costs were dependent on the unit's distance from a friendly supply node. If your fleet spends the entire (strategic) turn guarding a friendly BATS, the O&M costs are low. If you are out patrolling a friendly sector, they are higher. If you are in enemy space, far from any friendly logistics node, they are higher still.

Now let's see how this works against the traditional "plasma on a floating map" problem. The Feds (excellent long range direct firepower) are fighting a Gorn fleet in the campaign. The Feds choose to bombard with proximity-fused photons from long range, perhaps even trying a "Kaufman retrograde", while the Gorns try to close.

Case 1 - Battle in Fed Space: Gorns use ECM and EM, with brick, while closing at moderate speed. They take some damage but force the Feds back "N" hexes and declare the Feds to have disengaged. The Gorn force payed higher O&M costs, and took at least a little damage, but then attack the province's economic targets, since the Feds weren't pressing the Gorns hard enough to stop them from doing so. If the province is a rich one, the total economic hit that the Feds take might exceed the damage the Gorns have to repair, plus the difference in O&M costs.

Case 2 - Battle in Gorn Space: The tactics for fighting the battle are the same, but this time the Feds are paying the higher O&M costs and they don't get to disrupt the Gorn's provincial economic targets, since the Gorns declared the Feds to have disengaged, meaning the Feds were not victorious. They didn't press the Gorns and threaten the economic targets. Again, if the difference in O&M costs exceeds the cost to repair the Gorn damage, the Feds took the bigger economic hit overall.

In both cases, the Feds have to weigh their tactics against the larger strategic/economic issues. This method won't work well

with players who don't like that sort of thing but for our group it worked pretty well.

=====

By Richard Sherman (Rich) on Thursday, November 06, 2008 - 04:18 pm: Edit

Dale,

One approach may be to come at the problem indirectly.

If the objective is to create fun and interesting battles, but not the wholesale elimination of a particular race, then sometimes that can be accomplished by creating a set of rules that varies a campaign player's goals from turn to turn.

What I mean is...sure, the overall goal may be to conquer more territory or whatever. But if a player (or group of players) have a particular "mission" they must also accomplish within a given period of time, than other factors enter into the campaign than just "kill this base and conquer the planet" or "defend this base/planet."

When moderated, there can even be a system of rewards and/or penalties set up for missions accomplished, lost, or ignored. Almost a variation of random encounters, but with much more player involvement and better defined parameters.

This type of thing can have something of a synergetic effect on the enjoyment of a battle. Sure, the Romulans (or whomever) are defending their system, and sure the enemy attacking it would like to take it away from them...but what if they had other needed objectives? What if one or more of those objectives was MORE important - or even just equal but different - than just conquering/defending the system?

It can also be used to create battles that have nothing to do with attacking or defending a system, and could take place in open space or whatnot.

After all, we all know that - in war - taking territory is only one part of winning...

=====

By Paul Franz (Andromedan) on Friday, November 07, 2008 - 09:23 am: Edit

Dale,

I have an idea to limit long engagements. Allow the defending player and attacking players to draw in reinforcements from other areas. For example, at turn 10 a player may draw reinforcements from an area next to the area where the scenario is being played, on turn 15 a player may draw reinforcements from 2 areas away, turn 20, 3 areas, etc. Letting the units enter the board at any edge.

Thus an attacker can get stronger and therefore crush a defender that is being idle.

And a defender can possibly sandwich an attacker or reinforce the defense and allow him to be more aggressive.

=====

By Andy Vancil (Andy) on Friday, November 07, 2008 - 03:53 pm: Edit

That would make battles longer. At least one player would benefit by stretching the battle out to turn 10, 20, etc.

The only way a rule like that would work if only the player who was being aggressive was able to get reinforcements. But defining what "aggressive" means could get pretty murky.

=====

By Loren Knight (Loren) on Friday, November 07, 2008 - 04:21 pm: Edit

I was about to suggest what Paul suggested. There are several ways to address Andy's concerns.

First, each player can form a reinforcement pool (zero to any amount of ships). Then concurrent battles are layed out. At the start of each scenario each player rolls two dice and adds ten. This is the number of turns it takes for reinforcements pulled from other unplayed scenarios (which cannot return) to start coming in. Next, each player rolls one die and subtracts the result from the reinforcement turn number. This is when reinforcements from the reinforcement pool can start arriving. Reinforcements arrive according to speed and size class. Any reinforcement ship can be substituted for a smaller unit. X-ships, DNs and Fast Raiders.

Cruisers, NCA

CL, DD, FF.

Squadrons, BGs, and Carrier groups cannot be used for this rule.

The maximum number of reinforcements is three units. One every other turn once reinforcements begin.

Reinforcements use cannot return to the reinforcement pool or be used in another battle.

Naturally, big battles will end up being played last.

=====

By Larry E. Ramey (Hydrajak) on Friday, November 07, 2008 - 05:04 pm: Edit

You guys are really really really missing Andy's point.

The goal is to have fun battles with some "history".

The goal is NOT a realistic simulation of war. (space or otherwise)

=====

By Alan Trevor (Thyrm) on Friday, November 07, 2008 - 05:23 pm: Edit

Larry,

But the original question was posted by Dale, not Andy. And while I agree with most of Andy's response to Dale, I disagree with the last 2 sentences.

Quote:

An SFB campaign must have a primary goal of creating interesting SFB battles. If it does, the problem you're describing goes away.

Some campaigns have that as the primary goal, but for others it is one of several goals. For my part, I don't want a campaign that is merely a scenario generator. Certainly I want the SFB battles to be interesting. But I also want the strategic/political/economic choices to be interesting, and consider that to be at least as important. Different players will have different opinions on the matter of course. But speaking only for myself, I don't consider a campaign that guts the strategic aspects to ensure "fun" tactical scenarios to necessarily be an improvement.

=====

By Andy Vancil (Andy) on Friday, November 07, 2008 - 07:17 pm: Edit

Quote:

An SFB campaign must have a primary goal of creating interesting SFB battles. If it does, the problem you're describing goes away.

OK, I should refine this. Different campaigns will have different goals, and I agree with Alan that many of the strategic, political and economic aspects of a campaign can be more important to a fun campaign than good battles.

However, if your campaign rules are not designed with the goal of creating good battles, you will run into the problems Dale described, as well as others. You will end up with battles that are boring or unplayable from an SFB perspective, and at that point, you might as well admit that your campaign of galactic conquest is not really an SFB campaign. You'd be better off using F&E rules or something to resolve your space battles.

If you want fun SFB to be part of your campaign, you must design for that.

=====

By Andy Vancil (Andy) on Friday, November 07, 2008 - 07:26 pm: Edit

Loren,

I don't understand how your proposal addresses Dale's concern in any way, shape or form.

If one player is waiting for reinforcements to arrive, you can easily get the tedious situations Dale was concerned about.

That's not to say that you can't have a good scenario where one player is desperately trying to survive against superior forces until the reinforcements arrive. But such scenarios

require some design; they aren't likely to arise from the randomness of a campaign. And if the outnumbered player is Romulan, he's going to cloak. If he's a Tholian with a base, he's going to hide behind web. If it's a floating map, he's going to run.

=====

By Loren Knight (Loren) on Friday, November 07, 2008 - 07:41 pm: Edit

Andy, I think that by limiting the number of dead turns it addresses it a lot. At some point both players are going to have to make a move. By making the reinforcement arrival time somewhat random and available on BOTH sides (provided that reinforcements do not exceed command limits) the clock is ticking. Both side do not know what ship might be chosen as a reinforcement either. I think that the net effect will be to put pressure in a realistic way on both sides to act.

If one side is significantly smaller than the other then it can disengage intact or bunker down and wait for reinforcements. But the other side will then need to step up it battle intensity or perhaps the attack is getting reinforced earlier and the defender needs to think of something else.

Both side will have cards to play to influence the other to act.

If this fails then both can just run through dead turns. I've played dead turns in about two minutes or less. Dead turns should be mutually agreed on. Often we would say, "Have you got much to do this turn?" when it was obvious that it was unlikely to be very active. If "Yes" then we'd do eight impulse at a time or six or all up until Impulse 24 (last clear fire opportunity).

I guess it might not be that easy on SFBOL.

=====

By John Trauger (Vorlonagent) on Friday, November 07, 2008 - 07:44 pm: Edit

One could have reinforcements if a few restrictions are used.

* Defender Only. Attacker is presumably there for a reason and this acts as a spur for him to get on with it.

* Defender is outnumbered by some threshold amount, say 50% or more. This can occur into the scenario if the defender gets a run of bad luck.

* Defender must be defending a high-value target, such as worlds, bases or convoys. If two fleets are slugging it out in deep-space, no help is coming.

Once conditions for reinforcements are met, defender sends out a "distress signal", detectable to the enemy as such, which starts whatever clock mechanism the campaign uses to determine turns the defender must wait before help arrives.

There should be some campaign consequence of pulling ships off whatever else they were doing in order to ride to the rescue, at the very least being unavailable for any other calls for help during the current campaign turn.

Yes this encourages defending Roms to cloak and Tholians to web up, etc. But if they have something else to defend, that may not be practical.

=====

By Loren Knight (Loren) on Friday, November 07, 2008 - 09:14 pm: Edit

I think it's best to let strategy and economics determine how the player chooses to use reinforcements.

=====

By Ken Burnside (Ken_Burnside) on Saturday, November 08, 2008 - 03:54 am: Edit

Have every attacking force fill out a MIDDIE

Mission

Intent

Destination

Deadline

Intensity

Exception

Mission - what they're there to do

Intention - why they're there to do it

Destination - where they're supposed to be to do it

Deadline - when it's supposed to be completed

Intensity - At what level of force loss do you retreat? (If you're using a game that has fuel, this also tells you where bingo fuel is.)

Exception - Where do you retreat to? In what circumstances can you alter the Intensity from the pre-written format.

Alan - I am very much of the opinion that the purpose of any campaign system is to generate interesting (but not necessarily even) battles where there's a reason to consider force preservation.

This is one reason why F&E fails as a campaign game - there is no incentive that maps between F&E and SFB as a campaign system.

As to reinforcements:

1) Where were they? An SFB map - even the quad maps Dale uses - are tiny volumes of space compared to even the Earth-Moon system, let alone a solar system, and they aren't even in the round off errors for an F&E hex.

2) How long do they take to get there? Keep in mind that an SFB turn is 1/30th of a second. (One of these days, we'll get to see one played at merely 1:100,000 time dilation)

=====

By Loren Knight (Loren) on Saturday, November 08, 2008 - 11:13 am: Edit

Ken, as far as #2 goes... don't go there, right? I mean, how would any of this work with such exacting math? That said, I still keep in the back of my mind that tactical warp is actually sub-light warp maneuvering, even though that isn't official. This makes an impulse about 1 second and puts C at speed 30. You can break C with warp maneuvering plus full impulse (speed 31), or by engaging full warp.

While this ship has sailed around the world a thousand times, it does bring things more in line.

It does significantly weaken Impulse Engine power (supposedly it can push a ship to 0.99C and this reduces that to 10Kkm/sec).

Anywhoo, using SFU game scale to determine a campaign system is just going to fry your brain as in, "This is your brain. This is your brain on SFB game scale." We all know you have an excellent brain and it's my advice not to put it to such a dangerous endeavor.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike_Grafton) on Saturday, November 08, 2008 - 12:16 pm: Edit

C is speed 1.

And the time issue is subject to the elastic function known as "fun balance" so it isn't really any set amount of time.

I mean, you watch the show and how often can they fire volleys of Photons when they are fighting? Every couple minutes?

=====

By Ken Burnside (Ken_Burnside) on Saturday, November 08, 2008 - 01:17 pm: Edit

Loren: C is speed 1, by the text in the rules. SFB's scale makes no sense.

Let's look at the meta-issue here:

Problem - attacks against forces with defensive advantages tend to be boring as all hell. SFB has two significant defensive advantages built into the game, cloaks and webs.

Intent - we play the game to have fun. Playing games where one side has fun and the other has frustration isn't fun.

Proposed solution - Defender gets X amounts of reinforcement per turn.

Problem with proposed solution - if those forces were within reaction range of the fight, why didn't I, as the attacker, send forces out to pin them down? Why does he get a bonus and I don't? What is he not covering that I can now attack?

It's these ripple effects that are (potentially) a big problem.

The real solution is to make sure that the Attacker has clearly defined objectives, ala the Middie report.

=====

By Loren Knight (Loren) on Saturday, November 08, 2008 - 01:52 pm: Edit

Guys, I know C is speed one. It's been that way for 29 years. At 14 years old I knew the scale was wierd. At 15 I started imagining in my own head the view I posted above. My point was that using scale to define realistically how a campaign works won't work. By SFB scale nearly all battles take less than a second. Even at my scale a 10 turn game lasts five minutes; not long enough for reinforcements to arrive even in published scenarios. I mean, if the actual time interval is that short, why couldn't they just wait for reinforcements to arrive before the battle begins (except in base scenarios and why is the attacker cutting so close)?

The defender may have forces unseen but the attacker must make allowances for to some degree (depending on availability). This is why I suggested the reinforcement pool system. This mirrors F&E to a degree as well. An alternative way to my suggestion above is to only allow attacker reinforcements AFTER defense reinforcements (the attacker is then responding to defense reinforcements).

The case should be that the attacker has brought enough forces to take take down the defense. IF he didn't then to bad. He should withdraw.

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Saturday, November 08, 2008 - 02:08 pm: Edit

Thanks for the input everyone, keep it coming.

The more I think about it, the more I think campaign battles should be fought on a 1x1 fixed map. It seems to me that SFB was really balanced for that, and that it would eliminate MOST if not ALL of the "long, slow, tedious" elements from the battles.

=====

By Alan Trevor (Thyrm) on Saturday, November 08, 2008 - 07:23 pm: Edit

Dale,

See, I would hate to play in your campaign because I hate playing on a small fixed map. And I don't mind long slow battles. In fact, I enjoy them. Other people strongly prefer fixed map and quick battles, however.

Thinking back over the SFB campaigns I have played in that I have enjoyed the most, they have been the ones in which the players got together and designed a campaign that was mutually agreeable. The GM has to be involved in this process too, of course, because he's the one who will have to run the campaign. But the campaigns I've played in, in which the GM simply said "Okay, here's the situation. Here are the rules. Who wants to be the Feds?" haven't generally worked out as well, by comparison.

=====

By William T Wilson (Sheap) on Sunday, November 09, 2008 - 08:57 am: Edit

* Economics/Exploration/whatever vs. Scenario Generator. SFB is a very "heavy" game that takes a huge amount of time to play. Because players will spend most of their time in SFB, most of the fun needs to also be in SFB. Otherwise, no matter how interesting the strategic aspects of the campaign are, nobody will want to play.

F&E is a fine game, Master of Orion is a fine game. If you want to play those go ahead, but don't confuse them with SFB scenario generators, and don't try to re-invent them in your campaign.

Personally, my favorite campaigns are actually mini-campaigns or similar. Non-historical campaigns rarely feel like they are part of the SFU. It is really just a made-up universe that happens to use SFB ships. To me this "feels weird." But I do not expect everyone to agree with me about this, I think it is personal preference.

* Reinforcements arrive often enough in the fiction and published scenarios that obviously they are plausible, and apparently it is just one of those things about SFU timescale that makes no sense. I would not consider reinforcements any kind of way to speed up battles, though. If anything they will slow them down (by bringing in more ships).

* One standard-sized map is too small. That gives you room to run out only one plasma torpedo. All battles would be fought almost entirely within overload range, and it wouldn't be possible even to protect your scout (opposing scouts might be 30 hexes from each other - each one say 12 hexes behind their respective battle lines fighting at range 8). This won't even fit on a 1x1 map unless you arrange it just so. You couldn't keep carriers in the rear either. There'd be literally nowhere you could go to get out of range of base phasers. Even 2x2 maps get cramped in places. I've had good luck with the "opponent can declare you disengaged if you stray too far" system. And if battles are going too slowly or are too cramped you can just adjust the definition of "too far." This allows the battle to float naturally but doesn't let you retrograde. The "wall in space" drives me up the wall. In space.

* Tedious battles. Here is my list, in no particular order, of things that are tedious:

** Battles where one side is in a hopeless position but has to fight it out anyway because something else depends on the results. I will always try to agree to an outcome in such a battle in a campaign but this is not always possible.

** Battles where one side has to take disproportionate losses can be psychologically problematic. I think this is the problem with Tholian battles, although some attackers are in better shape than others to deal with them. Many people refuse to play with minefields for this same reason although if the defender doesn't get the minefield for free, it's really not a huge deal.

** Lots of effort spent without making meaningful tactical decisions. Consider those boring open space 12-ship battles where everyone fires R50 phasers all day. These are not boring because they take a long time, but because the amount of work you have to put in doesn't line up with the amount of decisions you make. You have to fill out a dozen EAs but really all you are going to do is roll 60 dice and count the '1's. Work to fun ratio is way off.

Carrier battles with a zillion drones are the same way. All those drones to account for (and reloads, deck crews and ready racks to keep track of - the drones are only the tip of the iceberg when there's a carrier) when in reality they are all or almost all just going to get shot down anyway and the end result is nothing. SFBOL gets better about drones all the time though, it's already much much easier than playing in person, I have hope that eventually it will be so easy that it's really a nonissue.

In a smaller space, you know the ships are going to come into direct combat because there is no way for them to avoid it, but that is just a different form of not having any decisions to make.

** People who play at a snail's pace. Seriously, there are some people out there who need to learn how to work the SFBOL client or turn off the TV or whatever. I continually try to improve my play speed and I think everyone should take a good look in the mirror and say to yourself, "how can I play more quickly?" If the client is slowing you down, you're probably using it wrong; there's three or four times I've asked Paul for an efficiency feature only to find that it's already in the client and I just didn't know about it. I *KNOW* that many players I have seen are wasting time on stupid things like figuring out which units of theirs still need to move. This can waste HOURS over the course of a large game. Now that we have target arrows, I don't want to see anybody spending more than five seconds apiece on drone movement. The best way to eliminate tedium is to play faster!

** Some people seem to have an attitude of "OMG YOU CLOAKED THIS SUCKS" regardless of the battle or situation. I find this attitude very tedious. Nothing makes time pass more slowly than listening to your opponent complain about the pace of the game.

** Limiting the number and/or size of ships in a battle can help. I'm no fan of FCR, but reducing command ratings in some way can cut down on battle size and get on with the issue of deciding on a victor more quickly. While fleet tactics are really

a different (and equally valid) beast compared to squadron and duel tactics, the need to fill out all those EAs (and keep track of all the drones) can weigh you down.

** Too many ships per player. SFBOL allows team play, but nobody really ever does this. Basic Set recommends three ships per player. My old in-person gaming group had a limit of two ships per player, and after a couple of marathon team EA sessions, did away with "team EA conferences" and forced everyone to sit at the table until EA was done. You can actually play even a large battle pretty fast if you have two ships per player. You also get occasional fun when not everyone, ah, "receives the same version of the orders." On SFBOL it is not really rare to have somebody playing five or six ships, one of which might be a carrier, and that is a lot of workload.

** Tactics or rules where one side is forced to choose between doing something advantageous (or neutral) but slow, or disadvantageous but fast. Consider retrograding. The best way to deal with a retrograde is to stop and not follow it, but this accomplishes nothing. But if you follow it you'll lose. Hidden mines are in the same category. You have two choices: meticulously record everywhere the enemy ships went so you can avoid their "slime trail," wasting a ton of effort and time, or ignore them and run over mines once in a while, which hurts. Cloaking is not like this. Cloaked ships are very slow and cannot do any damage. You can attack them under cloak, you can wait for them to come out, the one thing you cannot do is hit them for maximum damage right at this particular moment, but you do not have to make any "metagame" trade-offs.

Quote:

I've played dead turns in about two minutes or less.

Two minutes would probably be pushing it on SFBOL, but turns on SFBOL can and should go by much more quickly than they do.

Quote:

But the campaigns I've played in, in which the GM simply said "Okay, here's the situation. Here are the rules. Who wants to be the Feds?" haven't generally worked out as well, by comparison.

I don't agree with that. There are some aspects of campaigns where it is probably better to work by consensus, in terms of overall goals. Will it be historical or nonhistorical, two-sided or multi-sided, focus on battles or economics. But I think if you have a good campaign designer that you should let him design it. (If you don't have one, then... you play the hand you're dealt).

By Richard Sherman (Rich) on Sunday, November 09, 2008 - 09:42 am: Edit

Wow. Bill, that was most insightful.

And I think you just volunteered to be the next campaign designer and GM once Far Stars comes to an end in a few years.

=====

By Ken Burnside (Ken_Burnside) on Sunday, November 09, 2008 - 04:15 pm: Edit

Here's what I've learned about running campaigns.

1) Accounting sucks. Oh, it's fun when you're starting the campaign out, and playing "kid in the candy store" building your drone loadouts, fighter loadouts, putting legendary officers and crews on things...but the third time you have to go through it because you gained or lost territory, it stops being fun. Make your accounting as granular as possible.

2) Income accumulation, and compound interest, end more campaign games than military power. This kills most Starfire campaign games - someone figures out how to make their economy grow a little faster, and eventually, they outstrip

everyone else. The only winning strategy is to play 'miser' and hoard points.

2a) Disincentivize passivity. Fighting should not cost you so much that you avoid it at all costs; sitting and accumulating income should benefit you so rapidly that you can win the game by not fighting. Indeed, I recommend government accounting rules in campaign games with income: Your repair budget is whatever was left over from the start of the turn allocation; anything unspent at the end of the year is not only lost, but half that amount is deducted from next year's budget, since, clearly, if you weren't using it, you didn't need it, and there are homeless offspring on remote colonies who need government sponsored bat'leth lessons before the Federation sells them iPods loaded with propaganda. Like Lawrence Welk compilations.

3) Movement orders should be BRUTALLY simple on a strategic scale. Where you're coming from, where you're going, and when you're going to get there. Plotting out hex by hex movements for 30 units traveling by different paths stops being fun.

4) People play campaigns so that they'll play tactical games. It's very easy to make a campaign game that renders tactical games moot.

5) Put the end point of the campaign in the hands of the players; while Ted is to be commended for playing the Romulans until their planet got bombarded, most players would've quit long before then. Dale has seen some of my techniques for this, as has Ted for Master and Commander: The Far Side of Sanity the Galaxy. Whether this is points for taking an objective, playing ceasefire cards, put this in player's hands.

5a) One game that's ripe for pilfering for this sort of thing - Race for the Galaxy by Rio Grande Games, which is an SF variation on the card game version of Puerto Rico). A game starts with N victory points; when the victory point pool runs out, the player with the most wins, with objectives for getting victory points. Another way to end the game is to play out 12 planet/development cards before anyone else. For Puerto Rico, there's a third resource that can be exhausted.

Giving multiple ways to control the end timing of a game rewards different strategies on the campaign level.

6) Give victory points for extreme results in a campaign. Did your E4J manage to miraculously destroy an Intruder Group? You should get a victory point for it. (This also incentivizes playing in "Last reload drones at Alamo-7" scenarios. Sure, you're going to die. But if you die gloriously enough, you can score a campaign VP.)

7) Make sure there's a narrative to play. Give people a framework for telling their war stories of the campaign to.

8) If there are going to be random events, deal them out to the players and let them inflict disasters (and benefits) on each other. This is vastly preferable to the GM playing random "Khavek IV woke up in a bad mood and invaded the Tholians" events. Now there's some strategy to turn on with playing the cards to get the events timed when they'll do you the most good.

9) Mandates are less useful than incentives. Don't want to see fleets that are nothing but C7s leading D5As? Have each player build fleet lists equal to 20% of the point budget for their neighbor's fleet, for two neighbors (and each of his neighbors will be building 20% of his fleet). Letting your neighbors build 30% of your fleet rather than 20 gives you some at-start VPs...

By Andy Vancil (Andy) on Sunday, November 09, 2008 - 05:08 pm: Edit

Many good points, Bill and Ken.

One issue:

Quote:

One standard-sized map is too small.

It depends. I think it's just the right size for a tourney battle, or just about any other 1v1 duel. You're assuming that the battles are involving fleets.

The question I think needs to be asked before you get into questions like map size, is: What kind of battles do you want to be fighting in your campaign?

My friend and I have played many fun campaigns over the years, under a format where the maximum fleet size went from 300 BPV at the beginning of the campaign, growing to 450 by the end. This is because we have no interest in fighting large fleet battles, and believe that SFB is at its best when battles involve 1-3 ships per side. Under that format, we preferred a fixed hexagonal map 51 hexes in diameter, i.e., somewhat smaller than 2x2.

However, if you DO like big fleet battles, and maneuvering at range 50, and scouts, and carrier duels, etc., you probably need a different map size. But you need to figure out what kind of battles you want, first.

Fixed map, or floating? Deciding to use a floating map because of a desire for "realism" is a classic campaign design blunder. There are plenty of things about the game that are less realistic than "Walls in Space". The question you should be asking is whether you prefer the way battles play out on fixed maps, or floating maps. Fixed maps encourage one set of tactics, floating maps another. Which do find most fun to play?

Personally, I find that floating maps create a lot of rules headaches and increase the incidence of stalemates. But some people prefer the feel and tactics of the game on a floating map.

=====

By Ken Burnside (Ken_Burnside) on Sunday, November 09, 2008 - 05:54 pm: Edit

I've always preferred "fixed point" floating maps.

You define an object in the center of the map; the map floats. When that object is forced off the map by a player's movement, that ship has disengaged.

Given that, my other preferred map size is the 51 hex hexagon Andy mentioned. It's just small enough that two ships starting at opposite corners can have a train wreck in the middle around the end of turn 1 if they desire, it's big enough that you can run out plasmas, but not so big that plasma is futile, and not so large that the optimum tactic is range 50 phaser attrition. And applying realism as a justification for anything in SFB is a mistake. See discussion above about the plausibility of reinforcements arriving at exactly the right 30th of a second to intervene in a fight, while not being included in the initial force mix for one example.

=====

By Alan Trevor (Thym) on Sunday, November 09, 2008 - 06:47 pm: Edit

From reading Ken's post, I'm pretty sure I would not much care to play in one of his campaigns and I'm pretty sure he wouldn't enjoy one of mine very much. It's not that one of us is right and the other wrong. But we have different ideas about what makes a campaign fun.

And this is exactly why I think the campaign design needs player input. If nothing else, it may warn a player that he is unlikely to enjoy this particular campaign, and maybe open up a spot for someone else who does enjoy that campaign style.

=====

By William T Wilson (Sheap) on Sunday, November 09, 2008 - 06:50 pm: Edit

Quote:

I think you just volunteered to be the next campaign designer and GM once Far Stars comes to an end in a few years.

Well, designer maybe. Hopefully not GM. If I were to design a campaign (and I have a couple in rough draft form) one of my goals would be to make it sufficiently simple that you don't NEED a GM... so I could play in it. (I do think that such a

campaign can still be sufficiently interesting on the strategic scale).

Quote:

You define an object in the center of the map; the map floats. When that object is forced off the map by a player's movement, that ship has disengaged.

If you use a standard-sized map, this is the same as a 2x2 fixed map (well, it's one hex smaller).

Quote:

There are plenty of things about the game that are less realistic than "Walls in Space".

I dunno, I think it might actually be the least, maybe even worse than the time scale. But I will grant that fun needs to trump realism, so, whatever.

My goal with map rules would be simply to prevent the use of the retrograde. Beyond that, you don't really need a fixed map. If both sides want to fight at R50, ok. But if one side wants to close the range and the other tries to keep it open, this quickly evolves into a retrograde and they should be caught by whatever anti-retrograde rules there are.

In addition to the common objection of realism to fixed maps, I don't like that they make it too easy to disengage, or that they force ships that aren't retrograding, but just taking a breather, to re-engage before they are ready.

Quote:

we have no interest in fighting large fleet battles, and believe that SFB is at its best when battles involve 1-3 ships per side.

SFB handles a very wide variety of battles. A full 12-ship fleet may not be the best use of SFB, but there's a large portion of the game that you just can't fit into 3 ships on a side. I think campaigns should encourage diversity in battle types. There should be some duels, and some fleet battles; some base assaults, and some battles without bases; some battles with lots of attrition units, and some battles with none.

Perhaps the idea that one kind of map can handle all kinds of battles within the campaign is the problem. In a duel, a plasma ship may have a tough time winning on anything bigger than a standard map, even if the enemy ship doesn't retrograde. But this map would not hold even a moderate fleet battle.

By Andy Vancil (Andy) on Sunday, November 09, 2008 - 10:41 pm: Edit

Quote:

If I were to design a campaign (and I have a couple in rough draft form) one of my goals would be to make it sufficiently simple that you don't NEED a GM... so I could play in it.

That's always been one of my design parameters. My reasoning is that a) Being a GM just isn't as fun as playing, so why stick someone in that role in a campaign that may last a couple years, and b) For many years, my SFB group consisted of just me and my friend Dave, so we couldn't spare someone to be GM. Even now, with the Greeley Battlelab, I'd rather have one more player than have someone being GM.

By Ken Burnside (Ken_Burnside) on Sunday, November 09, 2008 - 11:55 pm: Edit

My campaign engine is designed to be GM-free; mostly this happens by use of card play for some elements.

It's got some things SFB campaigns don't have to handle - it's built around player designed weapons and ships, for example.

It's got some things that are done differently because I had the chance to make a set of game scales that work together. Operational and strategic movement tie into tactical movement seamlessly.

But mostly it's geared around minimum accounting, maximum kaboomage.

You don't have an income and expenditures; you have a BPV cap instead. There is no "hoarding points" from year to year. Your constraints are how quickly something can be built as a replacement.

Card play:

Each player has a custom deck of 54 cards, cards are of 6 types. The mix of cards varies by government type.

Ceasefire (1, 2, 3 & 6 point)

War (use to trigger a war, if already at war, use to rifle through your discard deck and take the card you want)

Tech Advance (another opportunity to boost tech)

Objective - hex XXXX is worth N victory points if you hold it.

Raid - play on another player, get 1 VP for every 350 points of his fleet you destroy.

Mission - nasty events you can play on other players, rarely, something nice you can play on yourself.

A production turn is 9 strategic turns; you draw two cards in peacetime, three in war. Look at how close your fleet is to your production cap. Bid how many rounds of cards you want to play this turn. SECOND highest bidder sets the number of cards each player must play.

Decide what you want to do to your fellow players. You can only hold 5 cards in your hand, anything past that limit is discarded.

During peacetime, you can't discard War cards - they have to be played or held on to.

During war, you can't discard ceasefire cards. You either hold them in your hand (where they take up slots for more useful things), or play them.

When the total number of ceasefire points played equals 10x the number of players at war, peace breaks out, VPs are tallied, and you see who won that round.

=====

By Larry E. Ramey (Hydrajak) on Monday, November 10, 2008 - 10:47 am: Edit

Our campaign used 1 fixed map for X BVP,

2 fixed maps for (X,Y] BVP,

4 fixed maps for (Y, Inf] BVP.

We also used the flexible commands in CDH to keep fleet size down... I think the largest you could ever get was something like 7-8 ships... and even then that's going to include a frigate squadron and those tend to end up leaving large battles pretty quick. ("Oh look... lets see... 16 dis... I can remove a CA shield or cripple that FF. OK, there goes the FF")

We had research and rules for differing weapon status and declaring war, ect,ect.... ALL focused on generating interesting battles. (2 F&E players and 2 guys that never wanted to touch F&E or anything more than 5 ships on the map at once).

Our big fear was when the Kzin players finally researched a CV group... but we figured we'd deal when we got there.

What 'broke' the campaign was when 4 Romulan CL/DD (WarEagle and BattleHawk) at WS-III "suprised" a group of 3 Kzin DDs. (WS-0) The Kzin fired 16 speed 12 drones and turned to engage with 8 overloaded DIS and the ability to pull speed 28 with 4-5 ECM up next turn..... we realized the Kzin DD was really a CL in disguise with all its refits built into it.

(In theory we all agreed what the fix was, to give the DD a "C-10" unrefit and then make the Kzin player research and install it..... but Joe moved to Atlanta.)

=====

By Tos Crawford (Tos) on Monday, November 10, 2008 - 10:59 am: Edit

Larry, have you ever formally suggested and submitted a defit of the Kzinti DD? I think ADB would be open to such a ship gracing a Captain's Log.

=====

By Kerry E Mullan (Nomad17) on Monday, November 10, 2008 - 12:10 pm: Edit

Yeah the only problem with the KZIN DD was that while loading OLs it tends to do poorly eating PL G and R torps before they get to fire.

As for roms in general cloaking is a lot less useful against fleets. Having a 1-2 chance to lockon is OK against 1 ship, against a scout equipped fleet having a 1-5 to lose lockon against 3 ships makes it less advantageous.

As well slowing down to spds under 10 tend to make it tough to uncloak against many opponents.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike_Grafton) on Monday, November 10, 2008 - 12:12 pm: Edit

The Kzin DD is a WAY underrated ship. And if the background didn't firmly state that it was really hard to build and maintain, it would be everywhere slapping Klink E4/ F5 and Lyran FF/DD agrossors around...

=====

By Lee Hanna (Lee) on Monday, November 10, 2008 - 01:32 pm: Edit

Ken's campaign sure sounds good to me, so far.

=====

By Larry E. Ramey (Hydrajak) on Tuesday, November 11, 2008 - 10:20 am: Edit

Tos,

Its not an issue in a "historical" campaign because the YIS date keeps you from making it. By the time you can make the DD, you are only a few years from making a CM which is clearly better anyway.

In a free campaign where someone is using the CDH, well.... I figure they are smart enough to do it themselves. Its kinda obvious what you need to do!

=====

By Tom Carroll (Sandman) on Tuesday, November 11, 2008 - 10:33 am: Edit

Quote:

=====

By the time you can make the DD, you are only a few years from making a CM which is clearly better anyway.

?!?

Of course the war cruiser is superior but that doesn't mean there might not be a campaign use for a good size class 4 ship.

=====

By Joe Stevenson (IkV_Sabre) on Tuesday, November 11, 2008 - 11:52 am: Edit

What Tom said

a.k.a. battlegroups! (I assume they are allowed in SFB, and not just F&E)

=====

By Larry E. Ramey (Hydrajak) on Tuesday, November 11, 2008 - 03:13 pm: Edit

Then use the DW.

The DD is a really weird ship, its a CL that is called a DD and is only in production for about 5-10 years.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike_Grafton) on Tuesday, November 11, 2008 - 07:08 pm: Edit

Well, then there are the PFT, CV and DDS roles.

And the Kzinti need all of them. Especially a scout better than the frigate one for smaller battlegroups and squadrons.

Actually the DD would make a rocking Drone Bombardment ship. Is there a version out there that I forgot?

=====

By Joe Stevenson (IkV_Sabre) on Tuesday, November 11, 2008 - 08:55 pm: Edit

"Then use the DW."

That comes MUCH later, Larry. Depending on how "historical" the campaign is.....

=====

By Alan Trevor (Thyrm) on Wednesday, November 12, 2008 - 06:14 pm: Edit

Well,

The discussion has drifted rather afield from Dale's original question regarding campaigns. But before I forget completely, I do want to mention one reason why, though it's not everyone's cup of tea, I strongly prefer campaigns with non-playing GMs (though as mentioned earlier I also believe the players should be involved in the basic campaign design).

A GM who is willing to put up with the (admittedly not insignificant) hassle enables strategic hidden movement*. To really make this work well does indeed involve a lot of work on the part of the GM. But when it does work, it creates a great deal of tension and confusion at the strategic level that some people enjoy a lot and some enjoy not at all.

*I have played various wargames that have involved hidden movement without a GM. Usually this involves "fleet counters" or "army counters" that are displayed on the map, with the composition of each fleet/army unknown to the opponent until he moves a unit close enough to the counter to "scout" it. I even tried writing such rules for an SFB campaign, but have never had the opportunity to playtest them. But no such system that I have seen allows the degree of subtlety that GM (willing to put up with the workload) allows. The SFB campaign that I enjoyed the most was fortunate to have such a GM.

=====

By William T Wilson (Sheap) on Thursday, November 13, 2008 - 08:10 am: Edit

Quote:
strategic hidden movement

Is of no value. It's not a personal preference thing, it's just a bad idea. Even in pure 4X games hidden movement is one of the top contributors to micromanagement hassle, but it can be worth it there because it opens up new tactics. You are trading off extra work for extra options, and as a result most 4X games use hidden movement (plus most of them have a computer in the role of the GM). In an SFB campaign on the other hand you also have to add quality of generated battles to the mix, and you don't have the computer GM, and that really tips the scales.

Generally one of two things happens when you have hidden movement:

- 1) Either it is relatively easy to tell where the enemy fleets are anyway, in which case you have to do all this extra work for nothing, or
- 2) It is hard to tell where the enemy fleets are, in which case many battles will be raids against essentially undefended targets (since they couldn't see you coming).
- 3) It's somewhere in the middle, in which case you still have to do all the extra work, and you sometimes get the lopsided battles anyway.

The "tension" of hidden movement is exactly the same as the "tension" of hidden mines. It is actually just hassle that seems like it might be fun until you actually try it, but which only causes problems.

=====

By Alan Trevor (Thyrm) on Thursday, November 13, 2008 - 12:40 pm: Edit

William Wilson,

I think you're way off base here. You may not find strategic hidden movement of any value. But to proclaim *ex cathedra* that

Quote:
It's not a personal preference thing, it's just a bad idea.

is more than a little silly. Of course it's a personal preference. I have actually tried it. And though I readily admit the hassle, I found it to be fun and interesting. And I'm probably in the minority here, but I do know other gamers who also enjoy that

sort of thing. It seems to me the argument is between people who want the tactical/SFB game to dominate, with the strategic campaign as basically an embellishment, and those who want the campaign to give equal weight to both tactical and strategic matters. And there are at least some of us in the latter camp.

<Edited for spelling>

=====

By Larry E. Ramey (Hydrajak) on Thursday, November 13, 2008 - 01:05 pm: Edit

It is very fun because all of a sudden you play different and the light goes on and you go "OHHHH THATS WHY GENERALS/ADMIRALS DO THAT."

Its a lot of work too.

=====

By Joe Stevenson (Ikv_Sabre) on Thursday, November 13, 2008 - 01:38 pm: Edit

I'll chime in here, too.

Hidden strategic movement had plenty value. You can always choose not to use it if it isn't something you're interested in.

=====

By Vincent Matteo Ferrara III (Vincentferrara) on Thursday, November 13, 2008 - 02:18 pm: Edit

In case any of you are interested, I created a simulated hex map in Microsoft Excel that allows hidden movement. I say "simulated" because it is actually squares, but I staggered them, so they are in the same relative positions to each other as they would be if they were hexes. I got the hidden movement by creating 3 identical maps and storing them in different tabs on the same document. One is for player A, one for player B, and one is the master map. Each player may look at his own map plus the master map, but not the other player's map. Each player plots where his units are on his own map, and if both players have a unit in the same hex, it will show up on the master map. If only one player has a unit in a hex, it will not show up on the master map. If anyone is interested, I can email it to you. I'd post it here, but I'm not sure if it is allowed, or even if it is technically possible.

My email address is: Vincent.M.Ferrara@delta.com

Or: vinferrara@comcast.net

I check my work email more often.

=====

By Ken Burnside (Ken_Burnside) on Thursday, November 13, 2008 - 03:45 pm: Edit

One can get something *close* to hidden strategic movement by preplotted, sealed, strategic movement orders - the MIDDIE acronym I posted earlier does this.

One of the important tricks is to make sure that your campaign system does in, in fact, generate arrival times for units. It wouldn't work with F&E, for instance. It does with mine, where you generate a distance between stars, divide by the push value, and you know the travel time. (And you can get that broken down into operational turns easily enough.)

=====

By Larry E. Ramey (Hydrajak) on Thursday, November 13, 2008 - 04:21 pm: Edit

Ken,

Yeah, that is how we did it. Wrote orders down, revealed to everyone. If there was argument, we all hashed it out over a beer and moved on. Key here is liking who you play with.

=====

By Ken Kazinski (Kjkazinski) on Thursday, November 13, 2008 - 11:27 pm: Edit

I like hidden movement. The heart of the matter, as Ken Burnside alluded too, is timing of movement. Also, how sensors and scanners work at strategic distances. In the campaign we ran you ended up putting bases in places that was not always optimal due to detection and scanning issues.

=====

By John Trauger (Vorlonagent) on Friday, November 14, 2008 - 12:46 pm: Edit

I like hidden T-bombs. It requires an honorable opponent, however. Anybody can write anything on a scrap of paper retroactively.

Hidden movement works based not on how it operates but the means by which the "hidden" angle can be pierced and what can be done once that happens.

Ships following flightpaths blindly is a sure way of getting lopsided fights with the one guy who figures out how to "game" the system winning big and turning everybody else off.

=====

By Ken Burnside (Ken_Burnside) on Friday, November 14, 2008 - 02:58 pm: Edit

A sample OpOrd might look like this:

Desron 2.2:

Mission: Picket

Intent: Confirm the location of the second Kodolian League Bellerophon-class carrier.

Destination: 1D-2812-0

Deadline: If no contact is encountered prior to 1:20, withdraw to base in 1D-2412-10 for resupply, and new orders.

Intensity: 1. If you encounter Kodolian forces, observe only. Do not engage them.

Exception: Withdraw to base in 1D-2412-10 (4 turns away). If that avenue is not feasible, make your way to closest convenient supply node.

A second OpOrd might look like this:

CruRon 4.22.

Mission: Engagement

Intention: Two Nike-class hybrid carriers have been reported in system 1D-2316-10. Attempt to cripple or destroy the two Nikes.

Destination: Do a circuit patrol of systems 1D-2316-10, 1D-2516-4 and 1D-2514-10.

Deadline: If this cannot be achieved by 1:27, return to base by 2:12.

Intensity: 3

Exception: Withdraw to base of your choice if you encounter a Bellerophon-class carrier.

=====

FEDERATION TACTICS

By Robert Russell Lender-Lundak (Rusman) on Wednesday, April 30, 2008 - 05:57 pm: Edit

I'm in the middle of a battle I'd love some comments on...

-----My Forces:

x1 FRA CLA (This is the CLA from the FRA Omega sector)

x1 Fed CL (No refits)

x1 Fed GSC (No refits)

x1 Fed Tug (No refits, no pods)

x1 Fed POL (No refits, w/ Leg Captain)

x1 Fed POL (No refits)

-----His Forces:

x1 Selt Battle Tug (PH-2's replace PH-1's)

x1 Selt CA (PH-2's replace PH-1's)

x1 Gorn CC (No refits)

x1 Trobrin SC (An FF scout from the Omega Sector)

=====

==

-----My Setup:

FED GSC - 3517/F

FRA CLA - 3212/E

FED CL - 3212/E

FED POL - 2501/F

FED POL - 2501/F

FED TUG - 0114/F

Last turn all my ships were moving forward @ high speed except the GSC @ spd 2 forward. I fired all Photons last turn except my GSC's.

-----His Setup:

Selt BT - 1003/D

Selt CA - 1003/D

Gorn CC - 0907/C

Trob SC - 0602/C

Last turn all his ships were moving speed 10 in reverse except his SC @ spd 10 forward. His Gorn has dumped three G-Torps of which at least one was real.

-----Info:

Year is Y159 so the Seltorians have no T-Bombs or suicide shuttles.

Floating map, open space, no terrain, no time limits.

I have a downed shield #1 on my Heavy Cruiser but no internals past the armor. I've managed to down his Gorn's #1 and #5 shields and score about 27 internals taking out half its phasers (all the left side ones).

He has been retrograding in reverse and the hits on his Gorn has caused him to breakup his formation somewhat.

-----Basic summary:

I am still technically out gunned but have mostly intact ships. Only ship I have with any real crunch power and staying power is the FRA-CLA but it has a downed #1 shield. (The GSC is rugged but more valuable for EW).

Gorn is threatened but not yet near dead. Selt's are totally intact. With luck I can use the tug and POL's to disrupt his retrograde. If I do not stop his retrograde, I see no choice but to give up or close & hose and risk losing ships.

=====

==

This is an ongoing campaign game and losing ships hurts badly for either side. His economy is about 20% greater than mine but I have lost fewer ships than he has so far. This is a key battle as the winner will control a nearby planet which is strategically located right in the middle of the area we are both attempting to grow our territories into.

We should be resuming the battle this coming Monday the fifth so comments would be appreciated soon.

=====

By Jim Davies (Mudfoot) on Wednesday, April 30, 2008 - 07:49 pm: Edit

If he's retrograding, the usual assumption is that he'll be disengaging if you let him open the range. So you control the system.

Maintain ECM on the CLA and bang away on the nose of the Gorn. He'll have to leave it behind or turn and fight. The Selt's aren't much danger in a retrograde; just knock the plasma off the Gorn and you can then handle him. The Selt's are badly affected by EW but the Gorn isn't, so kill the Gorn and Trobrin first, to make the most of your EW advantage.

You're a bit more maneuverable (with the Pols) but he has bigger ships. In a slugfest, the Pols)and Trob SC, if it's involved) will die quickly, and you probably want to avoid that.

I assume the GSC has overloads hot, so you can hold them until you need to kill something.

=====

By George Duffy (Sentinal) on Wednesday, April 30, 2008 - 08:01 pm: Edit

If the placement of the TUG is correct, have it HET and run down and anchor the Gorn from behind, then have your other ships close in on it with phasers. It won't be able to fire it's torpedoes if it's anchored and the Selt's and Trobrin will have to slow down and reverse if they want to save it.

If your lucky you may wind up with a captured ship and the system.

B^)

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Wednesday, April 30, 2008 - 08:16 pm: Edit

1.) The Fed TUG has a breakdown rating of 2-6. Best of luck!

2.) The Fed TUG only has 34 points of power. I don't know how it's going to run down a Gorn CC and anchor it and kill it.

3.) The Gorn CC can HET better than the Tug can.

4.) The Gorn CC has 4 batteries. The Fed Tug has 2.

=====

By John Trauger (Vorlonagent) on Wednesday, April 30, 2008 - 08:32 pm: Edit

Correction: It won't be able to fire its torps at anybody but the ship doing the anchor.

Can you disengage from reverse? Not by acceleration, I don't think, though perhaps distance.

I agree with Jim. Bunch the ships together for plasma defense and shoot at the Trobrin or the Gorn. Since the gorn's already hurt, I'd give him high priority, though if the trobrin gives him too much EW, consider popping him instead.

If I were him, I'd target your pols first with torps because a few internals will slow them down and knock them out of the fight.

What's at stake, anyway? What are the consequences of letting him run away other than a missed opportunity to trash a few enemy ships? How is attrition between the two sides going?

=====

By Jeff Wile (Jswile) on Thursday, May 01, 2008 - 12:04 am: Edit

Rusman:

If he is retrograding at speed 10 and you are pursuing at max speed, you might want to consider slowing down (atleast to speed 15) for a turn and reload your photons (and even consider overloading some of them say on the GSC that didnt fire the turn before).

you have started an attrition battle where you hold a significant advantage (two turn reload cycle for the photons instead of 3 turns required for the plasma torpedos).

The advantage is you will see what your opponent intends to do.. if he continues to retrograde at speed 10 he hopes youll waltz right over and get plastered by his plasmas...if he increases speed, he may decide to leave... and if he decelerates to start moving forward again... you'll be in position to hit him with overloaded photons.

You need the offturn to recharge your photons and by slowing down a little, you preserve your options.

=====

By Michael Lui (Michaelui) on Thursday, May 01, 2008 - 06:58 am: Edit

Why are you trying to catch him? Let the range open to 25-30 and just keep hitting him with proximity photons. Or regular ones. His plasmas get weaker the farther they have to go, your photons don't.

=====

By Jeremy Gray (Gray) on Thursday, May 01, 2008 - 08:15 am: Edit

I agree. If he is retrograding, why are you chasing? Is there some reason you have to chase (other than killing ships)? What are the victory conditions here?

Micheal's right. If you have to chase, hang back in the range 25-30 bracket and pound the Gorn CC with prox torps. Or shift to another target. He can't answer at that range.

The one thing I would not do is try to close to knife fighting range. From the looks of it, his fleet is much nasiter in close, and would make short work of a number of your ships if he gets you inside of range 4.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike_Grafton) on Thursday, May 01, 2008 - 09:24 am: Edit

And at ranges over 15 you should have an advantage of phaser ones (over his P2).

=====

By Jeff Wile (Jswile) on Thursday, May 01, 2008 - 12:55 pm: Edit

Unnnh guys?

Look at the hex positions posted above, the CLA and the CL are 22 columns away, the GSC is 25 columns and the POLs are 15 columns from the Selts.

Somehow, the Fed TUG got behind the enemy force (hex #0114) facing F... range seems to be about 11 or 12 hexes (just going by the hex # not having placed any counters on a map...)

Jeremy, the object is to control the area (with the nearby planet) as the area is strategically important (see the post above by Rusman, April 30th, 5:47pm, last paragraph).

The goal seems to be to force the opponent to retreat while inflicting greater ship losses on the opposing force than the battle costs Rusman.

IMO the ship most exposed is the Fed TUG.

If The Feds arent careful, they could lose the tug, the battle and the planet all in one easy single transaction!

=====

By John Trauger (Vorlonagent) on Thursday, May 01, 2008 - 02:04 pm: Edit

Is there a time limit or a fixed map?

With unlimited turns, the enemy can simply break contact, repair shields to full and come back 20 turns later. This favors the other side because they have larger ships with thicker sheilds. battle passes that result in shield damage on one side result in a trashed Pol on the other.

if there's a fixed map, the enemy can be plastered against the edge.

If there's a time limit, all the feds have to do is keep the enemy within sight.

Tractoring the gorn is a gutsy move that could result in a trashed tug, even if it succeeds

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Thursday, May 01, 2008 - 02:10 pm: Edit

This kind of set up is why I don't play floating map, no-time-limit battles.

That said, as Jeremy stated, you should be able to maximize the prox torps to pound him into rubble over a long game. It will take a while due to the setup.

As for the Tug, if you can and want to suicide it to gain a quick jump, by all means. But for the love of God don't try to do a HET in the thing unless it's a major desperation move. Odds are, it will break down and there it goes.

=====

By Michael Lui (Michaelui) on Thursday, May 01, 2008 - 05:37 pm: Edit

Jeff, by the facings and the fact that the enemy is retrograding, the Tug is in FRONT of the enemy not behind them. It should probably do a slow left circle and rejoin the rest of the fleet.

And go look at the Particle Cannon charts. You don't want to be within range 15 or 22. 25-30 works fine.

BTW, I don't think you understand what "controlling the area" really means. Here's a clue though: It doesn't mean go impale yourself on his weapons.

=====

By David Slatter (Davidas) on Friday, May 02, 2008 - 09:08 am: Edit

I don't think the tug is in danger. With (virtually) no weapons and plenty of power, it can speed and EW its way out of pretty much any trouble in these early years situations. The enemy probably won't be able to do any better on the tug than it did on the CLA, which means simply losing a shield. Losing shields on the tug is a great idea - provided you don't take too many internals - as the tug has little to offer in offense, and just soaked up a lot of damage that would have hurt a POL badly.

Don't chase him. Take your time killing the Gorn. Use your proxies. Repair the CLA front shield.. Why hurry?

=====

By John Trauger (Vorlonagent) on Friday, May 02, 2008 - 03:25 pm: Edit

Much depends on scenario rules.

Are there infinite turns?

Is the map completely open?

If so, the Feds want to settle into a groove that helps them: pacing the enemy according to the PC range chart so they have an average firepower advantage. Recommend 21+ hexes range. In that situation, only the gorn's a real threat until and unless the enemy turns and fights.

=====

By Robert Russell Lender-Lundak (Rusman) on Friday, May 02, 2008 - 04:24 pm: Edit

All,
Thanks for your comments. I want to remind you all of a couple points I posted on but some of you must have missed.

=====
=====

Year is Y159 so the Seltorians have no T-Bombs or suicide shuttles.

Floating map, open space, no terrain, no time limits.

I have a downed shield #1 on my Heavy Cruiser but no internals past the armor. I've managed to down his Gorn's #1 and #5 shields and score about 27 internals taking out half its phasers (all the left side ones).

He has been retrograding in reverse and the hits on his Gorn has caused him to breakup his formation somewhat.

-----Basic summary:

I am still technically out gunned but have mostly intact ships. Only ship I have with any real crunch power and staying power is the FRA-CLA but it has a downed #1 shield. (The GSC is rugged but more valuable for EW).

Gorn is threatened but not yet near dead. Seltors are totally intact. With luck I can use the tug and POL's to disrupt his retrograde. If I do not stop his retrograde, I see no choice but to give up or close & hose and risk losing ships.

This is an ongoing campaign game and losing ships hurts badly for either side. His economy is about 20% greater than mine but I have lost fewer ships than he has so far. This is a key battle as the winner will control a nearby planet which is strategically located right in the middle of the area we are both attempting to grow our territories into.

=====
=====

In reference to the "Area"... It is in open space on the main "Campaign" map but the loser of this battle will probably not have the strength left to stay and hold the planet. This is why I hold the opinion that the "Winner" will likely retain the planet.

As far as attrition goes, I have been winning and destroying his ships by about two to one of my losses. But with his economy being much greater than mine it has offset this fact. His gaining and holding this planet will only exacerbate this fact. Thus I sent the only real battle worthy squadron I have in the area to retake the planet (I had gained control of it the previous campaign turn).

My intended purpose for moving the tug up was to attempt to get close to his scout from behind his force and try to tractor it away. Unfortunately he saw this coming and E-Deceled near the end of the turn and moved it forward to get it closer to his warships. Now getting close with the Tug is a risky prospect.

As to capturing HIS ships... Have you looked at the number of Red Shirts on board all the ships?

His two Seltors alone have more BP's than my whole fleet. And the Fed's aren't exactly the best at depositing large numbers of boarders onto enemy units. The Gorn CC also comes stock with 20 Boarding parties and due to the destruction of one of his cruisers from earlier in the campaign game, he has a large contingent of crew and BP's from that ship aboard these ships after he Declared Catastrophic Damage from when I blew up his other CA in a previous campaign battle.

As for my moving the POL's up, I know I stand a chance at getting them hosed while too close to the Seltors but I am hoping to use them to distract him from holding his Retrograde like this.

PS. In case anyone is wondering, the Selt Battle Tug has six Particle Cannons and twelve PH-1's. (Second note, to balance the seltors with earlier year units we reduced their PH-1's to PH-2's until Y165 when he receives "K" refits.)

=====
=====

By John Trauger (Vorlonagent) on Friday, May 02, 2008 - 08:14 pm: Edit
All the more ready to NOT close. Your photons are as good at 30 as 13. His PCs aren't.

You just don't want to let him open up distance past 30 for too long. I don't know the PC charts, but the GSC should be able to focus heavy ECM onto the FRA to make his shield a hard target to hit. The FRA might wish to indulge in some gen reinforcement until he gets a box of shield back.

Again, if the Trobrin gives somebody, say the tug, too much ECCM, blast the trobrin instead.

The Gorn and the Trobrin are the linchpins of the fleet. The retrograde works best where a fleet has seeking weapons and the gorn is their primary supply of those. The Trobrin is their source of EW, which is the biggest problem for your prox photons. Beat those two ships up and the long game is yours.

=====
=====

By Michael Lui (MichaelLui) on Friday, May 02, 2008 - 10:33 pm: Edit

Quote:
If I do not stop his retrograde, I see no choice but to give up or close & hose and risk losing ships.

Why? If he's retrograding at speed 10, you drop back into the 25-30 range bracket, keep up with his speed 10, and keep proxying him, YOU WILL WIN THIS.

If HE stops his retrograde and tries to pursue YOU he might have a chance to do something, but his current tactics are just playing to YOUR strengths, not his. I don't know who got you fixated on having to break up his retrograde, but don't throw the battle away, let him retrograde. LET him help you kill him.

=====
=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Friday, May 02, 2008 - 10:46 pm: Edit

How, if you stop chasing him, would that result in a win for him? He's running away (presumably) from the planet that is the objective to hold here.

=====
=====

By Robert Russell Lender-Lundak (Rusman) on Friday, May 02, 2008 - 11:40 pm: Edit

Quote:
If I do not stop his retrograde, I see no choice but to give up or close & hose and risk losing ships.

Why? If he's retrograding at speed 10, you drop back into the 25-30 range bracket, keep up with his speed 10, and keep proxying him, YOU WILL WIN THIS.

How, if you stop chasing him, would that result in a win for him? He's running away (presumably) from the planet that is the objective to hold here.

Well, If I let him run, then he will wind up disengaging and will repair his ships and shields. Then I re-engage again and the whole procedure starts over again. Furthermore on my second attack, he may decide to fight at the planet itself and with it's atmosphere he can mitigate a great deal of my Photon damage forcing me to close. If he flies in the atmosphere my Phot's do 25% less damage + EW effects AND they have to beat through all that excess warp power being crammed into reinforcement.

So I feel compelled to take him now while I have the best chance.

In our campaign I have the option to keep attacking until one of us concedes the campaign hex (and hence the planet) but each new engagement results in the ships becoming less and less able to repair themselves. And his ships (except the Trobrin SC) have much more staying power than mine.

=====
=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Friday, May 02, 2008 - 11:48 pm: Edit

sighs
So just fall back to range 25-30, match speeds, and show him what narrow-salvoed prox/standard torps can do.

If he's backing up at speed 10, you will/should have big bricks, and as far as EW goes, you have a GSC. Fix the shield on the CLA, loan it ECM from the GSC, and torp him to death.

=====

By Robert Russell Lender-Lundak (Rusman) on Friday, May 02, 2008 - 11:56 pm: Edit

I guess that's my best option...

Anyhoo... Anyone with bright and unexpected nifty ideas, please feel free to let me know.

I resume this battle on Monday Morning

=====

By Michael Lui (MichaelLui) on Saturday, May 03, 2008 - 01:03 am: Edit

Well, when most of us are telling you the same thing it generally is the best option. HE is the one that must close to you to do real damage, not the other way around. And if he wants to fight at the planet it will still hurt HIM more than it hurts you.

Take a good look at the weapons charts of your enemies:

1. The only plasma you have to be afraid of in the 25-30 range is an "R" and he doesn't have any of those.
2. Particle Cannons are no better than P-2s at 23-30. (Except for firing twice.)

Then look at what is the same about your ships:

1. If you match his speed you have about the same size brick as he does on the cruisers.
2. You're not out-gunned except for up close (and even that's debatable).

Then look at your own:

1. Photons outclass every single weapon that the enemy has at 26-30 hexes.
2. You have more P-1s than he does so you can go to range 23-25 if you want.
3. He can't break through your brick with a narrow-salvo from 1 ship. You can.
4. The GSC TOTALLY outclasses the Trob scout. It can lend 6 EW points to 3 different ships at the same time, maintain a speed of 10, and still power the 4th channel in case you want to burn batteries for 6 more EW for a 4th ship.

And if he wants to withdraw and let you attack him when he's sitting in an atmosphere, that's even better. Go read the effects of atmosphere on HIS units, not just yours. He will be neutering himself if he tries it. His PCs will do ZERO points of damage at 23-30 hexes when firing OUT of an atmosphere hex. BOTH shots. Your photons will still be doing 3 or 6 points on him. EACH.

=====

By Jim Davies (Mudfoot) on Saturday, May 03, 2008 - 03:19 pm: Edit

What he said. And you have poor campaign rules.

=====

By Robert Russell Lender-Lundak (Rusman) on Saturday, May 03, 2008 - 05:31 pm: Edit

Thanks guys,

I will be sure and post here to let you all know how it went.

Cheers, RusMan

=====

By Robert Russell Lender-Lundak (Rusman) on Thursday, May 08, 2008 - 04:52 pm: Edit

Hi gang...

Well we picked up on that battle but my opponents wife came home and needed his help so we were unable to continue to its completion. We got in two turns and the events surprised me as much as my opponent. Here is the current layout from which we will again resume the battle next Monday.

=====

-----My Forces:

FRA-CLA = 2929B

FED-CL = 2630A

FED-GSC = 2828C

FED-TUG = 3018B

FED-POL = 3016D

FED-POL = 3319A

-----All of my ships were moving forward @ medium speeds except the Tug @ high speed.

=====

-----His Forces:

SELT-BT = 2320E w/x10 GAS & ADMIN = 2420D

SELT-CA = 2819D w/x4 GAS & ADMIN = 2819D

GORN-CC = 2714B

TROB-SC = 2814E

-----His Selts were moving FORWARD at low speed and had E-Deceled to zero by turn end. The Gorn was moving FORWARD @ spd-10 and the Trobrin in REVERSE @ spd-10.

=====

Synopsis:

He moved speed zero on turn-4 and I did fire on the Gorn's #1 again killing his few shield repairs and doing a few more internals.

His CA and BT did about 12 damage each to my GSC's #1 & #2 shields. The next turn he HET'd with his Selts and broke down with his Battle Tug (no tumble or pod loss). He subsequently E-Deceled with his CA (which had already fired its weapons). This gave me a chance to move into his formation with my TUG @ high speed. The few weapons his ships had available drew my TUG's #1, #6, & #5 shields down to about half each but I was able to use the Tug to grab his CA and drag it a bit away from his Battle Tug before it's post breakdown pulses had transpired. I hit his CA with a Suicide Shuttle and a few hits taking it's #1 & #2 shields down by about half each. He got through the #6 on POL #1 and took out a phaser and it's padding. I had switched its Legendary Captain to Engineer mode for the needed power.

Current layout... It's a major Cluster-Cram and I think I stand to do some major damage soon. Unfortunately his Battle Tug will have recovered from its breakdown and he also stands to do some major damage to me. On the bright side, I also have a few T-Bombs I laid with the TUG and this could mess with him greatly. (One of them already took out four shuttles.)

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Friday, May 09, 2008 - 12:36 am: Edit

blinks

He.....HET'd....with a BATTLE TUG?!?!?

Oh, brother.

Don't get into a knife fight; you'll lose. Stay at range, reload your torps, and if you are really lucky, he'll move the Gorn ship far enough out of formation so that you can dog-pile it.

It's going to take him forever to get the BT up to speed again, and even if he decides to castle, you can dump 100% OL's at range 8 and then turn away. Eventually, you'll jackpot.

=====

By David Slatter (Davidas) on Friday, May 09, 2008 - 08:40 am: Edit

Nice

You took shields on the TG and GSC. Both of which are not (that) important combat ships. The GSC can do EW from a safe range and be effective there, and the tug has (almost) no guns. Meanwhile, the ships you have that do damage can continue to do it... :D

Hetting with a battle tug? Well, that's a new mistake on me.

Advice as per Mike. Hold your nerve, and stay out of close range. Use the GSC's EW to protect yourself. Use your manoeuvrability and his static position to pick your range.

=====

By John Trauger (Vorlonagent) on Friday, May 09, 2008 - 02:20 pm: Edit

I'm wondering why the feds are inside range 23 or so.

=====

By William T Wilson (Sheap) on Friday, May 09, 2008 - 04:25 pm: Edit

Don't overlook that a battle tug that breaks down is essentially dead. Breaking down will cause the pod to fall off (dont

remember if this is in the breakdown rule or the tug rule, but it's there), and then you will take extra damage from dropping the pod as a result of breakdown, in addition to the regular breakdown damage. AND then the pod is a big sitting duck unless/until you manage to reattach it and only then, finally, can you get moving again. And the odds of success, even on the first HET, are, what, 50%?

Yeah. Don't HET a battle tug.

=====

By John Trauger (Vorlonagent) on Friday, May 09, 2008 - 05:16 pm: Edit

Speed is life, esp with major units of his decelled or broken-down. Circle out to range 20+ and force him to leave his shuttles in the dust. He WANTS a close-in slugging match followed by a resumption of retrograde.

Don't fall the to temptation of playing "hydran" and closing. Play the long game. Keep pounding the gorn or the Trobrin. It's nice that the BT HETed and blew it. target it next after the gorn.

=====

By Kerry Drake (Kedrake) on Friday, May 09, 2008 - 07:03 pm: Edit

Quote:

Breaking down will cause the pod to fall off

Technically not true. (C6.561) says:

Quote:

In the event that a tug carrying pods suffers a breakdown, roll again for each pod. If the result...is withing the breakdown range of the tug...the pod has seperated

=====

By Robert Russell Lender-Lundak (Rusman) on Friday, May 09, 2008 - 07:15 pm: Edit
John & William,

Quote:

I'm wondering why the feds are inside range 23 or so.

Well, as to why I got inside rng-23? He stopped retrograding, moved forward, and HET'd toward me... When his tug broke down, I took the opportunity to move in with my tug & other ships to disrupt the snot outta him. Unfortunately only one of it's two suicide shuttles hit but otherwise I had about a 20 or so impulse period by which to really thrash his tactics. Hence the current positions. And based on where I left off, I am still in reletivly good shape for this coming turn. with only a small chance that my POL #2 might get hit hard by his Selt CA before it can jam outta there. The TUG and POL #1 are in a position to be able to hall butt outta there before he can bring signifigant firepower to bear. If he chooses to fire on my POL #2 instead of my Cruisers than I can get in a rng-8 shot off on his CA and hurt him badly. If he does not fire on that POL than I scoot outta the area before he can get in a good range. My GSC is in range for Offensive EW on all three of his combat ships which should mitigate much of his damage potential.

Quote:

Don't overlook that a battle tug that breaks down is essentially dead. Breaking down will cause the pod to fall off...

As to being essentially dead & the Pods coming off his Tug?

This does not happen automatically, If the ship breaks down, a Die roll is made for each pod as well as the chance for tumbling. Should a ship NOT tumble or loose any pods, a Break Down is not as severe as many people think it is. The enemy has about 8-20 some-odd impulses to take advantage of the situation. After that the Battle Tug is (for the most part), free to pretty much resume normal operations (albeit from speed-zero). It only has a temporary time period of inability to

fight and only a few internals so to speak of. Since I could not quite use the 16 impulse recovery period to hurt the BT, I chose to try and hose the CA. It worked for mostly shield damage and for forcing it to E-Decel and that alone was worth the moderate shield damage My Tug and GSC suffered.

All in all I think I am coming out on top here.

=====

By Michael Lui (Michaellui) on Friday, May 09, 2008 - 07:41 pm: Edit

He said there was no tumbling or pod loss so I presume he rolled for them separately as per C6.561.

But I'm also wondering why the Feds are still inside range 23 (and a POL within range 5) after asking us for help. I mean, I can understand the Tug being at high-speed to get back to the rest of the fleet and diverting after the BT broke-down, but it actually looks like you were still planning on moving it through their fleet anyway. But the rest of the fleet, and especially the POLs, shouldn't be anywhere NEAR range 15 let alone inside range 8.

I know that it's YOUR battle, and I guess I shouldn't be surprised that you are ignoring us after your post for "any other ideas" kind of hinted that you prefer Hydran Fusion Beam tactics, but it would have been good of you to just tell us that you wanted us to present you with tactics that more suited your "up close and personal" style. You would have gotten a few different recommendations in that case.

=====

By Robert Russell Lender-Lundak (Rusman) on Friday, May 09, 2008 - 09:46 pm: Edit

LOL Micheal,

I certainly have not "IGNORED" any of you.

I appreciate your advice as well as that from others. I had planned on completely following the advice of those from this last week. As it happened his tactics changed. I had to adapt. I had originally planned on using the TUG to get behind his force and drag his Scout away. He saw that comming and brought it in close so I could not.

I would NEVER have run into the middle of his formation with that tug normally. But when his BT had broken down and I knew it would not have any weapons available until well after I got out of their arcs, I took advantage of the situation and made a run for it through his force. I HAD to bring the GSC in closer to offer EW to the TUG (Which is why it ONLY suffered shield hits as opposed to Internals). That also distracted him into dumping weapons onto the GSC as well as the TUG (spreading his fire too much).

The original plan for moving the POL's up close was to distract his fire away from my Cruisers (which were around rng-20 at the time. When his Gorn dumped a G-torp I had to get the POL's back as quickly as I could. The Gorns few remaining phasers and the Phasers from the SC were able to down a shield on POL #1 and forced it to turn downward (toward the EW support of my GSC, or away which would have left it to fend off a rapid loaded F-Torp with no phasers to weaken it. I chose to move it downward (out of Torp Arc) and toward my GSC's EW support.

One thing I cannot let happen is for him to disengage before I can at least inflict significant damage to at least one ship. (If I have to re-engage him, He will have repaired and will likely be in the Atmosphere. I know that you all have said that would be good. But remember, a few prox loads every other turn will NOT get through his Reinforcement. Even though his weapons will be neutered, the only way I would be able to deal enough damage to breach that reinforcement would be to close to OL range (which of course would leave me taking as much damage as I likely would deal). So I am going to take him here in open space while I can.

So you see, I WANTED to play the rng-23+ game but tactics changed that. He is no longer retrograding and is gunning for the close & hose game. I had to take an opportunity to deal to him what I could before I have my Phot's recycled.

With the current layout. My gamble seems to have paid off. He formation is broken up, his BT has 6-Warp & two PH-3 less, his CA has badly damaged forward shielding, his SC has blinded it's sensors, All his ships are moving spd-zero or none, and the BT and CA have used a valuable HET bonus up. (Don't forget, even the Selt CA has a lousy Break down rating @ 4-6.) And all this PLUS the Gorn-CC still is being sandpapered down by my mizia fire.

=====

By all means I DON'T want to get into a rng-4 or less knife fight. I WILL lose. But the way things stand I can still get outta range before he gets close.

=====

By Robert Russell Lender-Lundak (Rusman) on Saturday, May 31, 2008 - 06:33 pm: Edit

Hey all,

I had intended on letting you all know how the battle went but I forgot to post it until just now.

In short, as I had mentioned previously he stopped his retrograde and began a more traditional fight. I started to get pummeled fairly bad and got one of the POL's crippled, I took 30 internals on my GSC due to his incessant fire onto it. (He saw it as his biggest long term threat). Nearly all the damage to my GSC was repaired by the end of the battle.

My Fed CL took about 18 internals. I nearly crippled his Scout FF with said CL but my two full overload photons missed at range 1 (+2 EW shift).

Despite my sandpapering of his Gorn CC, he still managed to get a couple phasers repaired and brought it's power back to full.

At any rate the vast majority of the shields on almost all my ships were used up and full. His Selt CA had downed #1 & #2 shields, his Gorn had downed #1, 4, 5, #6 shields.

Long story short, had the battle continued I would have probably lost the CL and a POL, and maybe gotten another ship crippled. He probably would have lost the Gorn CC and (maybe) the Scout.

with far less padding and staying power on my ships than his, I decided to use my Captains bluff and the scenario ended right there.

I will be re-engaging and do not yet know whether he will choose to stay at the planet to fight me or do it in open space. After repairs all my ships are basically at full fighting strength except that my CL and the two POL's will have no hull padding. His ships will be intact except that his Gorn will have no padding and maybe no batteries.

Rus

=====

By Michael Lui (Michaelui) on Saturday, May 31, 2008 - 09:06 pm: Edit

When you re-engage make sure you stay in the 26-30 range bracket. I'd normally say 23-30 but you need to be careful of him trying to get close, which means staying a bit farther away. And keep your GSC in the 35-45 bracket.

Remember, HE is better in a knife fight than you are, so stay FAR away and win rather than closing the range and lose.

=====

By Robert Russell Lender-Lundak (Rusman) on Wednesday, June 04, 2008 - 01:34 am: Edit

Thanks

=====

By Richard Sherman (Rich) on Thursday, July 24, 2008 - 10:29 am: Edit

Since anti-Andro tactics came up in the ISC thread, try this:

Year - Y175

map - larged fixed (84x60)

Class M planet in 4230 (center of map)

no time limits

all drones are M-speed, and there are no WBP/Mega available Federation forces

3 GBDP on planet, facing A,C,E

DNL

CLD+

CLV+ (carrying 11 F18 and 1 F18E fighters)

FFA+

F-S

10% COI (and all already spent on special drone warheads, marines, TB, MRS, F7, etc.)

set up within 5 hexes of the planet, speed last turn max, WS2.

Andro forces

INT

COB

COB

EEL

10% COI (and presumably almost entirely spent on TB, plus extra marines and a few CDO)

set up in upper right corner of map, speed last turn max, WS2.

Federation objective - prevent harm/damage to planet, preserve DNL and CLD as much as possible (but carrier, escort, fighters, and even the F-S are completely expendable), force Andros to leave.

Andro objective - unknown

You're the Fed player...what's your battle plan? What tactics would you use?

=====

By Brian Johnson (Flash) on Monday, December 08, 2008 - 01:24 pm: Edit

Hello All,

I'm not sure where to ask this.

Some time ago I had a question as to how Photon torpedoes work. Whether they are pure energy weapons or more like direct-fire drones. I like the idea of direct-fire drones myself.

Someone was working on an article that included this problem. Any updates or thoughts?

=====

By Loren Knight (Loren) on Monday, December 08, 2008 - 01:51 pm: Edit

The photon in SFB is an energy weapon. SVC has posted this in the past, but it is likely those posts were recently trimmed from the BBS.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike_Grafton) on Monday, December 08, 2008 - 06:29 pm: Edit

Brian.

If the photon were to be a "Direct Fire Drone" that would have to account for ESGs intercepting them.

Plus that would also imply a limited ammunition supply

=====

By Ken Kazinski (Kjkazinski) on Monday, December 08, 2008 - 08:07 pm: Edit

There is some type of limiting factor. I do not remember which episode of Star Trek had a referense to the number of torps on board.

=====

By Stewart W Frazier (Frazikar1) on Monday, December 08, 2008 - 09:12 pm: Edit

ST6 showed the inventory for the photons, though some believe that was for the casings rather than the torps themselves...

=====

By John Trauger (Vorlonagent) on Tuesday, December 09, 2008 - 03:03 pm: Edit

The Franchise picked that up as well in Voyager, talking about having a limited supply of photon torps.

=====

By Jim Davies (Mudfoot) on Tuesday, December 09, 2008 - 07:17 pm: Edit

When Spock died in ST2 they loaded his body into a photon casing and shot him into space. But the movies aren't SFB canon anyway.

=====

KLINGON TACTICS

=====

By Bennett Eugene Snyder (Planner) on Saturday, February 16, 2008 - 11:01 pm: Edit

I've been wondering something recently and maybe I can find the answer here. I haven't read the Vudar module completely, but have read enough to learn that the race is radiation resistant. If that resistance includes the radiation put off by the WYN zone, why haven't the Klingons used the Vudar police ships (as they aren't supposed to know the Vudar are secretly amassing a larger fleet) as irregulars, going into the zone first and attacking any WYN ships coming to the attack.

Or at least harrasing the WYN response ships long enough for the attacking Klingon fleet to get their systems operational.

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Saturday, February 16, 2008 - 11:54 pm: Edit

The problem with the WYN radiation zone is it's effect on the ship's systems. Crew doesn't seem to be impacted by the trip through.

Also, the Vudar resistance seems to be more towards long-term exposure of moderate levels not short term exposure of ultra-high levels of radiation.

=====

By William T Wilson (Sheap) on Sunday, February 17, 2008 - 12:02 am: Edit

The only advantage the Vudar would have would maybe be surviving longer on a ship that goes into the radiation zone. Normally it just messes up the sensors, but only because the crew isn't in there long enough to be affected.

I can maybe see the Klingons loading a freighter full of Vudar commandoes instead of whatever was supposed to be on the freighter, IF the Vudar can survive the trip. And then the Klingons would be dismayed to find the Vudar all defect to the Wyn upon arrival.

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Sunday, February 17, 2008 - 03:13 am: Edit

●●● Vudar!!!

=====

By Bennett Eugene Snyder (Planner) on Sunday, February 17, 2008 - 02:30 pm: Edit

That was one drawback I saw with the Vudar being used. I guess I had the impression that their ships were more resistant to radiation, and could be used as skirmishers. Although I also figured that had they been victorious, the Klingons would want the sole credit for the victory.

=====

By Roy Chipoqua (Ris_Mace) on Saturday, April 12, 2008 - 06:49 pm: Edit

Hello, I am a big fan of Starfleet Command (the PC game based on SFB), and I love the Klinks! The K-D5L is my favorite ship of all. The disruptor and phaser arcs are very nice-- the ability to fire most weapons at R15 and then dance away is a lot of fun.

One question, though. How does one fly the E4/E5 series? They don't seem to have enough power to run and charge 2 dizzies at the same time, so how can you do the Sabre Dance?

=====

By William T Wilson (Sheap) on Monday, April 14, 2008 - 10:16 pm: Edit

You'll probably have more luck in the Starfleet Command topics. In SFB, the E4 is mostly useful for getting blown up ;)

=====

By Michael Lui (Michaellui) on Tuesday, April 15, 2008 - 06:59 am: Edit

Now you know why Klingon players INSIST the F5 is a frigate when setting up for a FF battle.

=====

By David Slatter (Davidas) on Tuesday, April 15, 2008 - 01:34 pm: Edit

E4s don't sabre dance.

But for their BPV, they don't need to. The very fact that they can overload 2 DSR at all gives them a big punch for their NW - albeit moving very slowly. Compare their alpha strike to the fed pol that only has 1 photon and similar BPV IIRC, and you see what I mean.

=====

By Richard Sherman (Rich) on Tuesday, April 15, 2008 - 02:06 pm: Edit

David:

That's not exactly a fair comparison. You forgot to mention the 3 P1 the Fed Pol has as well.

=====

By Larry E. Ramey (Hydrajak) on Tuesday, April 15, 2008 - 04:41 pm: Edit

I didn't mention the Klingon drone racks either.

4ph-2 are probably close to 3 ph-1 when you take the drones into account....

The Pol is nimble though...

The E4 is kinda crap.... it will do some damage, it just won't come back.

=====

By Jeremy Gray (Gray) on Tuesday, April 15, 2008 - 07:59 pm: Edit

I've been playing Klingons for a long time. E4s are called escorts for a reason. They are not going to contribute in a big way to a sabre dance vs general war ships. Too small, too slow, to easy to just blow up.

BUT, back in the days before say Y160, they are every bit the equal of many frigates (the Fed FF is an exception). Fleet speeds are generally slower, EW levels are not quite as high, and in general, life isn't as hard on little guys. In that environment, they can hang in with the sabre dance, perhaps burning up batteries on one turn, and leaving disruptors empty on the following turn. They will not have any EW to speak of, but the disruptor is pretty EW insensitive anyway.

Once the GW gets going, they are probably best used as skirmishers or as reserves. If they can draw heat off of the cruisers, or they can kill off drones/fighters, they make a meaningful contribution. Otherwise, they are probably only good for swinging in behind the cruisers and finishing off a cripple. If they can hang around until late in a battle, EW levels on beat-up big ships will be way lower and they can get some dirty work done.

If you get stuck in an E4, remember, it could be worse. You could be in a E4E. Now that thing stinks on ice.

=====

By Joe Stevenson (Ikv_Sabre) on Tuesday, April 15, 2008 - 08:26 pm: Edit

E4s, when not being used as escorts, are swarm ships. Pack hunters. 8-10 heavy weapons for the cost of a of dreadnaught, albeit far lower range.

Those that survive ight actually do something.

=====

By Joe Stevenson (Ikv_Sabre) on Tuesday, April 15, 2008 - 08:28 pm: Edit

E4s, when not being used as escorts, are swarm ships. Pack hunters. 8-10 heavy weapons for the cost of a of dreadnaught, albeit far lower range.

Those that survive might actually do something.

=====

By David Slatter (Davidas) on Wednesday, April 16, 2008 - 04:27 am: Edit

That is what I was trying to say. The E4 has quite a lot of guns considering its BPV. Think of it like a mini-klingon version of the Fed DD concept.

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Wednesday, April 16, 2008 - 12:38 pm: Edit

The E4 is a fine frigate.

Compare it to its historical opponents, the Lyran, Kzinti and Hydran FF's.

It rapes the Kzinti, is about equal to the Lyran (unless the ESG hits...), and does well against the Hunter as long as it can keep the Hydran outside of range 2-3.

It has problems vs the Fed FF...which isn't unusual, due to the unique abilities of the photon. I like to think that the Fed FF 'inspired' the Klinks to build the F5.....

Oh, and the trick to flying the E4 successfully (or the Lyran FF, for that matter...) is to fly it arming only one disruptor, if that. The disruptors are best used for coup-de-grace shots...

=====

By Alan Trevor (Thyrm) on Wednesday, April 16, 2008 - 02:45 pm: Edit

Mike,

At least in my experience* the Tholian PC is advantaged over the E4, at least until fast drones are available. But it's hardly a slam dunk. It only takes a relatively minor Tholian mistake or a relatively minor disparity in luck for the E4 to come out ahead. I would call it 6/4 for the Patrol Corvette, maybe slightly better than that in the era of slow drones or if the PC is a PC+.

*Note that I prefer to play floating map. Fixed map may be different but I don't have enough experience with fixed maps to really know.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike_Grafton) on Wednesday, April 16, 2008 - 03:20 pm: Edit

Actually, the Kzinti FF does fine with drone speed upgrades. Otherwise it is left in the dust though with just about only one viable tactic; the Kzinti anchor.

As for the Hydran, in SPPs "can you give an example of" article on speed changes, it is a Hydran POL that smacks around an E4. A hydran Fusion FF or even better a Hellbore FF should do fine.

Personally, I think the Lyran FF is the weakest of the three, ESPECIALLY before the ESG capacitor refit.

=====

By Jim Davies (Mudfoot) on Wednesday, April 16, 2008 - 03:46 pm: Edit

Given that the E4 costs 55 vs the Fed Pol's 40 and the Hunter's 48, it ought to beat them both. And likewise often lose to the PC's 59 and get spanked by the Fed FF.

I generally fly it in duels as a 2-turn-arming ship which can stop to knife fight at any point. On turn 1, charge phasers and batteries, launch a drone. On turn 2, launch another drone, come in behind both with 0-2 OLs and shoot from R8 or whatever. Rinse and repeat.

Its main problems are 1) really sucky rear shields, 2) the single battery which means it can't OL, 3) the 4-6 breakdown and 4) no redundant systems except phasers.

It gets much better with medium drones and a B refit, but that's unsurprising.

=====

By Jim Davies (Mudfoot) on Wednesday, April 16, 2008 - 04:02 pm: Edit

Agreed about the Lyran being poor. On paper it looks OK, but it has rubbish phasers (only 2 P2s with unimpressive arcs, and 4 P3s which don't see much use) so has to rely on disruptors to do damage. It also has bad rear shields like the E4, but without the monster brick on the nose.

Alternatively it forgets the distractors and charges in to overrun with a hack & slash, but that's a bit of a gamble with the unremarkable 16-pt front shield. And as all Lyrans know, you WILL lose one ESG on the way in. So that leaves you with something like 2P2 + 2P3 for your retaliation.

=====

By Tos Crawford (Tos) on Wednesday, April 16, 2008 - 04:03 pm: Edit

Convert your E4 to an E4D and buy faster drones. Then you can have some fun.

=====

By Tom Carroll (Sandman) on Wednesday, April 16, 2008 - 04:05 pm: Edit

Quote:

Actually, the Kzinti FF does fine with drone speed upgrades

Huh. I've found the Kzinti frigate becomes at best a vulnerable support unit when you start adding drone upgrades or refits. The increase in BPV starts moving it into DD/DW range where it is simply outclassed.

=====

By Jim Davies (Mudfoot) on Wednesday, April 16, 2008 - 04:39 pm: Edit

Convert your Kzinti FF to an FFD, stay at the back and have some fun. You'll make an astonishing nuisance of yourself until something gets sufficiently annoyed to come and blow you up.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike_Grafton) on Wednesday, April 16, 2008 - 05:02 pm: Edit

The second part of the Kzinti FF plan should be HOLDING his scatter pack until someone tries to come mug him. The scatter pack should ideally break when he is at range 10 to 15, coming at you and too fast to speedy weasel...

Drop the SP and watch him go bananas trying to deal with 6 from the scatter pack, PLUS rack launched drones. recover the SP for reuse if at all possible as you have 1 (?) and no other.

Against the Klink, Hydran and Lyran exploit your use of the Phaser 1 at longer ranges.

With your good drone control rating and speed (MC 1/4 with 12 warp IIRC) you should be fast and using the drones to commit him to be slow (so you can force the het) or you'll be on his number 3/4/5 shield plinking from range 8 to 15.

=====

By William T Wilson (Sheap) on Wednesday, April 16, 2008 - 06:40 pm: Edit

The regular Kzinti FF has two or four racks (2A pre-refit, 2C+2B post-refit), 2p1, 2p3, and a disruptor. It has a meager 15 power and a M/C of 1/3. BPV is 62, +9 for the refit (which adds eight total rear shield boxes and the extra drones). With the refit and 20 medium speed drones, it would cost 81, which is still IMO well within the frigate zone (compare to the Federation which is 78 including refits and medium speed drones). With fast drones, the Kzinti costs 91, but then, it can launch six fast drones per turn.

=====

By Jim Davies (Mudfoot) on Wednesday, April 16, 2008 - 07:03 pm: Edit

91 points of Kzinti FF is up against an F5K with more and better phasers, more power, an ADD-12, fast drones and a T-bomb (=91). My money's on the F5K.

=====

By Michael Lui (MichaelLui) on Thursday, April 17, 2008 - 05:58 am: Edit

But the F5K is a Destroyer, not a Frigate. It's SUPPOSED TO beat it.

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Thursday, April 17, 2008 - 01:02 pm: Edit

The F5 is a frigate. It says frigate on the SSD, and is listed as a frigate in the MSC.

If the F5 is a DD, then so is the Fed FFG.

Or were you thinking of the F5C? THAT is called a destroyer, and I'd buy that argument.

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Thursday, April 17, 2008 - 01:12 pm: Edit

While the F5 says "Frigate" in the description, it's really the Klingon Destroyer. It's just a small destroyer that blurs the line. (Just like the Kzinti BC, Klingon D6 and D7 aren't really "Battle Cruisers" and the Federation "Destroyer Leader" isn't under the Leader restrictions.)

=====

By that, the F6 is a "frigate", too, even though it's, functionally, a War Cruiser (2/3 MC).

=====

By James Hallmark (Jhallmark) on Thursday, April 17, 2008 - 01:37 pm: Edit

Names mean nothing, size is everything.

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Thursday, April 17, 2008 - 01:45 pm: Edit

So by that definition the Fed FFG and Romulan SNB are destroyers also, James?

Gary: It looks like a duck... quacks like a duck... says 'duck' on the SSD and MSC... so why try to call it a 'goose'?

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Thursday, April 17, 2008 - 01:49 pm: Edit

I should add, I'm not trying to pick an argument for argument's sake. In 'pickup' or 'patrol' BPV-based battles, it doesn't really matter what the thing is called, it's the point value that counts. However, in some campaigns, there is a distinction between how 'frigates' and 'destroyers' are treated; I run one such game. Having the Klinks suddenly have their F5s treated as DDs would be a heavy blow to the Empire...

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Thursday, April 17, 2008 - 01:59 pm: Edit

Best rule is to group by Movement Cost. That will get you closer than anything.

1/3 is a Frigate

1/2 is a Destroyer

2/3 is a War Cruiser

1 is a Cruiser

1.25 is a Light Dreadnaught

1.5 is a Dreadnaught

2 is a Battleship

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Thursday, April 17, 2008 - 02:02 pm: Edit

Gary: But that's not really a "rule", nor is it a good group, even, at least below cruiser size. By that logic:

The Fed POL is a frigate.

The Fed FFG is a frigate.

The Romulan SNB is what... a POL?

...and so on.

I disagree with this.

=====

By Jeremy Gray (Gray) on Thursday, April 17, 2008 - 02:11 pm: Edit

Dale and I have discussed this one at length. The F5 is either a big frigate or a dinky destroyer. Depending on what your metric is (size, combat power, BPV, move cost internals, etc, etc), you can cut it either way. I have always seen the F5 as a destroyer (albeit a pretty poor one), despite its name mainly because of its move cost. If the Fed FFG is your measure of an "average" FF, then the F5 starts to look a heck of a lot more frigate-like. Of course, compared to the Gorn or Lyran FF, it is pretty hard to say the F5 is in the same class.

This is not without real world precedent. Up until about 1975, the US Navy used the ship classification DL (really only DLG or DLGN remained), and while technically "destroyer-large", they were called frigates. In 1975, the small DEs "destroyer escorts" became FFs, and DLGs and DLGNs were reclassified as CGs and CGNs ... cruisers. "Name" does not necessarily equal "Combat Power".

In our campaigns, Dale and I have treated the F5 as a frigate, and the F5C as a destroyer. I'm not really in love with it, but it is what it is. I think this is in part influenced by the Feds relative strength in small ship classes (FFGs and DDs are awesome in their size class). In a campaign like, say, the Lyrans vs Klingons, the Lyran DD and Klingon F5 look pretty even to me.

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Thursday, April 17, 2008 - 02:12 pm: Edit

Fed FFG is a frigate. Problem?

Most POLs are frigate sized. Problem?

I don't think you comparing the Klingon F5 (worst Destroyer in the game) to the Fed FFG (probably tied with the ISC FF for best Frigate in the game) is a good rationale.

So, what is the Klingon Destroyer before the General War?

And, if the F5 is a frigate, what does that make the entire E-series?

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Thursday, April 17, 2008 - 02:14 pm: Edit

So, basically, even though it says 'frigate' on the SSD, is listed as a 'frigate' in the MSC, and stacks up fairly evenly to the Fed FFG in terms of combat power, it should be re-labeled or classed as a Destroyer because YOU say so? Sorry, I don't buy that.

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Thursday, April 17, 2008 - 02:18 pm: Edit

The problem occurs depending on what system you use for ship management.

There will always be some mismatches.

Before the general war, the Klingons don't HAVE a destroyer, they are forced to use their (excellent) frigate to fill the role - as it states in the R section. They also don't have a true light cruiser, but instead use the substandard D6 for the job.

Depending on the model, the E series is either a POL, smaller FF, or CA (E7).

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Thursday, April 17, 2008 - 02:21 pm: Edit

Do what you want. I'm not forcing you to do anything. I was just providing my perspective and counter-point on yours.

As it seem you're getting hostile, I won't post further. A topic that has no effect on game play isn't worth it.

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Thursday, April 17, 2008 - 02:25 pm: Edit

Gary: My intention wasn't hostility. Sorry if it came off that way. I'm simply saying, the only thing you've provided so far is your opinion. What I'm pointing at is in black and white in the game (rules and SSDs).

Anyway, you're right, no point in debating this ad nauseum. In most cases it doesn't matter, and campaigns use their own rules to manage these things anyway.

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Thursday, April 17, 2008 - 03:16 pm: Edit

Looking back at the EY Era, the Klingon F-series are their Destroyers, equivilant in every way to the Destroyers of their neighbors.

You can't really use the "class name" as a basis for argument; otherwise, I want to play the Gorns in a campaign against you (with their battle destroyers and heavy destroyers - they are both destroyers, afterall, right?).

It has been a Klingon idiosyncrasy that the E4 is good for little more than convoy escort duties and the F5 has the arduous role of being assigned every mission that is considered too small for a D6. However, when looking at class notes (for example, the "standard guards of bases"), I do consider the E4 to be the Frigate and the F5 to be the Destroyer.

If you are putting extra campaign restrictions on, I would base them more on BPV and perhaps Docking Size than on ship names or even size class for, as noted, the Fed FF is a superior Frigate and the F5 is a poor destroyer.

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Thursday, April 17, 2008 - 03:42 pm: Edit

Andy: Agreed, but the R-section does make it explicitly clear that the BDD is the Gorn DW and the HDD is the Gorn CW.

Personally, as primarily a Gorn player, I'd love to have the Gorn unrefitted DD count as a frigate... because that's about all it's worth. But c'est la vie. It's all relative and depends on your campaign structure. Before you get to the 'war' classes, and

the General War, there is more variability between class types and more 'tweeners' and 'oddballs' out there. Not to stray too far afield of the discussion...

=====

By Roy Chipouqua (Ris_Mace) on Thursday, April 17, 2008 - 09:58 pm: Edit

Thanks for the feedback about the little Klingon ships. Seems they are hard to classify to add interest and variety to the game-- so that not all the empires are cookie-cutter.

The best comparison I can draw is with the Romulan "Eagle" line of ships. R-WB+ is somewhat like a frigate, except for the heavy even shielding and Plas-R. The WE and KR (I'd call both of them light cruisers, but definitely not CWs) are also hard to put into a category, but it makes things more interesting.

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Friday, April 18, 2008 - 12:32 am: Edit

"Best rule is to group by Movement Cost. That will get you closer than anything.

1/3 is a Frigate

1/2 is a Destroyer

2/3 is a War Cruiser

1 is a Cruiser

1.25 is a Light Dreadnaught

1.5 is a Dreadnaught

2 is a Battleship"

Missing from the list is 3/4 (.75), which is traditional for pre-GW Light Cruisers (CL).

I would call the 1.25 DNLs 'Battlecruisers', since that's their actual function, but it is what it is.

I suppose you could postulate a class of ships that used the 1.75 MC, called 'Superdreadnaughts' (SD), that fall somewhere between DNH's and BB's, but SVC will probably shoot you.

Also, Dale, the Kzinti CL is really their DD....which is why the Kzinti never bothered to build a true DD until almost the start of the GW.

And the Fed 'Destroyer' is unique....its essentially a 'pocket cruiser'. It's NOT a DD, class wise.

The Gorn DD is equivelant to everybody elses FF, mainly due to the fact that until Y160 or so, its fighting sublight opponents.....

=====

By Tos Crawford (Tos) on Friday, April 18, 2008 - 01:08 am: Edit

Names are nothing. Use movement cost, possibly modified by war construction, unless you can come up with a good reason not to.

=====

By William T Wilson (Sheap) on Friday, April 18, 2008 - 01:43 am: Edit

The Federation CL is unusual with its move cost of 3/4. Many pre-war CLs (Gorn, Kzinti, Orion come to mind) have the 2/3 move cost of CWs, but not the 24 warp.

While the Kzinti CL is very bad and can not really stand up to anything bigger than a DD, it was still their CL. They had a DD as well, which has about as much combat ability as the CL does. It's a not bad DD, really.

The Fed DD is also, of course, unique, having the same firepower as the CA, but it's still a DD. Lots of pre-war ships are just strange.

=====

By James Hallmark (Jhallmark) on Friday, April 18, 2008 - 03:30 am: Edit

I will note that the F5 did eventually grow up to be a F5W. The Klingons just sucked at making small ships until a fair distance into the general war.

A more detailed breakdown of ship classes in general order of strength:

Skiff (1/4?)

POL (1/3)

FF (1/3)

Heavy Pol (1/2)

Battle FF (1/2)

pre war DD (1/2)

DW (1/2)

pre war CL (2/3-3/4)

HDW (2/3)

CW (2/3)

CA-CC (1)

NCA-NCC (1)

CB-BCH (1)

DNL (1.25)

DN-DNH (1.5)

BBL (1.75)

BB (2)

=====

By Michael Lui (MichaelLui) on Friday, April 18, 2008 - 04:57 am: Edit

Dale

So a Horseman says it's a war cruiser on its SSD, but the Traveller says it's a Light Cruiser on its SSD. Does that mean it's normally a CW when it's a HR but it's a CL after it's converted to a TR?

Or is it a CL when it feels like it and a CW when it doesn't?

Or is it a CL after the Tartars and Mongols (CMs) come out?

Use movement costs when deciding what any particular type of ship is, it's easier. (Of course the HR/TR would still be in murky waters, but nothing's perfect.)

=====

By Seth Iniguez (Sutehk) on Friday, April 18, 2008 - 08:48 am: Edit

Well the Kzinti BC is a CA. It sure isn't a BC

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Friday, April 18, 2008 - 09:20 am: Edit

I don't have my G2 at work, but a comparison of docking size may help as well.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike_Grafton) on Friday, April 18, 2008 - 10:21 am: Edit

"the Kzinti CL is really their DD"

Well, actually, the Kzinti have a fine DD design. It was just too hard to build/ maintain to build en-mass.

But once you have one, you are in a pretty good ship. And SOMEDAY you get to become a Carrier or PFT!

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Friday, April 18, 2008 - 01:23 pm: Edit

James: Cool. I will fight the skiff of your choice with my SNB.

Michael: Based on the YIS, and the fact it's called a 'Light Cruiser' in the index on module C1, I'd call the Horseman a CL. In my campaign we treat the Horseman/Traveller as a CL and the Mongol/Tartar as a CW.

Seth: Agreed, but then that's true for the D7 "Battlecruiser" as well; also the Gorn BC, and others I'm sure as well. It's pretty clear from the R-section that these are heavy cruisers.

Mike Grafton: Agreed; in free campaigns, the Kzinti DD gets a lot of love, out of all proportion to the few ships built 'historically'. The Kzinti CL+ tends to be more of a siege engine or base defense unit, from what I've seen.

Guys, my intention is not to be ornery about this nor do I want to debate class sizes ad infinitum. The only reason I got in this was, my campaign uses the Flexible Command System from the Campaign Designer's Handbook, where it DOES matter if the F5 is a DD or FF. In our case we made it an FF, as Jeremy mentioned, it could go either way. In MOST cases out there, class names don't matter; it's size class and BPV that matters.

To swing this discussion back to its original tack, if someone challenged me to a frigate duel, and I'm the Klinks... it would depend on who I'm fighting as to what would be a 'fair' matchup. Against a Fed FFG, yes, I would want an F5. Against a Hydran HN, the E4 would be a better match; and that's what this is all about, right? I don't imagine anybody would take an F5 against a ship 30 points its inferior and then crow about

their "great victory" (nor would their opponent tolerate that). So there you are.

=====

By Richard Sherman (Rich) on Friday, April 18, 2008 - 01:33 pm: Edit

Yeah, but if they did and it went the other way...
Expect me to sing like a bird if my HN manages to humble an F5!

=====

By Loren Knight (Loren) on Friday, April 18, 2008 - 02:32 pm: Edit

The F5W is a DD. The F5 is an excellent FF but NOT a DD and has been an FF for forever and is so unlikely to be changed that I'd suggest you might as well try to remove the reference to Battle Cruiser from the D7 too.

=====

By Andy Vancil (Andy) on Friday, April 18, 2008 - 04:59 pm: Edit

The F5W is a DW. The F5C is a DD.

=====

By Jim Davies (Mudfoot) on Friday, April 18, 2008 - 06:03 pm: Edit

I'd say that the Horseman and Traveller are CLs until they get refitted with proper 24-warp engines, whereupon they become CWs.

But back on topic, the Klingons have a real mess of small ships. The F5 is a substandard destroyer masquerading as a frigate; the E4 is a mediocre frigate labelled as an "escort", which it isn't, and the E3 is a police dinghy pretending to be a real warship.

Nobody else has "escorts" like that. Mind you, the Klinks don't even use normal names for their cruisers. They don't have a CA or a CL, just a pair of "battlecruisers" (a term the Gorns and Kzinti use for an upgunned CA).

=====

By Sean O'Carroll (Terryoc) on Friday, April 18, 2008 - 09:08 pm: Edit

The D6 is referred to by the Klingons as a "heavy cruiser". That's why the D7 is a battlecruiser, it's an upgunned D6.

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Friday, April 18, 2008 - 09:57 pm: Edit

One interesting note is that while the F5 is referred to as a "Frigate", the F5W is referred to as a "War Destroyer."

=====

By Glenn Hoepfner (Ikabar) on Friday, April 18, 2008 - 11:58 pm: Edit

The Klingons . . . well, they're just Klingons. If they could rename their shuttles, you'd see them as Stealth fighters. I'm surprised their B-10 isn't called the "Galactic Mobile Star Base".

=====

By Jim Davies (Mudfoot) on Saturday, April 19, 2008 - 03:45 pm: Edit

The D6 SSD says Battlecruiser on it (at least in my 1990 printing it does).

The E5 is a "Battle Escort" and once again isn't an escort at all. The F5E is a "Combat Escort". For once it is a real escort, but where the rather superfluous "Combat" comes from is anyone's guess. Could it just be that the Klingons are a bit warlike?

The F6 is a "Battle Frigate", where really it's an HDW without the modularity.

=====

By Loren Knight (Loren) on Saturday, April 19, 2008 - 04:36 pm: Edit

Well, the F5W is distinctly different and superior, although it is almost always better to spend another ten points and get a D5. I did the F5W though. The only thing wrong with it is what you can get for a little more or a chunk less BPV.

=====

By Sean O'Carroll (Terryoc) on Saturday, April 19, 2008 - 05:07 pm: Edit

The FC version of the D6 calls it a Heavy Cruiser. As for the 'battle' and 'combat' escort designations, I think that's intended to distinguish them from the E4 "escorts". Those got called "escorts" before "carrier escorts" got invented, hence the name confusion.

=====

By Robert Russell Lender-Lundak (Rusman) on Saturday, May 03, 2008 - 05:46 pm: Edit

I might be jumping in a little late to your conversation here but I want to point out that the Klingon E-7 is also referred to as a "Heavy Cruiser", (At least it says so on my SSD printing from R6).

=====

By Douglas Jordan (Djordan) on Thursday, September 11, 2008 - 04:35 pm: Edit

Does anyone consider the Klingons worth playing if not using EW or scatter-packs?

Their advantage would seem to be sheer numbers based on Fed & Empire but that is negated in SFB.

Against their three traditional enemies it just seems they are too outgunned class for class.

Thoughts?

=====

By John Trauger (Vorlonagent) on Thursday, September 11, 2008 - 05:20 pm: Edit

I assume "no EW" means "no ECM Drones"?

VS. the Kzinti, the loss of SPs hurts the kitties worse than the Klinks and EW is a wash, so losing it is a wash. I see no problem for the Klinks against the Kzinti.

The Klingons do have it tougher against the Feds or Hydrans, where the Klingon drone advantage often translates into an EW advantage. It's just a little harder without those toys. The Klink is not hopeless.

RE: the tournament game, where the Klink TC does just fine without SPs and EW.

If your group has adopted rules that make life hard on disruptor + drone races, they ought to be willing to give something back. Maybe a BPV discount of some kind.

=====

By Richard Sherman (Rich) on Thursday, September 11, 2008 - 07:31 pm: Edit

The Klingons still have significant advantages in power curve (against Feds and Kzinti primarily) and maneuver (against all three traditional opponents). Nobody sabre dances like a Klingon.

And remember, no EW doesn't necessarily literally mean "no EW." What about EM? What about PFC?

Lastly, it's been my experience that the Feds are hurt just as bad if there is no EW or SP, especially in the later years.

=====

By Douglas Jordan (Djordan) on Friday, September 12, 2008 - 12:06 pm: Edit

John:

It does mean no ECM Drones.

If one looks at a D7B vs. a Kzinti BC, doesn't the fewer drones and phasers translate into a disadvantage for the Klink?

Rich:

Does power curve really matter in this case? To sabre dance you would still have to get past that initial 64 points of photons. Both the Hydrans and Kzinti have superior short range weaponry in their cases.

I appreciate the thoughts, just trying to have fun without bogging down in the EW rules.

=====

By Jeremy Gray (Gray) on Friday, September 12, 2008 - 12:30 pm: Edit

I absolutely consider the Klingons worth playing in an environment without EW and SPs.

The key to winning with the Klingons, with EW or without, is the range 15 sabre dance. Their higher speed, combined with the

ability to reliably score damage outside of overload range makes them a potent force, even without SPs.

Against the Feds, the speed edge will generally allow them to stay outside of OL range for several turns, while Fed struggles uphill holding overloads. Drone defense between these two races is nearly a wash. The key for the Klingon is to delay the Fed's arrival at range 8, while he works on his leading shields with disruptors.

Against the Kzintis, Klingon speed and generally more available ADDs balance out the drone equation, and the ships are otherwise a fairly even match for each other. The Klingon actually gets a nice firepower edge at range 3, using all those Ph-2s to out range the more numerous Kzinti Ph-3s.

Against Hydrans (assuming fighters aren't using EW either), the Klingons have an edge both at range 8 and 15, and just need to avoid getting sucked into a knife fight inside range 2.

Even without SPs, if the Klingons want good drone count, they have some drone-heavy ship options like the D7D and F5D to compensate. I'd happily take a Klingon ship, squadron, or fleet under these conditions. If anything, as the ship count goes up, the Klingons get better against their opponents in an EW or non-EW environment. You just can't expect to win with them by immediately closing to range 3.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike_Grafton) on Friday, September 12, 2008 - 12:31 pm: Edit

"fewer phasers" depends on how you count the smaller (non Phaser ones).

And how usable they are. no-one does an oblique like a D7...

=====

By Alan Trevor (Thyrm) on Friday, September 12, 2008 - 12:35 pm: Edit

Douglas;

Power does matter. For example, a Klingon can try to saber dance against a Fed outside overload range. In the 9-15 range bracket (and especially 13-15) disruptors are far superior to photons in cumulative damage over a number of turns. Some people find this sort of wear-the-Fed-down-over-multiple-turns game to be tedious, but some enjoy it, at least as a change of pace compared to the close range "knife fight".

This tactic doesn't guarantee a Klingon win over the Feds. But, especially on a floating map, it is certainly viable. And it's the Klingon power curve (I'm thinking specifically about a D7 versus CA fight here) that makes it viable.

=====

By Alan Trevor (Thyrm) on Friday, September 12, 2008 - 12:37 pm: Edit

Ehh...

Jeremy beat me to it, and with a more comprehensive answer.

=====

By Larry E. Ramey (Hydrajak) on Friday, September 12, 2008 - 12:51 pm: Edit

If we are talking fleet actions.... the year matters... ALOT.

The later Klink units are just sick, EW or not. There is nothing NOTHING NOTHING more broken n all of SFB than a C7+10D5 fleet on a floating map. EW or not.

At least a D7 has to point at you for a while to get its guns in arc, meaning the Fed WILL finally get the R8 shot he wants. The "war" ships of the Klink fleet never even give you that.

Honestly, I think no EW actually works great for the Klink. Their traditional enemies would LOVE for the Klink to spend power on EW instead of movement. The Klink HATES a Fed CA+r coming in with a EW drone and a SC 15 hexes back protecting it because when it does unload, it can hurt a ship bad enough that the fed fleet will either over run and kill it, you the entire Klink fleet will have to stop the sabre dance and engage.

Hydrans, ST-E, enough said.

SPs are a wash in fleet/squadron action. There are plenty of racks in a Klink fleet to max out your drone channels over 2 turn build up. (1 F5D or D6D does wonders)

The EW rules can be tedious.... why not disallow powered EW from ships and EW drones? This still allows the "brawlers" to

close under erratic and try to get close and slay you. (Known as the Mike Tyson Approach)

It allows scouts to have a purpose.

=====

By Douglas Jordan (Djordan) on Friday, September 12, 2008 - 12:55 pm: Edit

Thank you all for the posts. Makes me feel better about going into an Admirals Game against the Hydrans. I had always thought that I would be more competitive with the Klinks if the ship count got up to squad/fleet, but my standard opponent is less comfortable with larger numbers of ships.

=====

By Alan Trevor (Thyrm) on Friday, September 12, 2008 - 12:56 pm: Edit

I will add that in my experience the Hydrans and Tholians can out-saber dance the Klingons at least in some circumstances.

For the Hydrans, the key is their hellbore ships, which often have humongous amounts of power for their MC, combined with a weapon that can do internals against a non-facing downed shield.

For the Tholians, the web caster is the key element, combined with good long range fire power from their disruptors, (few) photon torpedoes, and (lots of) phaser-1s. And of course, if on any given turn the web caster isn't needed as a shield or to hinder enemy movement, its web fist mode makes a good long range weapon in its own right.

=====

By Alan Trevor (Thyrm) on Friday, September 12, 2008 - 01:00 pm: Edit

Larry Ramey;

I need to disagree with you slightly about the C7 + 10 D5 fleet. I think a carefully chosen Tholian fleet with adequate web caster support can take on those Klingons at equal BPV with an at least equal chance of winning, on a floating map.

=====

By Larry E. Ramey (Hydrajak) on Friday, September 12, 2008 - 03:27 pm: Edit

"For the Hydrans, the key is their hellbore ships,"

Not in a fleet battle its not. In fleet battles, shields are just something that slow the 1st volley of internals down. A Disruptor fleet can punch through any facing shield at R15. The hellbore special abilities aren't that special.

Douglas,

Check out the "Day of the Eagle Comes Early". I HIGHLY recommend the FCR system from the CDH.

=====

By Douglas Jordan (Djordan) on Friday, September 12, 2008 - 04:03 pm: Edit

Larry:

Unfortunately I don't have access to the FCR. I had wanted to test the whole 'invincible starbase' thing. I think we'll just play this one pretty standard and in the future make any house rule modifications we feel would be necessary.

I'm not expecting much trouble in the first round, but by counting ship totals, I know my opponent could put 4 ships with a BATS. Depending on the ships, that could be a lot of fighters and more hassle than the BATS is worth.

=====

By Alan Trevor (Thyrm) on Friday, September 12, 2008 - 04:37 pm: Edit

Larry;

Quite true about massed disruptor fire at range-15. But there are other considerations as well. In particular, I believe the massed hellbores in the Hydran fleet make them far more effective at "Mizia attacks" because the Klingons can't protect a damaged-but-still-combat-capable ship by simply turning to downed shield away. The Hydrans can strip the weapons from the Klingon ships faster than the Klingons can strip the weapons from the Hydran ships.

Also, I'm curious about your thoughts concerning my claim that a Tholian fleet with web casters can out saber dance the Klingons. Do you agree or disagree.

(The fleet I have in mind could plausibly be called "munchkin", but it is completely legal under both the S8 rules and the rules restricting total numbers of web casters.)

=====

By Jim Davies (Mudfoot) on Friday, September 12, 2008 - 07:03 pm: Edit

I note that Douglas is playing an Admiral's game against the Hydrans, where the Klinks get no SPs. What do the Hydrans lose out on? SPs are quite handy for soaking up gatlings before an overrun, so I'd hope for some compensation in return.

=====

By Douglas Jordan (Djordan) on Monday, September 15, 2008 - 11:49 am: Edit

Jim:

That was my concern initially. That being, are SP's so vital to Klink tactics that to not use them would mean an impossible outcome.

Note:

We started over the weekend and my opponent's general inexperience will probably offset any tactical deficiencies I've set for myself.

=====

By Larry E. Ramey (Hydrajak) on Monday, September 15, 2008 - 12:04 pm: Edit

Sure, If you put the Entire 312th Battle Fleet in on group, it will kill EVERYTHING it comes in contact with. Neo-Tholians with CWs as support are the grossest ships in the universe.

Who cares? Tholians aren't a real race.

In fleet battles I don't NEED or WANT to Mizia you. I want to blow some engines off so that you slow down. I want your fleet structure to disintegrate. Disruptors are better than Hellbores in FLEET action. In squadron action, the Hellbore is still a pretty good weapon as 16-20 disruptors will only remove a shield, they won't gut the ship underneath.

Hydran fleets needs fighters. Full stop.

Jim/Douglas: The Hydrans lose out on EW games. That is HUGE. Without EW those Stingers are meat on the table for Disruptors. (small target IS EW)

All these rules aside.... anyone who thinks they can drop a SB with an 11 ship fleet when there are 6 or more defending ships (not police cutters, but real ships like CWs and such) is completely delusional. (or playing Andros or Tholians)

=====

By Douglas Jordan (Djordan) on Monday, September 15, 2008 - 12:13 pm: Edit

Larry:

I intend to cover the starbases initially, win the fleet battles and then hopefully be able to strike the bases during the following round. Another option I thought of was if I could be assured of certain Hydran ships being at the base, attack it in force with somewhat expendable ships, take out the particular Hydran ships (Paladin, Cavalier?) and then retreat.

=====

By Kerry E Mullan (Nomad17) on Monday, September 15, 2008 - 12:45 pm: Edit

Larry a couple questions on the SBase issue.

Why would the attackers only come in with 11 ship fleet instead of a 12 ship one?

If the defenders have 5-6 ships as well as the base it will most likely mean that the base will last longer, but the defenders just means 6-7 turns will be spent blowing up defenders before the base is hit.

Note for a SC3 KLI std Fleet the numbers fall in these ranges:

Disr 42 P1's 46

So at R25 it's 75 damage a turn

R15 it's 130 a turn

The defending fleet just puts a clock on the attackers as the return fire will injure 1 ship a turn as well, although the damage will most likely be less in the range of 40/70 so the ships survive longer.

Obviously this provides a declining firing curve but by the time the 5-6 defending ships are gone the attackers will be down 2 ships and have 4 others hurt in varying degrees. This still allows for the base to fall just for the attacking fleet to be beat up in doing it.

For an FCR type fleet a SBase with defenders will most likely be able to defeat attackers as the damage taken by the attackers will outweigh the amount of damage the defenders are taking.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike_Grafton) on Monday, September 15, 2008 - 03:50 pm: Edit

Well, if you are buying defenses for your starbase and have the option to purchase ships, I'd recommend a couple or two packages of mines be bought.

Mines defended by a P4 equipped base with repair pods (for the attending ships) are real killers.

NOT because of the damage the attackers get from the mines, but from the time they have to spend getting pounded at range 15 or so, supporting their Minesweeper (the Roms with the Sparrowhawk Minesweeper have the right idea) while they try to ease through the minefield.

Alternately, they can just plan on smacking a couple or three NSMs and closing at speed.

The problem with that plan is clever minefield detection specs/counts/ the captor mines and such.

=====

By Larry E. Ramey (Hydrajak) on Monday, September 15, 2008 - 05:35 pm: Edit

Did you guys forget the repair capabilities of a SB?

I'm not sure why my 6 ships are ANYWHERE you can hurt them without eating Ph-IV fire. If you move away from the base to shoot up my fleet I simply pull back behind the base and the base repairs its shields.

Even without mines, its just not going to happen. (WELL, ok... 12 DNp+ with 12 PF flotillas are going to nuke anything they see....)

But hey....its your life. If you want to waste it beating your head against a SB only to go, "gee.... that jerk on the BBS was right" go for it.

=====

By David Crew (Catwholeaps) on Wednesday, September 17, 2008 - 01:40 am: Edit

Douglas: One key criteria for discussion is: Is the map fixed, or does it float?

There is a vast difference between the two cases, and whether Klingons need EW and SP to survive depends in part on the map size.

The short answer is: Floating map: No. Fixed map: Maybe - depends on the size of the map.

=====

By Sidney G. Kanouse (Konus67c7) on Tuesday, September 30, 2008 - 04:54 pm: Edit

I have a question for more experienced Klingon players. Can an unrefitted D7 defeat an unrefitted Fed CA. I have heard more often than not that it difficult at best. Any input would be appreciated.

=====

By Tos Crawford (Tos) on Tuesday, September 30, 2008 - 05:03 pm: Edit

Its difficult, but so much about the match-up depends on how many photons hit in the first volley.

=====

By Jim Davies (Mudfoot) on Tuesday, September 30, 2008 - 06:32 pm: Edit

Unrefitted implies speed-8 or -12 drones, which really doesn't help. In later years you can use drones to soak up his phasers, but slow drones aren't much use outside a knife fight.

You have a very slow drone launch rate and 4 BPV in hand, so you might as well stock up on type-5 drones.

If it's a floating map, use your power superiority to sabre-dance at R15. Eventually he'll dump the OLs, and you can run in and

whack him. On a fixed map, he'll get R8 eventually, so you have to make him shoot a front shield and hope for no more than 2 hits. Then get revenge: close to R3 and get him in a turning battle where his lousy firing arcs hurt. Use EW to make the photons miss. Board him.

=====

By Jeremy Gray (Gray) on Tuesday, September 30, 2008 - 06:58 pm: Edit

Yeah, I think it can certainly be done. A big advantage the Klingon gains in the totally unfitted match is power. The D7 still has all the power it will ever have in its fully refitted state, while the Fed has to make due with only 34. The Fed might eventually pin the Klingon, but holding overloads, he is going to have a hard time generating enough ECCM to make "the shot" count and get his speed up to a level that's meaningful. Assuming even 2 ECCM, his max speed is 20 (with no power spent on anything else). The Klingon on the other hand can engage from range 12 and blow off ECM until he can no longer avoid range 8. Bottom line, a lot more power to shot and maneuver every turn. Plus, the Fed has a huge gunnery blind spot - a bad feature on a ship that is likely to get out-maneuvered.

=====

By Sidney G. Kanouse (Konus67c7) on Wednesday, October 01, 2008 - 05:42 pm: Edit

Thanks for the advice brothers, I would like to defeat a Fed. CA, and laugh at the burning corpses in a very wrecked hull. Are these tactics generally the same for most Klingon vessels?

=====

By Jim Davies (Mudfoot) on Wednesday, October 01, 2008 - 06:30 pm: Edit

Depends on your opponent. Feds of that era are weird. F5 vs Fed FF is the most comparable, in that if he tries to reload photons he'll stop dead. So it all hangs on whether he gets to do something useful with them before the FF becomes a phaser boat. The FF has great shields, good arcs and plenty of phasers. You have poor shields and can't HET. E4 vs Pol is similar, though you should win this. E3/G2 vs Pol is a lost cause, despite your supposed BPV advantage. The D6 has no directly comparable opponent. CL+ is the closest in BPV, and it's unlike the others because it's not so dependent on photons. The DD is just bizarre so it all hangs on the photons' first shot.

Other races are a different matter, but in general you want to soften the opponent up at range before jumping on him when he's empty.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike_Grafton) on Thursday, October 02, 2008 - 05:54 pm: Edit

And ONE key for the Klink is to ALWAYS threaten the range 0/1 pass/ overrun with drones launched so they hit next impulse. The Fed CA has lousy drone defense and has to divert phaser ones/ tractors...

=====

By Ezekiel P. Carpenter-Hyland (Admiral_Zekedak) on Thursday, October 02, 2008 - 06:14 pm: Edit

No mention of the classic -Klingon Hook- yet, so here goes... The D7 is turn mode B while the CA is turn mode D. After taking initial Fed overload fire (preferably at long range), the CA is vulnerable to the D7 turning in for a close pass then hooking onto the CA's rear shields (see Jeremy Gray's comments above). This gives the D7 one or even two turns of close-range fire while the Fed rearm photons and try to get the D7 back into a narrow forward firing arc. If done right, the D7 will surpass whatever damage advantage the CA may have initially achieved (i.e. Klingons with bloody noses sometimes charge). Once photons are rearmed, the CA will usually need a HET to use them, giving the D7 another energy edge for more cute stuff like an ECM advantage. Such a move also puts even slow drones into position to hit, and allows transporters to be used.

While this tactic accepts damage even at close range, the D7 should ride just enough above the curve over multiple turns to win (photon dice are an ever-present wild card). I personally find the hard part to be the turn 4+ finish when both of us are crippled and I have 2 of my front shields down. The Fed should be no better off and facing another turn of unanswered disruptor fire, but tactics will depend a lot on damage/respective shield strength. Even if you loose the game at this point, feel the pride of a true warrior for taking it the full distance.

There are also numerous ways for the Feds to counter the Klingon hook, both before it starts and while it is in progress. Responding to such counters might be a good topic for further discussion. One that I commonly see if the CA turning away after the range 8 photon launch.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike_Grafton) on Thursday, October 02, 2008 - 06:48 pm: Edit

Don't forget the MASSIVE Klingon transporter advantage for a mass Boarding Party Raid!

=====

By Richard Sherman (Rich) on Thursday, October 02, 2008 - 10:18 pm: Edit

The biggest conundrum the D7 commander faces in this match-up is not the execution of a good selection of his own movement and weapons tactics.

It is not the employment of drones or transporters.

It is not even mitigating/avoiding/lucking out on the photon shot.

It's knowing (accurately guessing) WHEN and WHERE the Fed's mid-turn speed change will come.

You MUST remember that a veteran Fed CA player will use his difficult power curve as best he can. That will mean his attempt to time an attack run with at least 8 impulses at a high (23+) rate of speed.

If you can avoid that or - even better - trick him through your own maneuver and weapons/power use, you'll have already won most of the battle.

=====

ROMULAN TACTICS

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Friday, September 19, 2008 - 05:05 pm: Edit

I'm interested in any insights or feedback anyone with experience may have about how a Romulan fleet deals with a Fed CVA armed with two SWACs... or in how to fight SWACs in general.

Takers?

=====

By Jeff Williams (Jeff) on Sunday, September 28, 2008 - 02:58 am: Edit

Well, it's one of those good news/bad news situations. The good news is he just sucked down all of his own drone launches along with your plasmas. The bad news is that he'll get more drones in the air faster than you'll get plasmas.

Plan on phasering down any SWAC the very impulse it pops out. 12 Ph-1s is not overkill if it removes a SWAC from his supply. Depending on your campaign rules, it might be worth it to force him to pop both SWACS, phaser them down, then disengage. Come back next round and fight on a more even playing field.

=====

By David Jannke (Bigslowtarget) on Sunday, September 28, 2008 - 08:17 pm: Edit

>I'm interested in any insights or feedback anyone with experience may have about how a Romulan fleet deals with a Fed CVA armed with two SWACs... or in how to fight SWACs in general.

Uck. I did that fight, not fun. Basically any SWAC that hits the board needs to die. Massed phaser fire, bolt an R torp,

whatever. Keep the wild swac rules in mind and don't dump all your plasma when he can use one.

Outside of that remember that gats mean your best weapons here are hidden deployment t-bombs. The area of effect damage can take out a whole fighter wing and even a suspicion of having them there will tend to keep him back. Set them up for fighter size and third or fourth target to detonate if they're in short supply.

Deploy some escort type PFs if allowed - the D torps are handy for both defense and offense. Go heavy on the scouts if possible. Kill things with long range photons first so he has to press the attack on you rather than you having to press the attack on him. You want a very long battle with oblique approaches, him advancing through plasma and you moving away to provide more time to deal with drones.

=====
By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Sunday, September 28, 2008 - 08:31 pm: Edit

David, thanks, but we don't use hidden deployment mines in our campaign, and PFs are still several years away. ;)

=====
By David Jannke (Bigslowtarget) on Monday, September 29, 2008 - 10:09 am: Edit

Ah, that's unfortunate. Oh well, at least his fighters aren't fast. You using an open map?

=====
By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Monday, September 29, 2008 - 12:06 pm: Edit

84x60 fixed map.

And, you're telling me.

We're currently in Y175.

=====
By Kerry E Mullan (Nomad17) on Monday, September 29, 2008 - 12:35 pm: Edit

Hmm some things to try which work better in the spd 20 era.

Launch a couple envelopers at individual fighters. Continue to close into R10 or 8 and bolt many remaining torps and P1 them. With just a couple envelopers out it may not be enough for the opponent to go wild.

Use normal drone defenses against incoming drones ie tractors, p3s, scout channels, and tbombs to thin the herd.

Launch outside of the range of the SWAC by using decent spd to draw his forces into a new location. ie launch at R15 and then turn off to draw him into chasing you.

Remember his force will have limited DF especially if you can hit ftrs with plasma and phasers.

=====
By David Jannke (Bigslowtarget) on Tuesday, September 30, 2008 - 12:51 am: Edit

Ok, so we're fixed map, no pfs, closed but big map. Hmm if only we had a wheelbarrow. No, ignore that its an obscure reference and somewhat silly.

Ok, here goes. I'm going to round here and assume on one side they're adding more sp, special drones, etc and the other side is deploying Tbombs, special sensors, shuttles and etc to counter their efforts. Those might neutralize each other or might not depending on the approach speeds, drone maneuvering, etc.

SWAC everyone has covered - kill it quick. Now on to the fighters. At this year F14s only have two real drones and two dogfight drones. A10s have two. He's probably got about 16 racks so total launch capabilities of 64 drones plus say 24 from scatterpacks for a total of a pants wetting 88 drones inbound from a one turn launch. Ok you MIGHT be able to cloak them away, but it depends on having either range, an EW advantage or sacrificing the initiative. Its bad to depend on, but possible as a last ditch maneuver. Back to the wet pants. Good news, it will be a while to recover and rearm after that. If you can take down that many drones in a turn you get to force him to depend on other heavy weapons to do the damage. Oh - or getting to range 2. Don't let a dozen F14s get to range 2. That would be bad. Even range 3 is not good.

You have about 750 bpv to play with or should have. Ship selection is key here. Each KDR you deploy can take out 14 drones (2 D racks, 4 p1s, 4p3s). A 6 KDR fleet can spend its 12 S torps on fighters, escorts or whatever and have the D torps reloaded about the time his fighters are. 8 War eagles will take out only about half the drones, cloak out and then die. If you have to have a carrier fleet look for one that features a strong carrier rather than a large number of fighters. Your escorts carry from 4 to 6 D racks a ship which is great, but your fighters are dogmeat for F14s. Use plasma Ks where possible to extend the magazines. Launch k/d torps at drones. If you're close enough to launch defensively at fighters your either really really brave or really really dead.

Finally, remember this is going to be a maneuver battle. You don't come in, overrun something and shoot the wad. You are going to have to come in, draw drone launches, get some range to kill off the drones and come back in. Maybe kill a couple of fighters, go erratic to avoid the photons and move out again. Don't get trapped against the walls (though with the fighters moving only 15 and a big map its not a big threat)

=====
By Michael Lui (Michaellui) on Tuesday, September 30, 2008 - 05:57 am: Edit

Unfortunately for him he's working with a set fleet.

=====
By Jeremy Gray (Gray) on Tuesday, September 30, 2008 - 10:03 am: Edit

To clear up any confusion, this is the matchup:

SUP-K Praetor Zajac

4x G-SF, 4x G-II Silver Squadron

BS Beta (Cloak, PAM)

FHK Defiance

FHF Adversary

KFR Nemesis

CVAa Julius Caesar (Prime Team)

11xF-14, 1xF-14E VF-84 Jolly Rogers

11xA-10, 1xA-10E VA-214 Black Sheep

DER Agrippa

DER Scipio Africanus (Outstanding Crew)

DE Pompey

SC+ Hermes

Roms are set up in the center of a 2x2 map (84x60 hexes), Feds enter at a corner. Both sides WS-III, speed max.

Note, the CVA does have 2xSWAC, but does not have the "+" refit.

=====
By Paul Stovell (Pauls) on Tuesday, September 30, 2008 - 10:35 am: Edit

Dale,

My one suggestion is to use your Tbombs primarily as a wall(s) against fighters. Even a dummy Tbomb line will probably be good enough to deny large chunks of the map to the Federation fighters and in this game this may very well be the whole Fedearition force. You can add a high target count and running your own fighters over them to tempt the fighters in and the odd bomb set for size class 4 could be game breaking if a bunch of DE's think they can get a range 8 shot by risking one.

With only 10 ship carried photons the BS can be a major pain as long as the fighters are walled off from their first couple of attack runs.

=====
By Larry E. Ramey (Hydrajak) on Tuesday, September 30, 2008 - 11:36 am: Edit

The Roms have complete firepower superiority in the Glory Zone. There are a LOT of heavy torps over there and not a lot of firepower in the fed fleet.

However.... if the drones force you down at a poor time and you end up under cloak with F-14s on top of you.... its all over.

You really gotta plan that cloak usage well...its not going to work out as a "Ooopss, I'm in a bad spot, I think I'll cloak."

Starting with a few shotgunned S torps at the A-10s would likely be a great way to lowering the amount of photon tubes in the fed fleet. If the A-10s are far enough back they can't get whacked by a volley of F torps... then they aren't shooting at the Rom ships.

There is ALWAYS the chance that the fed does something dumb and slows down too much and the Roms run them over. Rom fighters are no joke against a slow target.

=====

By Michael Parker (Protagoras) on Tuesday, September 30, 2008 - 01:35 pm: Edit

I am by FAR not an expert in SFB, in fact I would consider myself quite inexperienced.

But what is going to force the feds to move out of Proxie range? I count 7xS G and the KFR is going to be hard pressed to get in range I think. The Feds have alot of Photons to play the sit back and proxie to death. I forget if the SC+ has a photon tube, but its 21 Photons in that fleet and alot of Gats. It seems to me the Rom's are going to be forced to come out with the CV and Cruisers and try and deal with the feds or sit and take massed prox photons.

Perhaps the Roms could cloak everything, but that could get awful dangerous with the CVA fighter wing ready for a high speed run, the F-14's could be tractorred at 30 to come sit on some cloaked ships right?

What am I missing? And believe me I am sure I am missing something!

=====

By Ted Fay (Catwhoatsphoto) on Tuesday, September 30, 2008 - 01:44 pm: Edit

Mike P,

Only 10 photons on the Fed ships, plus another 11 photons on the A-10's (which have a max range of 10 or 12, I think). SC has no photons.

Launched plasma torps (even envelopers) won't do much good because of the 132 or so ph-3s the Fed fleet can fire every turn (not including ph-1's).

The Roms are going to have a very hard time in this battle. IMO, the primary defense will be the cloak to force the Fed to come to closer range.

=====

By Michael Lui (Michaellui) on Wednesday, October 01, 2008 - 07:04 am: Edit

I don't think the Roms want to cloak. Escorted by the F-14s, the A-10s will go to range 12 with proxies, unload, then go back to the CV for more.

=====

By Paul Stovell (Pauls) on Wednesday, October 01, 2008 - 11:20 am: Edit

Michael you are forgetting the +5 range for the cloak that will mean the A-10's need to come to range 7. They would only be looking to do 2 points per hit on aveage as well.

I'm not saying clacking is a good idea although I suspect it might be for the ships and is almost certain to be for the Base.

=====

By Kerry E Mullan (Nomad17) on Wednesday, October 01, 2008 - 01:23 pm: Edit

Well the following is more likely what I would do.

Basically have all hte movable units try to reach R8 to ftrs or shipsand alpha bolt on either a single ship or individual ftrs(ie this includes the bearing f torp as well). If on a ship fire with phasers, if on ftrs use phasers to clean em up.

I would go in with allocated tracs to allow for the shot and attempt to minimize p1 use on drones. Then I would run back to the base and cloak or weasel the lot of em, using ftr launches at this point against any incoming units other than drones.

If the opponent wants to rush the base hey that seems like a good thing for you. Obviously if you can arrange to group drones in stacks of 6 or more tbomb them etc.

Rest and repair by the base picking off ftrs with p1's from R15. I don't think I would launch a single non-ftr torp until the ftrs are

down or reloading, most likely this means the turn 4 or so time. Then I would start with a single enveloper and continue the boltfest.

Is it an autowin...yeah not even remotely close. Does it give you a chance though, probably.

=====

By Richard Sherman (Rich) on Wednesday, October 01, 2008 - 01:31 pm: Edit

Paul,

The A10s (if they wanted that shot) would only need to make range 12, not 7. Heavy weapons use true range against cloak, except for the to-hit #s which use effective range. Please also note that a proximity photon is INELIGIBLE to fire at a target at a true range of less than 9 hexes.

So the A10 would shoot at range 12, but have to roll to hit as if it were range 29 (or 17 if they held lock-on).

=====

By John Trauger (Vorlonagent) on Wednesday, October 01, 2008 - 05:03 pm: Edit

In many respects each side wants the other's EW capability.

The roms could use the Fed SC's lock-on breaking potential and Feds could use the base's EW lending potential.

As it is, the Roms have the EW advantage for lending but could exhaust the base's special sensors breaking lock-ons. Look at OEW against the carrier when a photon strike looks likley.

the Feds should find reloading photons to be a pain. the DEs (epecially the Pompey) will only have so much power to go around while reloading the A10's photon freezers will suck down power for the CVA. Something will have to give, either speed or a longer recycle time for freezer and ship photons.

Huge Question: Does the station have a mine field? A yes answer could save the romulan bacon.

The FHF is a rather durable platform. having it run around the board might make a Fed admiral nervous and could influence his actions.

I once set up a defensive t-bomb wall against an opponent with superior fighters. I set the TBs in the wall to accept only fighter-size objects and to detonate on the 5th contact. I reasoned that my opponent would probe my wall. When a first few experimental shuttles (or the ships) got through OK, the t-bombs would be more likely to catch and kill a big fighter stack. It worked pretty well.

=====

By George Duffy (Sentinal) on Wednesday, October 01, 2008 - 05:32 pm: Edit

Quote:

the Feds should find reloading photons to be a pain. the DEs (epecially the Pompey) will only have so much power to go around while reloading the A10's photon freezers will suck down power for the CVA. Something will have to give, either speed or a longer recycle time for freezer and ship photons.

Please correct me if I'm wrong... I thought the reload racks on the escorts can only reload drones (not photons) and for that matter they only have the setups for F-18s. So that when a F-14 lands it has to take the loadout based on a F-18 or use the "Kzinti Weightlifting Team" option to reload special drones B^)

=====

By David Jannke (Bigslowtarget) on Wednesday, October 01, 2008 - 09:31 pm: Edit

I don't think there are many Romulan strategies that will result in a win but there are some tactics and elements that could let you respond to the Fed's tactics. There are also Federation tactics that could result in a loss. The trick is to get the Fed to pick one and then clobber him.

Why no Rom strategies? The first reason is the base. You can't leave it behind more than briefly since its your only EW platform and you can't take it with you. Prox fused photons mean its in danger even at long ranges. If the Fed chooses to

engage you away from it or chooses to use his fighters as a defensive point and engages at long range you are going to have a lot of trouble keeping it in the fight.

Next reason is he doesn't have to move fast. He can stop because the gats give the Fed total phaser superiority within range 2 and tremendous seeking plasma defense. Plasmas usually suck down even long range phaser power so Rom phasers can get in and do some damage, but the combination of gats and swacs mean you can't ever depend on building up a big enough wave the feds to use their p-1s defensively.

Can you bolt at range 9+? Yes, if you can get there and if you can see the target when you arrive. I think the best bet for the Fed is a slow advance and then static base busting. He should set up shop outside the base's loaning + ships weapons range of 25. If your ships are beyond 15 you are going to lose loaned EW. His scout will still be able to loan. When you reach range 20 or so with your ships he can start launching drones which you are going to have to deal with somehow before taking your shot.

On the plus side, when you do get there, providing you somehow avoid a shift, you'll do an average of around 50 points if you bolt all 7 S torps (15 @ 1-3s = 7.5 * 7). That's enough to worry an escort or dent the CVA. Best of all you can leave right after, move out and reload.

Ok. Now for getting through the drones to get there and getting ew parity so you can hit something. Move the fighters forward and plan to use their plasmas against drones targeted on your ships. Continually monitor when the plasmas can be launched and still intercept speed 20 drones targeted on your ships and launch as early as you can guarantee the drone kill given the range. Hold the ships plasmas and phasers for immediate threats. Use Tbombs early and often against stacks. Obviously if he launches on the base or the fighters (and you can tell) you're going to get your shot. If he launches too early you might be able to get them with the fighters, too late and you may be able to get the shot and get out before they arrive.

Dealing with the ECM

Have the base loan itself hide but not cloak and attempt to make the scout waste its time lending ECCM to get the shot. Shoot down ECM drones with P4s if he's not moving fast and is staying at long range. Approach under erratic, with ECM plasma until you have to come out to take care of drones. You could try a cloaked approach, but I don't think you'll be able to move, allocate the ECCM, cloak and make sure he doesn't get an early lock on because of your speed at which point you're going to eat a lot of drones. Might be worth thinking about though.

Can someone do a year check on sensor drogues for me? They might help in conjunction with speed changes.

Of course the above assumes the Fed agrees with me and is doing a slow approach/static attack. If he's going for maneuver or a close approach to the base then you will get the chance to rip him up with P4s, you might well be enveloping rather than bolting and he's going to be the one with EW problems.

=====

By Kerry E Mullan (Nomad17) on Wednesday, October 01, 2008 - 11:04 pm: Edit

Fed fire against the base. Um I would pretty much ignore fed fire at the base if they go proxing.

Getting hit with 25 or so damage from full fleet fire every other turn and you have what 12 batteries, good luck doing anything to it. This is especially true as the base can rpr 3 shields a turn for no power til the end of time.

Otherwise hitting A-10 ftrs before they reach range 8 is optimal. Again this can be mitigated with EW as ftrs can only ever have 6 EW and the initial targets should always be the EW ftrs anyway.

=====

By Tos Crawford (Tos) on Wednesday, October 01, 2008 - 11:36 pm: Edit

I've heard this before. What rule enables a base to repair 3 shields a turn for no power? I know it must have something to

do with Continuous Damage Control, but apparently its a rule I either missed or didn't understand. Is this a base only rule or can ships do it? Can a ground base or SC4 orbiting base do it?

=====

By Kerry E Mullan (Nomad17) on Thursday, October 02, 2008 - 12:04 am: Edit

The rule is R.1.1G1 in the 1999 edition. It is the same section stating bases do not blind channels with fire etc. The rule is as long as it is self repair and the base has 50% of its internals.

Note these are the updated or upgraded base rules

=====

By George Duffy (Sentinal) on Thursday, October 02, 2008 - 12:59 am: Edit

Kerry

I think that that particular rule may be out of date. By interpretation, a base will have unlimited CDR while it maintains at least 50% of undestroyed boxes onto itself

In the MRB, CDR rule (D9.71) hasn't changed in the fact that:

"All ships (including bases and PFs) have a limited capability to repair systems during a scenario".

Also (D9.76) still limits the amount of repair to all systems by the highest DamCon rating (6 in the case of bases)

If Rule (R1.1G1) override this, then why were bases still included in the MRB version of (D9.71)

B^)

=====

By Kerry E Mullan (Nomad17) on Thursday, October 02, 2008 - 08:43 am: Edit

George,

Well I am not sure. As the R section that is referred to are the updates or "special rules" for bases in the 99 reprint I am not sure if it is out of date or not.

I do know that the rules given in that section do not seem to be incorporated anywhere else in the ruleset:

ie in the scout or special sensor channel section G22 or G24 can't remember offhand I do not believe it states that bases do not blind special sensors with fire. This is only stated in that R section area. As well it does not state the special arc firing rules in any of the D section rules (ie similar to the klingon special arcs that are stated there).

Again in the D section (CDR) this is not referenced in any matter as well. Note that the reason it is 3 shield boxes is that the DControl rating is 6 so 3 can be repaired. Obviously if this fact changes (DC rating goes below 6) then only the applicable repair can be used.

As far as I know the rules updated there are the current ones in use. Of course anyone is free not to use them as it is an advanced rule and if it has changed then I will be more than happy to try to update my books.

=====

By David Jannke (Bigslowtarget) on Thursday, October 02, 2008 - 09:31 am: Edit

>25 or so damage from full fleet fire every other turn and you have what 12 batteries

I might have (again) misunderstood the starting forces. Doesn't a base station start with 2 batteries and add 6 on the pam for 8? I was thinking it would have 24 power available after housekeeping.

2 for torp means you could put up 11 general, bounce 8 specific, but that does mean no EW, no weasels, no p4s, only 16 points next turn and the feds can add 1/2 a point per p1 if they like.

=====

By Kerry E Mullan (Nomad17) on Thursday, October 02, 2008 - 10:36 am: Edit

Oh my mistake I was thinking a BATTs which has 12 batts. With just the 8 batts after 6 turns on the same shield you might start getting ints.

At R25 or so I don't think the base will be firing many phasers, but I was just going with 8 batts as reinf. After he damages a shield 6 specific would be added to it on fire turns. That leaves 18 for other things notably EW.

=====

By Michael Parker (Protagoras) on Thursday, October 02, 2008 - 12:04 pm: Edit

It might be worthwhile to dock that frigate to the BS for the few extra power. Its the only incredibly vulnerable rommie asset, and the power it could add to the BS would probably be better used than the G torp it has to offer.

=====

By Ted Fay (Catwhoatsphoto) on Thursday, October 02, 2008 - 12:52 pm: Edit

Perhaps, but it can only transfer 2 power (limited by damage control of transferring unit). I see the bigger asset of the FF as being its phasers, tractors, and transporters (t-bombs) for drone defense.

=====

By John Trauger (Vorlonagent) on Thursday, October 02, 2008 - 01:50 pm: Edit

If the base docks the mauler to it, does it get full access to the mauler's batteries?

=====

By Michael Parker (Protagoras) on Thursday, October 02, 2008 - 02:02 pm: Edit

Ted,

As the Feds wouldn't you concentrate on the FF though first? Although I suppose you could let it take a couple Prox volleys then dock it and let it get repaired while giving power to the BS? But that sorta defeats the purpose of adding power to the BS as you use that extra to heat up REP boxes.

Edit:

Mmmmm can you shotgun on Drones or just fighters/shuttles? 5 P1's 2-F and a G would be a nice drone defense if it could withstand long range sniping. Its been so long for me playing SFB seriously though!

=====

By Ted Fay (Catwhoatsphoto) on Thursday, October 02, 2008 - 03:11 pm: Edit

You can shotgun on drones. Probably better to shotgun on fighters, though.

Yeah, the Feds *could* concentrate on the FF; however, it's better IMO that the Fed shoots the FF rather than the cruisers ('cause you need the heavy plasmas for bolting).

Any way you cut it, it's tough for the Roms.

John, I don't think the base can use the mauler's batteries. I'm pretty sure power transfer has to be done during EA and is limited by the damage control rating of the transferring unit.

=====

By Bill Linton (Bill) on Thursday, October 02, 2008 - 04:44 pm: Edit

John, Power from the base could be used to recharge the mauler's batteries but not fire the mauler.

E8.33 States The Engines and Reactors of a mauler ship may be coupled directly to the mauler.

E8.331 states that you can allocate energy from those power systems during EA.

E8.332 states that if you fire the mauler using the power allocated during EA 1/2 of all power boxes used are damaged. (batteries are fired under E8.31/E8.32)

-Bill

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike_Grafton) on Thursday, October 02, 2008 - 05:58 pm: Edit

Set base rotation slow enough that he doesn't get shots at the same shield every turn. Or the Feds will have to move (and thus use power).

=====

By John Smith (Johnsmith) on Thursday, October 02, 2008 - 08:20 pm: Edit

Speaking of these new base rules, I have the pre-99 edition of the book. Looking in the errata for the pre-99 books, I don't see anything in the R1 section about bases. Am I missing it, or is it not there? Or am I possibly looking in the wrong place?

=====

By Kerry E Mullan (Nomad17) on Thursday, October 02, 2008 - 10:56 pm: Edit

nope the updates were only included in the 99 advanced mission booklet as far as I know.

=====

By Larry E. Ramey (Hydrajak) on Friday, October 03, 2008 - 11:11 am: Edit

The FF is actually very useful. You buy a NSM (all rommies can buy 1) and run it under cloak into the middle of the Feds. Even if you AREN'T using hidden mine deployment... the roms have to guess which mine is the T bomb, which is the dummy t-bomb, and which makes a DEA go "poof" (you know.. the NSM).

With hidden mines, it is even more horrific.

=====

By Richard Sherman (Rich) on Friday, October 03, 2008 - 11:44 am: Edit

Larry,

While there might be an "opportunity attack" of that type, it's not really a practical tactic. A Rom FF attempting that runs the risk of getting flash-cubed before it ever gets to inter-mingle with the Fed squadron. Since the Fed squadron also has solid EW capabilities in both the presence of a scout and SWAC shuttles (and possibly an MRS as well), flash-cubing can pay off for them against a cloaked aggressor.

Conversely, the Romulans "could" use their other ships to try to create an opening for a run of type, but now the whole squadron is committed to a type of attack with an iffy payoff and high risk.

I think Ted has the right idea; use the FF as fleet escort for drone/fighter defense. With an excellent power curve and shields, a decent phaser array, plus 3 torps (including a G-torp), the KFR would be very capable in this role.

=====

By Marc Baluda (Marc) on Saturday, October 04, 2008 - 02:24 am: Edit

Larry - your tactic doesn't work. An NSM must be dropped out of a hatch. A dummy t-bomb must be beamed out, not dropped out of a hatch. Can't be confused.

=====

By Larry E. Ramey (Hydrajak) on Monday, October 06, 2008 - 01:12 pm: Edit

You don't have to fly right up to the Feds to ruin their day with this...

Of course it does depend on hidden mines or not.. we always played with hidden mines. Made 1st Gen Roms a lot scarier.

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Monday, October 06, 2008 - 07:20 pm: Edit

Guys, we are not playing with hidden mines.

I appreciate all the input and discourse.

=====

By Paul Stovell (Pauls) on Tuesday, October 07, 2008 - 04:39 am: Edit

Dale,

If you are considering laying an anti-fighter cordon of Tbombs then the possibility that you have included an NSM in the mix is quite scary.

It does mean you will need to lay some of the regular Tbombs out of the hatch to play the NSM shell game. This in turn will dilute the number of real Tbombs amongst the dummies.

A whole squadron cloaked underrun to lay mines might be interesting if the Feds take a creeping attack so you can be sure to get underneath them.

Losses to flash cubing could be horrid but ship explosions and the difficulty of avoiding overkill against cloaked targets might make it a winning approach?

=====

By Larry E. Ramey (Hydrajak) on Tuesday, October 07, 2008 - 11:32 am: Edit

There is always the problem of "flash cubing" someone when there are Ph-IVs pointed at you.

Not to mention a FH-F out there that has a weapon that is almost completely immune to EW.

You are welcome to drop a shield that faces me. If you say "well, I don't have to drop a facing shield"..... Yes... Yes you do. I'm not stupid. Don't assume I'll do stupid things. If you want to lay a tbomb on my cloaked FF then you WILL drop a facing shield. I don't have to get in your hex to make this work fairly well. I don't have to HIT you with a NSM.... I just need to make you think about it, or abort your "perfect" attack run a few times... eventually you run out of WWs on those DEAs and then the ENV-S start doing real damage. (or you have to speed up and then the PH-IVs start doing damage)

=====

By Joe Stevenson (Ikv_Sabre) on Tuesday, October 07, 2008 - 12:24 pm: Edit

"flash cubing"

I'm out of the loop.... what means this "flash cubing"?

=====

By Kerry E Mullan (Nomad17) on Tuesday, October 07, 2008 - 01:03 pm: Edit

"Flash cubing" is laying a tbomb to explode upon a cloaked ship. When this occurs, all ships get to reroll their lock-on attempts. Normally the range is better and you use the "-4" modifier not the "-10". As EW is usually in your favor the chance actually becomes a decent shot and each ship gets it. Of course once you have it with any ftrs etc well drone death comes quick.

=====

By Larry E. Ramey (Hydrajak) on Tuesday, October 07, 2008 - 01:56 pm: Edit

Especially since you can "Darkfire". Launch a VI warp seeker and then launch a standard drone targeted on the warp seeker. Finagle it so that both enter cloaked ship hex the same time. Both hit ship. Warp seekers NEVER lose lock on once they launch. 8 hex range though.

It is an issue, but the FF can always HET away from a T bomb, I'll trade a HET on my mostly useless FF for a shot from the FH-F or the BS Ph-IV.

My only point here is that a Rom FF is more useful in a fleet battle than most other races FFs because of the cloak and the option to buy a NSM.

=====

By William T Wilson (Sheap) on Tuesday, October 07, 2008 - 02:36 pm: Edit

Darkfire is exceptionally difficult to pull off against a moving ship. He can easily move so that the type-VI hits him first (causing the type-IV to lose lock) or move into the hex with the type-IV (causing it to hit the type-VI first) or just run out the type-VI (which can only go 12 hexes).

Flash cubing on the other hand, isn't all that great even if the target is stopped (if the target is moving, he might avoid the flash cube). Flash cubing provides a lockon to everyone, but they have to roll immediately to retain it. This will be pretty tough against a stopped ship (EW can help sometimes). If one ship retains lockon, it can fire, but he can't give the lockon to anybody else. A wild weasel launched by the cloaked ship can protect it from tractors and also from drones (even type-VI) for long enough for everybody else to lose the lockon again.

If you have a whole fleet ganging up on one poor little cloaked ship, then there is some stuff they can do, but where is the rest of the Romulan fleet while all this is going on?

=====

By Larry E. Ramey (Hydrajak) on Tuesday, October 07, 2008 - 05:12 pm: Edit

Sheap,

Its not that hard to pull off when there are 11 F-14As and 11 A-10s on the map. You just drop a few VIs and a few Is from all directions making anything the FF does a bad choice. If I'm the fighter strike commander I figure, drones at a cloaked ship are NEVER a wasted resource.

=====

KZINTI TACTICS

None were posted during 2008.

GORN TACTICS

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Saturday, March 29, 2008 - 01:58 am: Edit

Question.....can the Gorn PF/INTs use the Plasma Carronade? =====

By William T Wilson (Sheap) on Saturday, March 29, 2008 - 03:17 am: Edit

Yes, under FP14.15 in R10 (which basically says "they can use it but it counts as a launch").

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Saturday, March 29, 2008 - 04:01 am: Edit

Yoiks.

=====

By Troy J. Latta (Saaur) on Tuesday, December 23, 2008 - 03:48 pm: Edit

That's been errata'd. It now counts as a bolt instead of a launch. only 1/turn

=====

THOLIAN TACTICS

None were posted during 2008.

ORION TACTICS

=====

By Glen Twist (Sirbroadsword) on Sunday, July 27, 2008 - 12:59 pm: Edit

I know these posts are getting close to a year old, but I thought I might just voice my opinion with regards to an Orion science vessel...

Now, I don't have the module that the DW comes in (I only have BS and AM currently, with D3 and C2 in the mail and hopefully J, M, R1 and C1 at some point), but it looks to me like the battle raider has a lot more potential for becoming a science vessel...

Naturally, the BR is bigger (and thus more resource intensive) than the DW, but for one thing, the BR has a pair of lab boxes... I personally am at a loss as to exactly why this is, but it means that the BR has double the lab capabilities of virtually any other Orion vessel at the outset...

Furthermore, it has two more option mounts and more power (apparently anyway... I haven't seen the DW's SSD) than the DW, allowing for the ship not only to mount two specail sensors rather than just one and still have space for both probe launchers AND drone racks, but should still have the power to use them both...

I think a good set-up for a BR 'science ship' would be two spec-sen and probe launcher in the nose, and drone racks (with probe drones) in the wings... This set-up is both symmetrical and (hopefully) effective...

Maybe I'm just speaking cobblers and gibberish here, but from what I've seen so far since I started with SFB, the BR has much more potential than the DW does, with double the spec-sens, double the labs and double the drone racks for probe drones (using my set-up at least)... The only question would be if the BR can effectively operate two spec-sens...

What do you think?

EDIT: Oh and while I'm here, do you guys think this would be a fair system for deciding what an Orion player can have in his option mounts?

What happens is the Orion player rolls a ten-sided dice (a type commonly seen in many RPGs) for each of his option mounts, and if the result is 1-7, that mount can only use a weapon or system from the Cartel's home territory... If the roll is 8-9, that mount can use a system from either the operating zone or the

home territory and if the roll is 10 (represented as '0' on some ten-sided dice), that mount can use any available system... Obviously, for the Cluster Cartel you simply use a modified version, such that die rolls 1-9 means the mount can only use a weapon or system from the cartel's "Home Territory" (Klingon, Kizinti and Lyran IIRC) and a roll of 10 means the mount can use any available weapon/system... Simple really... But do you think it's fair?

=====
By Glenn Hoepfner (Ikabar) on Sunday, July 27, 2008 - 09:21 pm: Edit
Glen,

I think what you had to add is greatly thought out. My only concern is that, would the cartels use such a hull (chiefly designed to assist in the acquisition of goods) for scientific research?

If the Orions could use a smaller hull for the same basic mission (remember, they are not explorers and have fewer overall resources), they probably would.

Perhaps, something of what you described could be used as a "What could have been" ship, but (bear in mind, SFB history is not my strongsuit), I can't imagine a BR hull being used for this purpose.

Much respect.

=====
By Glen Twist (Sirbroadsword) on Wednesday, July 30, 2008 - 06:56 am: Edit

Well, I just thought that, given that the Orions (based on their having invented probe drones) apparently view knowledge as a valuable commodity, that they must surely use a "science vessel" of some description...

Hmm... You know, they could probably procure exploration freighters for the job... Yea, maybe that makes more sense...

=====
By Reid Hupach (Gwbison) on Wednesday, July 30, 2008 - 03:10 pm: Edit

An OFT with a probe in one option and a sensor in the other.

HYDRAN TACTICS

None were posted during 2008.

ANDROMEDAN TACTICS

=====
By James Hallmark (Jhallmark) on Sunday, March 16, 2008 - 10:28 pm: Edit

Exploiter:

Am I correct in thinking that the Exploiter has an advantage against most equal BPV opponents?

I am considering dueling one and it seems that it would be a tough fight for most of the ships.

=====
By the way I own C 1-3, Jindarians, and R1-10. So I have a lot of options.

Any suggestions for which ship(s) to take that would make for an even fight?

=====
By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Sunday, March 16, 2008 - 10:46 pm: Edit

You're looking at 192 BPV for an EXPLOITER.

What year are you playing? The EXPLOITER is Y177 so this can make a difference.

In general, go direct-fire as 1v1 the 2 DisDevs will do a number on a "big plasma" opponent.

=====
By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Sunday, March 16, 2008 - 11:00 pm: Edit

Best options:

1. Tholian DP (189 BPV w/ snare) or DPW (208 BPV)

[Requires your opponent to give you a S8.331 exemption for an unescorted SC2.]

2. Federation BCJ (197 BPV + drone speed upgrades). Built to be an Andro killer.

3. Klingon C7 (180 BPV + drone speed upgrades).

4. Lyran "Wildcat" BC+pb (189 BPV)

5. Hydran CHC (192 with 3xSt-2, 207 with 3xSt-2M)

=====
By Glenn Hoepfner (Ikabar) on Monday, March 17, 2008 - 01:13 am: Edit

James,

One other thing about the exploiter. It's extremely power hungry and suffers greatly in long games.

=====
By Richard Sherman (Rich) on Monday, March 17, 2008 - 12:59 pm: Edit

James,

With the Feds, the BCJ isn't your only option. The BCG (180 BPV) with fast drones, or the BCF (182 BPV) with sabot, and using bolts/carronades, are also good options that don't have power demands as high as the BCJ.

A Neo-Tholian NCA with collar (185 BPV) also is a possible good, and cheaper, alternative to the DPW.

A Lyran BT is about the same as their fully refitted Wildcat BC, but has both some positive (8 disruptors) and negative (no P1, slower) trade-offs.

If you wanted to delve a bit into the "twinkie", and your opponents allows them, a Fed CB or Klingon D7D with fast drones and a Legendary Wpns. Officer (LWO) might be good choices. Using officers is at least somewhat objectionable to most, except in campaign games or scripted scenarios...

=====
By James Hallmark (Jhallmark) on Monday, March 17, 2008 - 08:01 pm: Edit

Gary, Glen, Rich,

I will pick the year for balance (Basically drone speed). Also due to relative playing experience I won't take a ship with more than 192 BPV unless it is very justifiable, such as using a race that is bad against Andros. Also we won't be using commanders options.

I plan to pick a few ships, let my opponent veto 1 and then select the one I will use.

Thank you for the input.

=====
By Glenn Hoepfner (Ikabar) on Tuesday, March 18, 2008 - 12:39 pm: Edit

James, regardless of the year you pick, my comments about the exploiter hold true. Energy wise, the Exploiter SUCKS.

=====
By James Hallmark (Jhallmark) on Wednesday, March 19, 2008 - 10:02 pm: Edit

Gary,

I was surprised that you recommended a Lyran BC. I had always assumed (but never actually played) that Lyran's would be bad due to there secondary weapon (ESG) being ineffective. Is this compensated for by scaring the Andro into staying out of effective ph2 range and the decent power curve?

=====
By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Thursday, March 20, 2008 - 07:01 pm: Edit

Lyran BC has a lot to recommend it. Lots of power, lots of firepower, good shielding. ESGs both prevent the Andro from trying an optimal R3 TRH shot and makes him spend power to stay away from them.

=====
By Mike Strain (Eviimike) on Thursday, March 20, 2008 - 10:21 pm: Edit

BC is a good ship; when you give it the power pack refit (and turn it into a BCH) it becomes a great ship.

Only 'problem' with the BC is power management; like the Fed, if you try and load everything at once, you don't move so fast.

=====
By Michael Lui (Michaellui) on Thursday, March 20, 2008 - 11:14 pm: Edit

It would have been better to remove weapons than adding "power-packs".

=====

By Scott Moellmer (Goofy) on Friday, March 21, 2008 - 08:50 am: Edit

=====

REMOVE WEAPONS!!????

Have that man flogged... ;)

=====

By Ken Burnside (Ken_Burnside) on Friday, March 21, 2008 - 10:14 am: Edit

Well, when they're removed the LDR way, very few people complain...

=====

By Larry E. Ramey (Hydrajak) on Friday, March 21, 2008 - 03:38 pm: Edit

Try an unfitted BC without power packs..... They aren't so hot.

Granted you aren't going to fight an Andro with that.

You could always take a Lyrans CC with a PF or 2. (Would have to look up the BVP there)

Thats enough dis to ruin the Andro's day.

Is the map open or closed?

A closed map and a Gorn BCH has a pretty good chance.

=====

By James Hallmark (Jhallmark) on Friday, March 21, 2008 - 03:45 pm: Edit

The map is closed but slightly large (42X42).

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Saturday, March 22, 2008 - 09:03 am: Edit

The problem with the Lyran "Hellcat" BCH vs. the "Wildcat" BC is that the BCH is a formal PFT. That means, under (S8.34), you have to purchase at least 4 PFs in order to bring the BCH.

=====

By Marc Baluda (Marc) on Saturday, March 22, 2008 - 11:29 am: Edit

Gary, it counts as a true PFT for certain purposes (lending and deployment of PFL and PFS), like the DN is a true PFT. I don't think you are required to purchase 4xPF as it is not a PFT. Again, it's a PFT for certain purposes.

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Saturday, March 22, 2008 - 04:02 pm: Edit

Marc - How are you figuring that?

The rules make it pretty clear that the Lyran BCH (and DN and Romulan ROC) are PFTs for all purposes (except being able to fill a "Free Scout" slot).

(R11.36) HELLCAT HEAVY BATTLECRUISER (BCH): ... The Hellcat is a true PFT; see (K2.113).

(S8.34) PF TENDERS ... PFTs cannot be used without at least four PFs. ... The Lyran DN and BCH and Romulan ROC are "PFTs without special sensors" ...

=====

By Stewart W Frazier (Frazikar1) on Saturday, March 22, 2008 - 08:59 pm: Edit

Gary, the Hellcat (and the Lion) can operate as a normal warship (sans PFs), as a casual PFT (carrying 1-6 PFs, without a leader/scout), or as a PFT (6 PFs with leader/scout). F&E supports this as it is built there as a normal warship (BCH), and has to buy the PFs and meclinks to operate as a PFT (BCP). Advanced Operations allows any ship (with tractor/meclinks) to operate as a casual PFT and notes that the Lyran BCH (and DN) can operate a full casual flotilla.

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Saturday, March 22, 2008 - 10:45 pm: Edit

Stewart - Is there a SFB to allow this or are you just talking F&E?

=====

By Darin Smith (Dsmith) on Sunday, March 23, 2008 - 09:51 am: Edit

I assume this argument only matters after PFs are introduced. BEFORE they exist I assume I can use the Lion.....

I think Stewart is right on this one.....I don't see a ship becoming more restricted after PFs come out than it was before....

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Sunday, March 23, 2008 - 10:57 am: Edit

The HELLCAT BCH has a YIS of Y180, which is after the introduction of the Lyran PFs. Therefore, it's reasonable that it was always operated as both a BCH and a PFT.

The LION DN has a note in (R11.2) that prior to Y178 the PF MechLinks are removed and the REPAIR is CARGO. In this case (and, even after Y178 if a specific DN hadn't received this refit), it wouldn't be a PFT.

Neither the Lyran BCH nor the ROC has this option of a non-PFT configuration.

But, again, can you cite a rule that exempts these ships from rule (S8.34)?

=====

By James Hallmark (Jhallmark) on Sunday, March 23, 2008 - 02:14 pm: Edit

I took a Klingon DDW and got slaughtered. In hindsight the only reasonable tactic with a DDW that I can think of is to avoid engagement (still firing some disruptors to soften the panels) for a couple of turns while making the Andro waste energy and T bombs on chasing you and shooting drones. Against a full panel the DDW can't do internals until range 4 and does not average internals until range 1 (excluding leaks). Due to the inability to threaten the Andro the Andro has no reason not to close to r5 do 30 internals, turn away and repeat. By delaying engagement the EXP will run low on power and have to slow down. After the EXP slows down the Klingon can more safely engage.

Of course my choice to use a fixed map would not facilitate this.

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Sunday, March 23, 2008 - 02:41 pm: Edit

Disruptor ships have historically performed poorly vs. Andromedans due to their low 1-turn "crunch" power. Even with the revised rules on disruptor leak and panel degradation, they often just can't fill the panels faster than the Andro can clear them.

=====

By Marc Baluda (Marc) on Sunday, March 23, 2008 - 06:35 pm: Edit

Gary, I'm figuring that because the S8 rule you cite specifically kicks the Lyran DN and BCH out of the rule and into the "Heavy Ships" rule directly above. That rule applies a different deployment limit and restriction which obviates the need for the rule you cite, which requires PF deployment with a PFT. Further, you will see that they are treated as SCS under the K rules, which also have a separate deployment restriction that obviates the need for the rule you cite because other deployment restrictions exist to prevent abuse.

I understand why you are reading it that way, and I do think there is ambiguity, but in this instance that ambiguity leads to the absurd result that players can't use a Lyran DN or BCH unless they buy PFs. That clearly is not the intent. The intent is to prevent people from using a PFT as a "free scout" and not buy PFs. Your reading gives the Lyran DN the worst result of every deployment rule - it's a PFT (that has no special sensors), can't have a PFL or PFS because it uses the casual PF deployment rule, but must purchase at least 4 PFs.....

Try asking the question in the Rules Question section. I'm comfortable at the moment that there is no PF deployment required for the Lyran DN and BCH.

I hope that is helpful.

M

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Sunday, March 23, 2008 - 06:46 pm: Edit

Marc - Again, cite a rule.

"I'm figuring that because the S8 rule you cite specifically kicks the Lyran DN and BCH out of the rule and into the "Heavy Ships" rule directly above."

I don't see where having the DN and BCH under the "Heavy Ships" has anything to do with their being PFTs. It's a separate restriction and both have to be followed. That doesn't "kick...[them] out of the rule".

"Your reading gives the Lyran DN the worst result of every deployment rule - it's a PFT (that has no special sensors), can't have a PFL or PFS because it uses the casual PF deployment rule, but must purchase at least 4 PFs..... "

I've never said this. The Lyran DN is, by rule, a full PFT. That means it gets to have a PFL and PFS. It also has to buy a minimum of 4 PFs.

"Try asking the question in the Rules Question section."

No. I don't have a question. You seem to dispute the rules as they are written, so I'd suggest you ask if you don't like the verbiage.

The same rule that requires a minimum of 4 PFs specifically names the Lyran DN, BCH, and Romulan ROC. I don't find that ambiguous at all.

=====

By Marc Baluda (Marc) on Sunday, March 23, 2008 - 08:00 pm: Edit

Gary, I think you are wrong for the reasons I cited, and I was using your cites but adding the language you exclude in your ellipses. However, this discussion is rather pointless as you don't have to buy the mechlink refit, which means it's not a "true PFT" since it doesn't have the mechlinks, which to me illustrates the problem - you can deploy these ships without the PFs, and you simply don't buy the mechlinks (perhaps the BCH is required to have the mechlinks.....what does the SSD say? The DN does not). I think what is clear to you is not so clear to others.

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Sunday, March 23, 2008 - 08:20 pm: Edit

And that's what I said; that if the DN didn't have the MechLink and Cargo>Repair refit, it wouldn't be a PFT.

The BCH doesn't have that option. It's always built with it, therefore it's always a PFT and must abide by the PFT rules.

=====

By Marc Baluda (Marc) on Sunday, March 23, 2008 - 08:55 pm: Edit

Gary, you're persuading me that the BCH may have an issue, but I'm not convinced. I find it odd that a BCH would have to carry PFs under S8. I think that you are reading the rule reasonably, but I think it's not what was intended and not the only reading. After 180, the same issue could be said of the DN given the SSD saying "Before 180, -6 for no mechlinks." Your reading requires that the Lyrans MUST deploy PFs with any DN deployment after 180, and any BCH deployment ever. The Romulans also seem to have an issue here given that you read the S8 rule to not bump those ships up to the "heavy ship" category before reaching the PFT 4xPF deployment rule.

Anyway, I think it academic - even using your reading, one could just ask to deploy a DN or BCH without PFs and if someone objects you probably shouldn't play with them. There is nothing abusive about deploying the DN or BCH without PFs (but there is something abusive about using a PFT with special sensors without PFs).

=====

By James Hallmark (Jhallmark) on Sunday, March 23, 2008 - 10:53 pm: Edit

It is academic. I use ships that have mech links or fighters without them frequently, as long as the ship is basically a standard warship.

=====

By Stewart W Frazier (Frazier1) on Sunday, March 23, 2008 - 11:46 pm: Edit

Gary's problem is that the SFB rules, in and of themselves, do not make the distinction of the Lyran DN/BCH being capable of being either a 'true' PFT or casual PFT (F&E does, and the interaction between the two is usually enough for some).

The BCH SSD lists the mechlinks as '-6' so the ship could be built without them, but with them it still has the option of being casual or true depending on whether there is a full flotilla available (or more specifically, the leader/scout).

A Lyran DN/BCH with a PFL/S is a true PFT and operates as such, but can be a casual without them (both ship and PFs counting against the command limits).

also note that (S8.23) references (K2.114) for casual PF use.

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Monday, March 24, 2008 - 04:33 am: Edit

Stewart - I have to disagree on all your points.

"...SFB rules, in and of themselves, do not make the distinction of the Lyran DN/BCH being capable of being either a 'true' PFT or casual PFT..."

Incorrect. Both the R-Section text for these ships state they are True PFTs and the MSC gives them a "P" note (True PF Tender).

"The BCH SSD lists the mechlinks as '-6' so the ship could be built without them..."

No, there is no such notation on the BCH's SSD. The DN has this option but not the BCH.

"...still has the option of being casual or true depending on whether there is a full flotilla available (or more specifically, the leader/scout)."

No, it doesn't have the option. A ship either is or isn't a PFT. While a PFT may purchase a Leader and/or Scout variant, it isn't required, and still makes it a true PFT even if they aren't purchased.

"A Lyran DN/BCH with a PFL/S is a true PFT and operates as such, but can be a casual without them (both ship and PFs counting against the command limits)."

Can you cite a rule that allows this?

"also note that (S8.23) references (K2.114) for casual PF use."

Huh? Neither of these references relate to the topic of this discussion.

(S8.23) is about independent fighters and PFs (where their carrier or PFT is not in the battle).

(K2.114) allows that the Lyran "Wildcat" BC is a casual PFT. We are talking about the "Hellcat" BCH.

=====

By Richard Sherman (Rich) on Monday, March 24, 2008 - 11:26 am: Edit

The best point here is, as stated earlier, this is academic.

Assuming Gary's reading is correct on all counts, any player who attempted to actually enforce this rule on his Lyran (or Romulan) opponent, thereby attempting to "block" use of the DN or BCH, or "force" use of PFs, in what otherwise should have and could have been a friendly game, will quickly find himself playing solo.

Rules written by people have flaws, and occasionally require other people using those rules to interpret them in the most reasonable fashion to continue the enjoyment of the game, not "ram them down their opponent's throat" like it was another weapon to be used.

OTOH, this dialogue is insightful in discovering what may potentially be unintended consequences in the rules for the Lyrans and Romulans, and Filsinger and/or SPP should be alerted so they may comment.

=====

By Marc Baluda (Marc) on Monday, March 24, 2008 - 02:13 pm: Edit

Gary, I do think you can read the S8 rule to not apply the 4xPF requirement because these ships get kicked up to the "large ship" rule which applies more onerous limitation on the ships deployment. The purpose of S8 is to prevent abuse. If one

keeps that in mind, it's hard to see how the rule requires the BCH or DN to carry PFs.

Now, if one tried to use the BCH in the PFT command slot, it should have to carry 4xPFs.

Another point worth considering is that I don't think mechlinks can be purchased without purchasing the accompanying PFs - if I'm right that is another hitch.

Can I suggest that follow-up questions be moved to "Rules Questions" as this is the Andromedan Tactics topic?

=====

By Steve Petrick (Petrick) on Monday, March 24, 2008 - 02:25 pm: Edit

There are always going to be disconnects between Star Fleet Battles and Federation and Empire because the two systems operate on different scales. Star Fleet Battles has rules to keep players from using ships in a consistently illegitimate manner, e.g., having a player who always shows up to play with four squadrons of F-15D fighters operating from his two Federation CVAs which are escorted (if escorted at all) only by four NACs (each) and refuses to play if you want to use electronic warfare (scouts).

In Federation and Empire a turn is six months of combat, allowing the assumption that the various "battle lines" actually met the (S8.0) rules but simply factor in the overall gross effects. Thus in Federation and Empire a battle line might, conceivably, be composed on a given battle round of a dozen Battleships (a BB flagship with ten BBs filling out the battle line, and an extra BB provided by a Command Point), and if three of those BBs were Lyrans Cave Lions, you could have three PF flotillas in addition to that plus a Free Scout.

The upshot is that in Federation and Empire it is entirely possible for a PFT to appear in a battle line (either as a combat ship or as a scout) and not have ANY PFs, because there is no absolute requirement to purchase replacement PFs (502.432). But by and large a PFT without PFs would be held out of combat, not committed to combat. Hence the rule in SFB about having at least four PFs to reflect that fleet command will not use PFTs without PFs, and enough PFs to make committing the ship worthwhile.

So, yes, under the patrol rules (S8.0), a Hellcat BCH cannot appear without at least four PFs, it is a true PFT. Technically, Lyrans DNs should have the refit making them true PFTs, but there is a waffle clause in that they were built before PFs and refitted to be PFTs that makes it possible to assume a given DN has not been converted, and could simply have the standard mech link refit and appear with just two PFs and no repair capability. But the Romulan ROC is a PFT, and your choice in a patrol battle is to use the ROC with at least four PFs, or not use the ROC at all.

Beyond that, as has been noted, local player groups can negotiate to do "X" even if it is not what the rules say, but the no player can, or should, be faulted for adhering to the rules. And any "historical scenario" can "violate" the rules of (S8.0) because they represent a specific case where something outside the norm "happened". For example, while the rules normally only allow on BB on a side, there is a historical scenario using two B10s to attack an Andromedan base.

=====

By Mike West (Mjwest) on Monday, March 24, 2008 - 06:07 pm: Edit

Wow. Not the answer I expected.

So, by the spirit of S8, no Lyrans heavy (BCH or better) may ever show up after Y180 without bringing at least 4 PFs?

That's pretty harsh. Oh well, not a big Lyrans fan, anyway ...

(BTW, the ROC isn't a fair comparison. The Romulans have lots of DNs, and the primary reason most people would even choose the ROC is to bring PFs along with it. The Lyrans don't have those choices. It is either bring the PFs or skip the DN/BCH entirely. Again, that's harsh.)

=====

By Steve Petrick (Petrick) on Monday, March 24, 2008 - 06:11 pm: Edit

Mike West:

It is what the rules say. Do you wish me to change the rules by fiat? If I did so, what would be the point of having rules? The ship is a true PFT, the rules requires true PFTs to have PFs. There is no "special exception" for this ship listed anywhere I can find.

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Monday, March 24, 2008 - 06:25 pm: Edit

Mike - Keep these things in mind.

1. Having the BCH and DN being a PFT is also an advantage, assuming you want to bring PFs, over other races that don't have that option.
2. The BC can sub for the BCH without that much loss (2 APR, 2 Battery).
3. The DN has to be accompanied by 3 other ships by (S8.331), so it's not like you are playing a low BPV battle where 4 PFs makes a difference.

=====

By Marc Baluda (Marc) on Monday, March 24, 2008 - 08:30 pm: Edit

Kudos to Gary for catching this. I don't think the rule necessary for "true PFTs" unless they have special sensors and are trying to use a scout slot, but there you have it.

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Monday, March 24, 2008 - 09:14 pm: Edit

I'm with Mike West on this one - this really hampers the Lyrans in BPV fights.

=====

By Richard Sherman (Rich) on Monday, March 24, 2008 - 09:36 pm: Edit

I can guarantee you it's a rule I'll be forever ignoring. And FWIW, yes, I expect that the rule be changed by fiat, and that is no slippery slope. This game is the property of ADB and is entrusted almost completely to two and only two people. This is a game; not some matter of law where we have to be concerned about what the perception of equitability is.

Correcting such an obvious flaw does not all of a sudden bring into question the integrity of the entire rules system. That is an overreaction.

=====

By Mike West (Mjwest) on Monday, March 24, 2008 - 10:40 pm: Edit

Quote:

It is what the rules say. Do you wish me to change the rules by fiat? If I did so, what would be the point of having rules? The ship is a true PFT, the rules requires true PFTs to have PFs. There is no "special exception" for this ship listed anywhere I can find.

Well, yeah. If a rule doesn't work right, and there is a really, really simple way to fix it, I fail to see the harm. It isn't like simple fixes haven't been done before to correct inconsistencies and "injustices".

Again, it doesn't really matter to me. I don't usually play Lyrans, and this will be a fun rule to screw with opponents over. (No, I won't hold them to it. Just mess with their minds some.) Leave it or change it as you will.

But the idea that the Lyrans are the only race that is not allowed to use their BCH solo seems a tad odd.

But then, I guess that is no more odd than the fact that while the Lyrans DN must take at least 4 PFs, the Lyrans DNH is forbidden from using PF Leaders or PF Scouts, or operating a true PF flotilla. It may only operate a "casual" flotilla comprised of standard combat PFs. Because, while being bigger, stronger, more deadly, and having the exact same PFT capabilities, it is not a "true PFT".

So, yeah, I think it would be good to make the treatment of Lyrans Dreadnoughts (and the Heavy Battlecruiser) both a little more flexible and consistent.

=====

By Alan Trevor (Thyrm) on Monday, March 24, 2008 - 10:56 pm: Edit

I don't think there's any need to change the rule. Nor, with all due respect to Richard Sherman. do I think this is an "obvious flaw". Here, for whatever it may be worth, is my take on the S8 rules generally.

It seems to me the S8 rules are primarily intended to serve 2 purposes. The first is to prevent abusive "munchkin" fleets that fight at a much higher level than their nominal BPV would indicate. This is more of a problem with some races than others because they may have "oddball" ships or capabilities that could "scale" in odd ways if BPV were the only limitation on choosing them.

The second purpose, and the one relevant to the Lyran BCH and DN, is to encourage "historically plausible" fleets. Under S8, you can't stick multiple dreadnoughts in the same fleet even though it would be physically possible to do so. But on the scale of an Empire, you've got lots of demands for those few ships. The Empire can't afford to put a bunch of dreadnoughts into one fleet because it doesn't have enough to go around. But a pick-up Patrol Battle is divorced from any such external constraints and players could form fleets that were wildly unrealistic, like a Napoleonic gamer who wanted to field an army composed of nothing but Old Guard. The S8 restrictions are similar to Napoleonic Miniatures rules that require a player to field historically realistic forces, with only a small percentage of his total force composed of Guard, Grenadiers, Cuirassier, or other elite units.

The Lyrans rely more on PFs than any other race. And DNs and BCHs are in short supply, and would be very high on the food chain for receiving PFs, since they will tend to be in the most important battles on which the fate of the Empire might depend. Therefore I would argue that it is historically rare for them to ever deploy without PFs and the S8 requirement that they do have PFs is appropriate.

And if you really want, for some purpose, to field a Lyran BCH without its PFs? Ask your opponent if they will agree to a battle without S8 restrictions, or with modified restrictions. I've played many, many games in which, by mutual consent, we used modified, or no, restrictions because we wanted to try something different, just for fun. In my experience (which admittedly can hardly be universal), most players are very willing to be reasonable about things like that as long as you don't abuse the privilege. Is your experience different?

=====

By Glenn Hoepfner (Ikabar) on Monday, March 24, 2008 - 11:39 pm: Edit

I'll be brief (so said the boxer).

Seriously, I like this restriction with the Lyran simply because not all races strategize the same way. Every race must be unique in their own way, even if it is a flawed concept of a specific tactic or characteristic that is rarely utilized.

I'm good with it.

Other races get screwed with their own uniquenesses.

This includes me who has seemed to lost all concept of proper grammar and spelling.

=====

By Marc Baluda (Marc) on Monday, March 24, 2008 - 11:57 pm: Edit

As a Lyran player I find this odd but instead of worrying about it I will use this as a measuring stick of whoever tries to force its use. It's unnecessary from an abuse perspective.

I also think one doesn't have to read the rule this way. The Lyran DN and BCH are "true PFTs" for certain purposes (which frankly only appears to be to carry a PFS or PFL), but they are not PFTs (they don't have special sensors and S8 shouldn't be troubled by them). Seems simple to me.

Beware the "true PFT" with no special sensors!

=====

By Michael Lui (Michaelui) on Tuesday, March 25, 2008 - 06:32 am: Edit

Quote:

But the idea that the Lyrans are the only race that is not allowed to use their BCH solo seems a tad odd.

WRONG!!! The Hydrans are not allowed to use ANY of their Hybrid ships without buying fighters for them and that includes their BCH.

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Tuesday, March 25, 2008 - 08:58 am: Edit

Michael Lui. But Hydran players expect to have to buy fighters - it's been engrained in them since the LN and RN. Lyran players don't expect to buy PFs and for those players who don't like using PFs, this eliminates the BCH from being usable.

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Tuesday, March 25, 2008 - 09:01 am: Edit

There are other true PFTs with no special sensors. The Romulan SKYHAWK-C comes to mind.

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Tuesday, March 25, 2008 - 09:03 am: Edit

Quote:

Lyran players don't expect to buy PFs and for those players who don't like using PFs, this eliminates the BCH from being usable.

As Alan pointed out, to the Lyrans the PF has the same place in their doctrine as the fighter is to the Hydrans.

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Tuesday, March 25, 2008 - 09:05 am: Edit

Mike -

"Well, yeah. If a rule doesn't work right, and there is a really, really simple way to fix it, I fail to see the harm. It isn't like simple fixes haven't been done before to correct inconsistencies and "injustices."

It's a matter of perception.

To some this is a broken rule.

To some this is intentional racial flavor and changing it would just lead to more "cookie cutterism".

=====

By Mike West (Mjwest) on Tuesday, March 25, 2008 - 09:12 am: Edit

Quote:

Quote:

But the idea that the Lyrans are the only race that is not allowed to use their BCH solo seems a tad odd.

WRONG!!! The Hydrans are not allowed to use ANY of their Hybrid ships without buying fighters for them and that includes their BCH.

Not really a direct comparison. Hydran fighters are, for all intents and purposes, are merely weapons that are part of the ship, not fully separate units like PFs. Bringing the Hydrans into the argument is a specious as saying that my statement isn't true because Kzintis have to bring along drones for their racks, and actually make them fast.

Apples and Oranges.

Besides, the real problem for the Lyrans is the BPV. The Hydrans have to spend an extra 40 BPV to bring a minimal number of fighters. They Klingons have to spend an extra 24 BPV to carry fast drones. The Lyrans have to spend 148 BPV.

=====

By Mike West (Mjwest) on Tuesday, March 25, 2008 - 09:25 am: Edit

Quote:

As Alan pointed out, to the Lyrans the PF has the same place in their doctrine as the fighter is to the Hydrans.

and

Quote:

To some this is intentional racial flavor and changing it would just lead to more "cookie cutterism".

I fail to see how adding an option is "cookie cutterism". I fail to see how "not screwing the Lyrans" leads to "cookie cutterism".

As an example, look at it this way. S8 establishes that a SC2 ship may not appear without three additional ships. However, because of the "PFT" thing, that means a Lyran DN cannot appear without the equivalent of four ships. The effect of that is that there is a rather large BPV range where every race but the Lyrans can bring DNs to the battle, but the Lyrans may not.

So, if not wanting to see the Lyrans get screwed means I am for "cookie cutterism", then whip out the dough because, in this specific case, I am for "cookie cutterism". May I decorate them after they bake?

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Tuesday, March 25, 2008 - 10:16 am: Edit

I would argue that the PF does not take the same place in the doctrine of the Lyrans as Fighters do to the Hydrans. Our local Lyran player, for example, doesn't use them much.

You really can't play the Hydrans post-EY without having fighters. You can't even have PFs as the Lyrans until Y178 or so, leaving decades of good play (including some of the more commonly used campaign dates - Y150, Y165, Y175) without it even being possible to use them. So no, I don't consider PFs to be a core part of the Lyran's SFB doctrine.

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Tuesday, March 25, 2008 - 10:53 am: Edit

Of course it's not part of their doctrine before PFs exist. The contention is that PFs did become a core doctrine for Lyrans after PFs were fielded.

=====

By Larry E. Ramey (Hydrajak) on Tuesday, March 25, 2008 - 11:24 am: Edit

PFs are good.

Stop whining.

I'll take my hellcat with 4 PFs and a side of milk thank you very much.

=====

By Mike West (Mjwest) on Tuesday, March 25, 2008 - 11:37 am: Edit

Not if the BPV limit is set at 200, you won't.

A BPV of 205 gives a fully loaded C7. A BPV of 240 gives a fully loaded Overlord. With a BPV of 325, the Hellcat still can't show up.

=====

By Alan Trevor (Thyrm) on Tuesday, March 25, 2008 - 12:37 pm: Edit

Mike West;

I still don't see why this requires a rule change. As I said, I believe one of the two main puposes of S8 is to encourage historically accurate fleets, and historically the BCH would have presumably not deployed without PFs, or done so only very rarely. But if you want to play a 200 BPV game and use a Lyran BCH, why not simply ask your opponent if he'll allow it? Would the people in your gaming group really object to that? If so, why?

=====

By Mike West (Mjwest) on Tuesday, March 25, 2008 - 01:11 pm: Edit

Alan,

Again, personally I don't care if any of this is changed. I am merely pointing out that it doesn't make any sense. (To me, among others. That doesn't mean I/we are right.)

As for what I do, that doesn't matter a whole lot. Obviously, I would have no problem either bringing a "naked" BCH into battle, or letting my opponent do likewise.

That said, anytime I see a rule I feel compelled to work around or ignore or outright contradict, I will question it. If I am "wrong", fine. But I will initially challenge it.

=====

By Larry E. Ramey (Hydrajak) on Tuesday, March 25, 2008 - 01:21 pm: Edit

So, my Hydran BCH can't come to a 205 battle. The world is unfair to the Lyran!!!

Note upstream in this thread I suggested going hunting the Andro with a CA + 1-4 PFs. (however many you can get)

Maybe I am stupid.... you are complaining that the Hellcat has to show up with PFs, but its ok for my Hydran to have to show up with Stingers, and ok for the Zin to be forced to buy upspeed drones even if he plans on anchoring you and IV-s would be just fine.

Is this what you are saying? Somehow adding the PF racial flavor to the Lyrans is bad.

OK. Here is your cheese.

=====

By Marc Baluda (Marc) on Tuesday, March 25, 2008 - 01:24 pm: Edit

Another issue with PFs is they require another EA - that's burdensome beyond fighters. I don't see that comparison.

with that said, I think this is academic. If you want to fly a Lyran BCH w/o PFs, fly one. But I still think the rule as written provides some ambiguity and should be cleaned up, and the reading SPP and Gary set forth is not the way I would clean it up because I think it an unnecessary and restrictive rule that inhibits player's use of these ships for no apparent reason (FYI, as mentioned the DN must also take PFs after 180.....)

=====

By Larry E. Ramey (Hydrajak) on Tuesday, March 25, 2008 - 01:42 pm: Edit

Rules Exist to Inhibit a Player. That is why we have them. If not, we would all be playing Calvin-ball.

The rule exists to add racial flavor. Lyrans used PFs. They used them casually, much like Hydran Hybrids.

That is the apparent reason.

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Tuesday, March 25, 2008 - 02:12 pm: Edit

Quote:

A BPV of 205 gives a fully loaded C7. A BPV of 240 gives a fully loaded Overlord. With a BPV of 325, the Hellcat still can't show up.

SFB isn't about making each ship class the same BPV for all races.

On the flip side, it's so unfair that the Lyran BCH can bring a full PF flotilla, with a Leader and Scout, and nobody else's BCH can.

=====

By Kevin Humar-Barrett (Cheethorne) on Tuesday, March 25, 2008 - 02:31 pm: Edit

As for the cost, you could just play with four Interceptors instead of four PFs. They would only cost you 88 BPV vs. 148 BPV for the PFs.

However, in terms of placing a burden on a player, I would have to agree that playing with PFs requires more than playing with fighters, because having to do another EA form is not something you can just wave away.

I like that the Lyrans have this as a racial flavour, I just wish running four PFs (or Interceptors) was as easy as running an equal BPV of fighters.

=====

By Richard Sherman (Rich) on Tuesday, March 25, 2008 - 02:32 pm: Edit

The problem with rules, good or bad, isn't really about what's fair or unfair. That's always a matter of perception. What rules are for is so two people with differing opinions and desires can sit down and, despite those differences, "speak the same language and understand one another."

But when the rules themselves don't make any sense, that breaks down.

So here's one hypothetical example:

Player X shows up to play a game with Richard Sherman. X wants to take a Hydran BCH without her integral fighters. Rich thinks, "hmmm...violates (S8.0), but I don't care." He tells X "no problem." Next game, X wants to take a Lyran BCH with no PFs. X gets the same answer from Rich. 3rd game he wants to take a Kzinti DW with all slow drones in a Y182 battle. Rich says no. Player X is upset, and an argument ensues.

I have no problem with asserting my opinion, likes and dislikes. I have done so here, and will continue to do so unless and until I'm booted from this board for doing so (which I hope never happens). The problem is that, in games - and particularly this one - each time I have to do that because of a real or perceived flaw in the rules - it both creates the potential for unpleasant arguments AND weakens the "faith" (if I can use that word) in the game.

I don't want either of those things to happen.

So, while stating that I will ignore the rule, I also would request it be corrected. Recognizing that such an event is highly unlikely...well...this is one significant reason why "house rules" exist at all. So local players can continue to speak the same language and understand each other.

=====

By Alan Trevor (Thyrm) on Tuesday, March 25, 2008 - 04:02 pm: Edit

I guess I should add that if SPP and SVC do decide to modify S8 so that a Lyran DN or BCH can show up in a standard Patrol Battle without PFs, I don't have any heartburn with that. It's just that I don't see any pressing need for that change.

Also, I agree with Gary Bear in that, in high-BPV scenarios or in a strategic campaign, the fact that a Lyran BCH or Dreadnought is a true PFT is a big advantage.

=====

By Mike West (Mjwest) on Tuesday, March 25, 2008 - 05:16 pm: Edit

Quote:

Also, I agree with Gary Bear in that, in high-BPV scenarios or in a strategic campaign, the fact that a Lyran BCH or Dreadnought is a true PFT is a big advantage.

That is true. Which is why I asked for the option. I don't want to see the Lyrans lose their advantage. I just don't want it to also be a millstone around their necks.

Also note that while the DN is a true PFT, the DNH is not. So, make sure you don't upgrade any of your DNs into DNHs, as you will lose that strategic advantage!

=====

By Steve Petrick (Petrick) on Tuesday, March 25, 2008 - 07:40 pm: Edit

I guess we are back to the age old "Make this change over which I am personally unhappy, and just do not make any other changes that anyone else asks for so that my change is not a precedent."

Afterall, if I make this change why don't I say wave my hand and allow all Hydran Hybrid ships to use Stinger-Ts if they want, or allow the Hydrans to use all the Stinger-Hs that they want, or heck why don't I change the rules and allow the Feds to have built PFs, or better yet let the Feds use FB-111s on mech links, or hey how about revising the rules and letting the ISC mount PPDs on destroyers, or making the Snipe-R a real and standardly deployed ship for attacking bases or . . .

I mean if I change one rule because one person (or three people or whatever) is not happy, surely I should change any rule that any single person complains about or does not like. Why not just throw the rulebook out and allow photons to hit on die rolls of 1-5 out to range 75?, and on a 1-6 from Earth to Remus using proximity charges? Or double the range of plasma-R torpedoes? Or allow the Kzintis 100% special drones with no limited or restricted restrictions? Or allow Tholian disruptors and/or photons to fire through webs? Or change all breakdown ratings to 6 as was done in Federation Commander?

There is always going to be somebody who thinks something is wrong, and by all that is right and just if I changed rule X because player Y was unhappy, then I can change rule Z because he is unhappy. And most of them are quite willing for me to just make their tiny little change and then never, ever make any other change.

Guess what. There is NO POSSIBLE WAY for me to make everyone happy by making this or that tiny insignificant change. But bitter experience has shown that if such small tiny insignificant changes are made, I will be deluged with demands that some other small, tiny, insignificant change be made with the note that I have no excuse for not doing so because I made someone else's small tiny insignificant change. And if I do this for "The Lyrans" I can expect to also be roundly lambasted for my obvious "Klingon Bias" in giving something to "the Klingon Ally" as part of that.

How about I just submit my resignation and commit suicide? (A little humor from "Blackadder Goes Forth" for those who do not understand the reference.) On the other hand, it would be a lot less painful than this.

=====

By Glenn Hoepfner (Ikabar) on Wednesday, March 26, 2008 - 02:20 am: Edit

I read only the first paragraph of SPP's latest post and quit. (I think he's a bit long winded but that's another issue).

Please, people. Quit your whining. Every race is different. Personally, I couldn't care less about PFs or fighters (for Hydrans only).

And I'm probably wrong here as well.

None of this is game breaking.

Go to bed.

Get some sleep.

I've got a headache.

Note: I'm aware my opinion isn't worth diddly, but what the heck.

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Wednesday, March 26, 2008 - 08:31 am: Edit

SPP. You could do that or you could rationally step back and ask yourself "should every ship that is allowed to carry PFLs and PFSs be forced to carry PFs in every engagement?" i.e., while it passes the common sense test for PFTs, whose primary role is to support the PFs, does it make sense for ships like the BCH, which has carrying PFs as a secondary role, at best?

There was so much disagreement because this one didn't pass the common sense test.

You could see an Admiral not permitting a PFT to go to the front lines without at least some PFs, but can you see a Lyran Admiral stopping a DN or BCH from being deployed because there are no spare PFs to attach to it?

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Wednesday, March 26, 2008 - 08:53 am: Edit

Suggestion (I don't have my G2 handy..)

Currently, the note for fully capable PFTs is "P" (IIRC, see above)

How about adding a "P1"

P1. Unit is a fully capable PFT. However, if acting as the flagship (S8.21), this unit is not required to carry PFs, as an exception to (S8.34).

Or, you could just modify (S8.34) which already lists the BCH, DN, and ROC as specific exceptions.

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Wednesday, March 26, 2008 - 11:41 am: Edit

Quote:

... can you see a Lyran Admiral stopping a DN or BCH from being deployed because there are no spare PFs to attach to it?

These ships would have the highest priority to get replacement PFs and would never be without PFs. So, fielding them without PFs would be what would never be "historically" seen.

=====

By Larry E. Ramey (Hydrajak) on Wednesday, March 26, 2008 - 11:49 am: Edit

S8 isn't about the Admiral "letting" the ship go out without its PFs. It is an attempt to put some constraints on players so that pick up games somewhat resemble the battles that were "historically" fought.

If you want to control how your BCH leaves the SB, play a campaign. You can do whatever the heck you want. In my campaign, you can run an unescorted CVA if you want to, there will be economic/operational penalties.

If an F&E commander is stupid enough to send forth a Hellcat without the PFs, that is his choice. If you are playing World in Flames as a scenario generator you are free to put every single Tiger-II and Elephant you have into 1 Battalion. Go for it. If I'm playing a WWII game, I'd get pretty irritated if every single German tank I had to face was either a Tiger-II or a Panther-G. This is the same thing.

=====

By Steve Petrick (Petrick) on Wednesday, March 26, 2008 - 03:54 pm: Edit

Andy Palmer:

All of which comes down to: "Be reasonable, make the change I want, and then just do not make any other changes (except possibly for some other changes that I will ask for later). Since clearly anyone who disagrees with the change I want is wrong and I am right and the game should be played in accordance with my personal vision and the vision of anyone who agrees with me. People who disagree with me are wrong, including anyone who agrees with me now, but may disagree with me on any changes I will ask for later."

=====

By Michael Powers (Mtpowers) on Wednesday, March 26, 2008 - 04:43 pm: Edit

"There was so much disagreement because this one didn't pass the common sense test."

Same deal as the whole "Fed Escorts, and only Fed Escorts, cannot have loaded ready racks at any Weapon Status" thing.

=====

By Richard Sherman (Rich) on Wednesday, March 26, 2008 - 05:10 pm: Edit

SPP:

You must be right. It couldn't possibly be that, as players, our motivation would be to correct what we believe is an error in the rules. It couldn't possibly be that we care about a game we've invested so much time and energy and money into. It couldn't be a desire to avoid our own fixes locally, that others may argue with when we play. No, it must just be pure self-interest. Like a child, we just want what we want, right?

What a cop-out. "Players are whiners, and THAT's the reason we can't change anything...because it'll just encourage more whining."

I work in employee relations and civil rights. If I took that attitude at work, I'd be fired for it. And I'd deserve to get fired for it.

I'm sorry for my sarcasm, but PLEASE (begging, not yelling) don't give in to that mentality here. It's demeaning, does disservice to your players, and ultimately will leave you frustrated and angry at those you serve.

=====

By Alan Trevor (Thyrm) on Wednesday, March 26, 2008 - 05:21 pm: Edit

Richard Sherman,

But you are presenting your position as if all players agreed with it. But several of us have already posted reasons why we don't think the rule needs to be changed. You obviously disagree with those reasons. But that doesn't justify a pretense that this is some "Players versus SPP" argument. It would be more accurate to describe it as "One group of players versus a different group of players" argument, in which you want SPP to take your side rather than our side.

=====

By Michael Lui (MichaelLui) on Wednesday, March 26, 2008 - 05:24 pm: Edit

Rich+Andy

So does that mean I should start arguing for Hydran fighters to be able to be purchased with Commanders Option points since someone did point out that "Hydran fighters are, for all intents and purposes, merely weapons that are part of the ship, not fully separate units like PFs."?

I mean, you can never see a hybrid ship without fighters just like you can never see a drone armed ship in Y182+ without fast drones....or a Lyran BCH without its PFs.

=====

By Dave Butler (Dcbutler) on Wednesday, March 26, 2008 - 05:38 pm: Edit

As someone who doesn't have a dog in the fight (I rarely play SFB these days), the only potential change I'd think of suggesting would be to allow a "true PFT" SC2 ship to count its flotilla against the (S8.331) requirement for consort ships. (SCS would still have to have their (S8.31) escorts, and therefore wouldn't catch a break.)

Even that's a hesitant, "well, maybe" sort of thing; I'm okay with "these ships worked in heavier groups" as a racial (Empirical?) quirk.

(It's odd, however, that in F&E the default is that the Lyran BCH never has PFs (it's a special conversion to give it the ability to carry (non-casual) PFs). Now that I know the SFB rule, I kinda wonder if it isn't better than the F&E rule.)

=====

By Marc Baluda (Marc) on Wednesday, March 26, 2008 - 05:44 pm: Edit

In the latest G3 post the Lyran DNH and DNL now get the "P" notation.

Perhaps we can all chill a bit? I didn't think any of the frustration was warranted. I don't agree with Gary's reading of S8, or SPP's, and I don't think the limitation is necessary, but SPP clearly is saying what was intended and that is that any ship with a "P" designation has a PF deployment requirement because it is a "true PFT." The fact that they are also heavy ships, BCHs, DNs or whatever doesn't change the fact that they are PFTs.

So, there it is.

One thing I would like to note is that the "mechlink refit" for any "P" designated ship is really a "PFT refit." The "mechlink refit" generates the impression that it is a not a PFT for every purpose (and the use of "true PFT" instead of "PFT," and "casual PFT," seemed to create three categories, not the two that exist SPP's clarification of S8).

To summarize, I thought there were 3 categories of PFTs: (1) PFT; (2) "casual PFT" ineligible to carry PFS and PFL; and (3) "true PFT" which was a PFT for some purposes (carrying a PFS and PFL, possibly with repair), but was otherwise a casual PFT (i.e. couldn't go in the PFT command slot). Just wanted to point out that this is where part of my objection came from.

=====

By Richard Sherman (Rich) on Wednesday, March 26, 2008 - 06:00 pm: Edit

Alan,

Nothing could be further from the truth. My post is about the repeated diatribe often heard from many individuals in power

who tire of the community they serve. My point is that, no matter what is thought of me, or a group of players, or players in general (the distinction matters not), it's just wrong to dismiss a person's opinion or argument because of a belief that they are motivated purely by self-interest.

I spoke of "players" instead of "some players" because the approach I'm talking about will, sooner or later, adversely affect everyone (including the person who took that approach).

At this point, I've got to say that I don't even care that much about the specific rule. We're all going to do what we think appropriate anyway. It's too small to fret much about, as Glenn Hoepfner humourously said, above.

What I don't like is someone telling me what I think as my reasons for suggesting a change. He doesn't know what my motives are; only my actions.

And to state for the record, let me be clear again. Although I think this is an error, I don't care one whit PERSONALLY whether the Lyrans can bring a BCH or DN/DNH/DNL to a battle without PFs or not. It's a **** game; I'll not lose sleep over it. Not to speak for others, but I don't think Andy and the others will either. Just as with most people in all walks of life, if we thing something is wrong in our daily lives, we don't do that thing, unless compelled to by law/force.

The sad thing is that, at least for me, being basically repeatedly told I'm a "whiner" and have nothing but selfishness in my heart regarding something even so small as this is..well...insulting. What must SPP then think of us if we were discussing something REALLY important, like our lives and families and such (I mean, many of us do choose to disclose an awful lot of personal information here...)?

Sigh. Methinks this has gotten out of hand, and away from me.

=====

By Steve Petrick (Petrick) on Wednesday, March 26, 2008 - 06:39 pm: Edit

Richard Sherman:

Alan Trevor is correct, there are two sides to the issue, and yes he is on one side and you are on the other (apparently, I have not scrolled back up to confirm his position), but the fact is there is not universal support for making this change.

There is a valid question of whether something should be changed because "it is wrong" or should be changed because "I do not like it". Obviously people in the latter category will assume (this is afterall human nature) that it is not their dislike, but that "it is wrong". For example: I do not like PFs, so a rule that says my race must use PFs in some circumstances is wrong irrespective of the game background.

We could just ditch the game background, but part of that already happens if a group of players do not like PFs and just, within their group, do not use them.

The list of complaints and "make this one change" is virtually endless (for example, the Kzintis want their scout cruisers to have "four special sensors like everyone else's, it is not fair that they do not have four special sensors"), and some of them are "why did you change that to this, change it back".

Do I want to anger and disappoint players?

No.

I would like to be on good terms with all of you guys.

But trying to do that by making minor change after minor change is not going to put me on good terms with anyone.

It is part of the historical background. Part of the Historical background is that the Lyrans went into PFs in a big way, and when Module K was done this was reflected in the rules:

(K2.113) SPACE CONTROL SHIPS: These are usually dreadnought hulls modified to carry 12 fighters and 6 PFs. They are true PFTs even though they generally lack special sensors (K2.52); most have specified drone storage (K2.65). The Lyran Lion DN and Hellcat BCH, the LDR CC, and the Romulan ROC (and a few others), while they have no fighters, are treated under this classification. The Federation SCS has no PFs; the conjectural SCSA has conjectural PFs. The Kzinti SSCS is a true PFT. All will have the "P" in the notes column of the Master Ship Chart. (Fed SCS has no PFs and no P.)

(K2.114) CASUAL PFTs: These are ships modified to carry from 1-6 (usually 2) PFs for increased firepower. These ships have fewer reload weapons (K2.65). Most do not have repair or scout systems, but the ability to install mech-links on virtually any ship (R1.R1) could create casual PFTs that had those systems (by installing the mech-links on a ship that already had scout and/or repair systems). For example, the Lyran Wildcat BC is a casual PFT, but can repair PFs.

The PFs on casual PFTs are all of the standard combat types (no leaders, scouts, or versions unless specified in a published scenario). [It is theoretically possible that in a multi-scenario campaign a casual PFT might have some of the PFs from a destroyed PFT.]

So it is not a matter of just changing (S8.34), it going back and amending the rulebook. This is a deep change.

=====

By Steve Petrick (Petrick) on Wednesday, March 26, 2008 - 07:08 pm: Edit

Richard Sherman:

The above was posted late as I kept getting interrupted.

Respectfully, I never, ever, used the term "whiners" (except in this missive right here). I have referred to players, to people, to individuals, and to groups and other general terms, but I have never used that derogatory term, or any other derogatory term in my responses here or considered using it.

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Thursday, March 27, 2008 - 08:59 am: Edit

SPP. I will comment that I see no need to change any of the (K) rules that you posted; nothing in them specifies a minimum number of PFs that must be carried in patrol scenarios, which is entirely covered in (S8.34) (i.e., being a "true PFT" applies to more than just patrol scenario PF minimums).

I will also comment that I don't play Lyrans (I stink at ESGs) and, as a primarily Hydran player, forcing BCHs to carry PFs is actually advantagious to me. I see this purely as an artificial and unnecessary "handcuff" on Lyran players, greatly limiting their ability to use their high CR combat ships in patrol scenarios. Yes, it's purely opinion, and whether the change gets officially made, I'll play it that way anyway (it won't be the first, and won't be the last change from RAW that I use).

In fact, given how little our group uses PFs, or even plays that late in the timeline, I doubt if this issue would EVER come up for us.

Nonetheless, as a forum for expressing player opinion on the matter, I expressed mine, for purely unselfish reasons.

=====

By Larry E. Ramey (Hydrajak) on Thursday, March 27, 2008 - 09:08 am: Edit

I gotta wonder what game you play that you think lots of Lyran PFs running around on the other side of the map makes like better for you.

Lyran PFs are GOOD. They are especially good against Hydrans and Andromedans.

=====

By Marc Baluda (Marc) on Thursday, March 27, 2008 - 11:44 am: Edit

Larry, forcing PFs vs. allowing them (no one disputes the BCH is capable of carrying PFs, it's whether it is required to do so). If you are forcing a player to do something, it advantages the other side by definition (otherwise it isn't forced).

But again, that's the rule stated by SPP (and it's not a Lyran "flavor" thing - it applies to the ROC as well).

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Thursday, March 27, 2008 - 12:40 pm: Edit

Larry. I'd rather face 6 PFs as a Hydran than the same BPV worth of ship. PFs can't play sabre dancing games with me and don't have ESGs to cancel out my 'bores. Plus, what Marc said - limiting the Lyran player's choices is good for his opponents.

=====

By Larry E. Ramey (Hydrajak) on Thursday, March 27, 2008 - 03:04 pm: Edit

Clearly Andy, you play a different game than I do. PFs can't play saber dancing games..... O.K. My only theory is you don't play with EW.

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Thursday, March 27, 2008 - 03:16 pm: Edit

Larry - I play with EW. What range are PF Disruptors again?

=====

By Steve Petrick (Petrick) on Thursday, March 27, 2008 - 03:32 pm: Edit

Andy Palmer:

Rule (S8.0) is intended to reflect deployments that would be expected to be seen given the historical and racial backgrounds for the various races in Star Fleet Battles. It does that, it keeps the Klingons and Feds from fielding forces entirely composed of drone throwers for example. It does not allow you to field a force of all command/leader ships, or even all DNs. It does not let you drag a minesweeper around for the joy of simply sowing large numbers of mines in the middle of a deep space brawl, or simply forming a Klingon fleet with all the SFG ships possible (you can, but there is a penalty involved for having the extra SFG ships) or hauling along a monitor for a fight in deep space or . . .

The rule reflects that the Lyrans went for PFs in a big way, bigger than anyone else, and that is the historical and racial flavor for them. Obviously if your group has banned PFs (for whatever reason, mutual, player in the group with the most powerful personality does not like them, have not picked up Module K but you have Module R3, or what have you) then you ignore it, but technically you are ignoring historical racial background.

If you want to cite Federation and Empire as an excuse for doing so, you may as well right then and there announce that you are not using (S8.0) at all and move along since Federation and Empire's extrapolating operations over a period of six months can, as has been noted, result in fleets with multiple dreadnoughts in a single battle line, and can certainly create circumstances in which PF tenders are committed to action without PFs as part of that.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike_Grafton) on Thursday, March 27, 2008 - 03:46 pm: Edit

All things considered the S8 restrictions are sometimes irritating IN DETAIL, but do a pretty good job of "keeping it real."

As for Wanting a Lyran BC sans PFs? Buy a Tug with a battle pallet. or a CCH. Or a CX.

The thing is just one tiny thing to limit the Lyrans from running wild (I mean, who else can build a BCH every year from scratch AND upgrade a fairly wimpy CL to another...) Everyone gets something and that's what the Lyrans get.

My masterwork (ok, reasonably coherent story) for the next CL is about the Lyrans for the simple reason that in the fiction they ALWAYS seem to get the biggest pack of losers/ idiots/ inbreds/ frenchmen (sorry) telling them what to do. Prince whatever igniting the GW by stupidly getting killed. Duke otherguy as Commodore of the squadron intercepting Cavalry (I think the scenario uses the terms "drooling" and "Fop." And the rest of the stories aren't that flattering either...

And NOW I am working on a story with Romulans (perhaps they WON'T spend all their time trying to stab each other in the back!). But given my limited skills, don't hold your breath waiting for it...

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Thursday, March 27, 2008 - 04:16 pm: Edit

Marc -

Quote:

If you are forcing a player to do something, it advantages the other side by definition (otherwise it isn't forced).

All of (S8.0) is about "forcing" how players build their forces. Don't make it sound like the Lyrans are the only ones that would prefer to operate in a different manner than specified in the (S8.0) rules.

And we're talking about one ship that isn't even available until Y180. There are other restrictions that reach much further, so I'd say this is a fairly minor inconvenience.

=====

By Marc Baluda (Marc) on Thursday, March 27, 2008 - 04:52 pm: Edit

Gary, you seem to be responding to things that aren't in my post or the quote. To wit:

"All of S8...." I agree.

"Don't make it sound...." I'm not, I never mentioned the Lyrans in my post. I'm noting a logical fact that has nothing to do with the Lyrans.

"And we're talking about one ship...." I wasn't. I was talking about a logical fact relating to S8. See above.

"There are other restrictions..." I agree.

I think you are reading things into my posts that aren't there.

M

=====

By Scott Tenhoff (Scottt) on Thursday, March 27, 2008 - 06:21 pm: Edit

SPP, not to throw a wrench to far into this machine, but I'm sometimes known to do that.

So the Lyrans can't take the following force in an S8 pickup battle then:

DN/DNH+6PF (1 flotilla)

BCH+6PF (1 flotilla)

NDS+6PF+12fr (1 flotilla+1 sqd)

Since it is now above the attrition unit limit.

To take an NDS in a S8 pickup battle the Lyrans would be limited to a single DN/BCH and would have to settle for a BC (w/o PFs).

I guess they could take 4xPFs on each DN+BCH+NDS (for 12xPF total, counting as 24 attrition factors), but then they might not be formed into flotillas as you'd want them (ie PFL+3PF, PFL+3PF, 3PF+PFS)

=====

By Jeremy Gray (Gray) on Thursday, March 27, 2008 - 06:25 pm: Edit

Is this topic mis-labeled? Where are the Andros?

P.S. Yes, I have had a few beers

=====

By Jim Davies (Mudfoot) on Thursday, March 27, 2008 - 07:26 pm: Edit

The Andros went to a Furry/Otaku convention, saw how well it went and used the costumes to infiltrate the Lyran fleet. Hence the DN called Hello Kitty.

=====

By Steve Petrick (Petrick) on Thursday, March 27, 2008 - 08:07 pm: Edit

Scott Tenhoff:

I do not understand this:

"but then they might not be formed into flotillas as you'd want them (ie PFL+3PF, PFL+3PF, 3PF+PFS)".

I have no idea what you are trying to say there as I have not said anything to this point about how the four PFs the tender must bring must be organized.

Obviously the ships could (as you have stated) arrive with four PFs each under the restrictions of (S8.0) but not more than that or less than that, IF YOU WERE PLAYING UNDER THOSE RULES (emphasis). Nothing stops a Lyran Player from arriving in a pick up game of some ungodly number of points with 50 BCHs (i.e., ignoring command limits, ignoring limits on BCHs, ignoring the PF situation, etc.) to fight a battle with 50 Mæsrn Dreadnoughts (ignoring the fact that there are no

common borders, ignoring the limits on size class 2 units, ignoring command ratings, etc.).

But in a **TECHNICALLY HISTORICAL BATTLE** (emphasis) the Lyrans would be limited as per the rules (no more than three sets of attrition units (i.e., PF flotilla and fighter squadron equivalents), and if at True PFT shows up it must have at least four PFs, and the PFs of different PFTs cannot be counted as part of the same flotilla except in certain rule-specified cases, e.g., the Romulan Chickenhawk. The four PFs on each Tender could be a PFL, a PFS, and two Combat PFs, or a PFL and three Combat PFS, or a PFS and three Combat PFs, or four Combat PFs.

I remain confused about the whole thing in any case because I have mentioned several times that you can get your opponent to agree you do not have to operate under the rule [or any rule in (S8.0)]. And I have noted that the rules themselves say so, but perhaps noone has looked. Please see the second sentence of the third paragraph of the introduction to the (S8.0) rule section. (I have, by the way, just checked and that paragraph was not changed from the way it appears in the 1999 edition of the rulebook.)

So if Andy Palmer does not want to play with PFs and Jim Davies does, there is going to have to be some discussion. But if Richard Sherman and Jeremy Gray both do not want to play with PFs but want to keep the rest of the rules intact, they can do so. And if Scott Tenhoff and Marc Baluda want to play strictly in accordance with the rules, they would have to accept that PFs are going to show up if the Lyran BCH shows up.

What is being asked is to change a rule to fix it so that the Lyrans are never, ever, affected by something done to reflect a racial characteristic, and I am sorry, I just do not see the need. Are there really so many non-Lyran players that are forcing the Lyran players under that rule to not use BCHs unless they bring PFs that the rule must be changed?

=====
By Steve Petrick (Petrick) on Thursday, March 27, 2008 - 08:12 pm: Edit

In re: The above.

I went back and checked and indeed the very first post I made on this included this as the first sentence of the final paragraph:

"Beyond that, as has been noted, local player groups can negotiate to do "X" even if it is not what the rules say, but the no player can, or should, be faulted for adhering to the rules."

=====
By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Thursday, March 27, 2008 - 08:46 pm: Edit

"Are there really so many non-Lyran players that are forcing the Lyran players under that rule to not use BCHs unless they bring PFs that the rule must be changed?"

I actually think it's a bit of mental recoil as I've found many players that have just never made the connection that the Lyran BCH, since it's a "true PFT", is under the (S8.34) restriction.

=====
By Glenn Hoepfner (Ikabar) on Thursday, March 27, 2008 - 11:35 pm: Edit

Jean,

Can we get this topic moved to its own location so I can see where the Andro tactics left off, please?

Thanks.

=====
By Michael Lui (Michaellui) on Friday, March 28, 2008 - 12:00 am: Edit

All the posts starting from Gunner on Saturday, March 22, 9:03 am. There IS one or two that can stay in the section, however MOST of them from this point are about things other than fighting Andros.

=====
By Jean Sexton (Jsexton) on Friday, March 28, 2008 - 07:36 am: Edit

Guys, I cannot move that many posts without making the filing mess up.

I'm not sure of the purpose of the talk at this point as SPP has already said no to changing the rules. Are the participants asking rules questions? If so, then the conversation needs to move to the Q&A section. Are the participants proposing something new? Then move the conversation to the the Proposals Board.

The only sure thing is that Lyrans and Hydrans shouldn't be in this topic unless they are fighting Andros.

Glenn, Jeremy, I will ask the Steves about cleaning out the non-Andro riff-raff who invaded the Andro topic.

Jean

WebMom

=====
By Glenn Hoepfner (Ikabar) on Saturday, March 29, 2008 - 01:43 am: Edit

Jean, at least it looks like you can stop those kinds of posts.

=====
By Gary Carney (Nerroth) on Monday, June 23, 2008 - 06:38 pm: Edit

So...

Given the crucial role that the Andromedans played in the Cloud and in Omega, it would stand to reason that there would be plenty of good excuses for Andro players to take part in scenarios against the likes of Baduvai or Trobrin, Eeneen or Iridani, Maghadim or Mæsron fleets, as well as the usual Alpha suspects.

Are any of the Andro regulars experienced at taking on Omega or Magellanic forces, and if so what kind of challenges or opportunities do you find in the process (especially, in the case of Omega, now that gunboats and SCSs are in print)?

=====
By Kevin Humar-Barrett (Cheethorne) on Wednesday, December 10, 2008 - 11:21 pm: Edit

Well, to revive the old question posted above:

I don't have experience in those kinds of fights. However, I think it opens up some good possibilities for new Andromedan ships that we haven't seen before.

It has been said that the Andromedans developed or adapted new technologies to counter Alpha sector opponents (like the PA Mine), I would love to see what they developed to specifically fight the Omega opponents. I can't imagine what they would be off the top of my head, but I'm sure there would be a few things that could fit into a future Omega book or into the C3A: Andro Threat File (or whatever it is called).

As for the Magellanic forces, I would also be interested to hear how the Andro's play against them (I just got C5 recently).

=====
By James Hallmark (Jhallmark) on Monday, December 29, 2008 - 10:25 pm: Edit

Would a COQ and Cobra rather fight against 2 Hydrans (CA/CL Hellbore variants) or 2 Feds (CA/NCL/CS)? Why?

=====
By Jim Davies (Mudfoot) on Tuesday, December 30, 2008 - 08:51 am: Edit

In a tournament setting, it's always been very much easier for Feds to beat Andros than for Hydrans to do it. More crunch power. All those hellbores make it hard to do Stupid Panel Tricks, but 8 photons and 12P1 will make either of those ships just Go Away in a cloud of smoke.

COQ and Cobra = 255.

CAR+ and NCL+ with fast drones = 271.

DRG+ and TRV+, no fighters = 265.

So you won't get any fighters, which means that the Hydrans will be eating all the phasers and T-bombs directly whereas the Feds can dump a sackload of drones to soak up a lot of fire before the overrun.

Yep, as the Andro I'd rather face the Hydrans.

=====
By Richard Sherman (Rich) on Tuesday, December 30, 2008 - 12:52 pm: Edit

I'd add that if the Fed takes a CS+ instead of the CAR+, it gets even uglier for the Andro. The CS+ has a much better power curve and an extra drone rack. It does give up some staying power, but if paired with an NCL+...well...it's not likely to need to worry about staying power.

Really, I'm not even sure that would be truly a fair fight. If Feds are the choice, I'd suggest a CL+, DDG+, or maybe even a DW, in place of the NCL+.

I should mention also that the Hydrans do much better, and can even afford a couple of fighters, if an IRQ is taken instead of a DG+. But that's an NCA, not a CA. Another interesting choice could be to take an LN+ and 4 ST2 in place of that TR+.

=====

By Jim Davies (Mudfoot) on Tuesday, December 30, 2008 - 02:16 pm: Edit

This is where we note that the CS and IRQ are well known for being rather better than perhaps they should be.

On further inspection, I think that (barring lousy photon rolls) the Feds would be hard pressed to lose this one with a CA/CS and NCL. They can blow the Cobra to bits or badly hurt the COQ at R8, when the Andros will just down a shield and do 20 internals in return. At R5 it's more even, but at R4 (should the Andros let that happen) the COQ just dies horribly.

The only saving grace the Andros have is 2 DDs, so they can both [threaten to] hop out.

=====

By Kerry E Mullan (Nomad17) on Tuesday, December 30, 2008 - 04:14 pm: Edit

True under most circumstances the Adros are in for a beating. The only way I see things working out in their favor is if they can do a coordinated attack and time it.

A few things that may work is to DD around R9 one of the cruisers either forward or backwards. Most of the time you get a 1-3 chance to do so and about a 1-3 to work in your favor. During the 4imps its FC is disrupted the andros can either hit it if it went closer or hit the other cruiser if it went further away. As the andros should be going spd 30 the 4imps is a lot of maneuver time.

Again these are random rolls but having a cruiser go from R9 to R3-5 means in the 4 imp delay of disr firecontrol it will take some serious ints and the other cruiser won't even pierce a bank. ie from R3 the cruiser is taking 74 damage ish or more if centerlined.

As well if the cruiser gets moved backwards the non-DD'ed cruiser can be attacked during the 4imps as you may reach R3 to the other cruiser before the DD'ed cruiser can fire.

Of course after fire the CON DD's away 12 hexes while the cobra tries to flee most probably taking ints on its way out.

Tbombs and EW tricks can help as well, ie throw out 3-4 tbombs at R9 or so and the feds may turn off or hit em if they are high spd.

Most likely first pass the Cobra either dies or is mangled enough to not be worthwhile, but if the Andros can mangle a cruiser then the next attack run may be advantageous to the andies.

=====

By Richard Sherman (Rich) on Tuesday, December 30, 2008 - 04:20 pm: Edit

James,

I concur with Jim.

Jim,

The only minor quibble I have with your last is that I'm not even sure range 5 evens it up for the Andros here. True, the TR's get better, but so do all those P1s.

I gotta say, I've just never been impressed with the Andro 6-panel motherships. The RAV is probably the "least bad" of the bunch, in my view. The COQ is in the middle, and the EXP...well...there's a reason it's nickname is the "Exploder."

Actually, in a larger battle (not this one), maybe the thing to do is to take the scout-momma version (Missionary, I think).

=====

By Glenn Hoepfner (Ikabar) on Tuesday, December 30, 2008 - 05:07 pm: Edit

Jim, James, I concur with Rich. Way, way . . . way too many times my Andros have suffered under the thumb of Rich's Feds (I'm not aware of ever winning against him in any of the combinations).

But each game was a learning process, and frankly my best results were when I learned to fly the Andro as a Klingon, saving my batteries as much as possible.

I'd like to point out that he always had good dice.

=====

By James Hallmark (Jhallmark) on Tuesday, December 30, 2008 - 10:16 pm: Edit

The game was played this afternoon. Thanks for the comments. My friend was the Andro. I took two Fed NCL+. He started by attempting to keep the range >8 and attritioning me. That did not work out well because I could maintain 28 while holding photons and contingent allocating an HET. This did not allow him to load very much especially because I never shot him for the first 2 turns. At the beginning of turn 3 we concluded that he could not win in the time we had available to play. So for fun he Dis Dev the CON behind me and I HETed (did not role 6) and blasted him to the point that his own PA panels would have killed him at the end of the turn.

=====

By Jim Davies (Mudfoot) on Thursday, January 01, 2009 - 05:28 pm: Edit

I think the Andro's only real tactic here is to try to separate the two Feds by DisDev and nailing one of them without losing anything important in return, but this is rather dependent on luck. My original analysis was based on tournament experience where the DD can't be used offensively.

=====

LYRAN TACTICS

By Jim Davies (Mudfoot) on Thursday, March 27, 2008 - 05:00 pm: Edit

Over in the Andro Tactics forum, Larry Ramey claimed that:

Quote:

Lyrans PFs are GOOD. They are especially good against Hydrans and Andromedans.

Lyrans PFs are good? I think they're unmitigated rubbish, and probably the worst standard issue PF in the game. Lousy phasers, disruptors that suck power and no terrain-creation weapons like drones or plasma.

Discuss.

=====

By Larry E. Ramey (Hydrajak) on Thursday, March 27, 2008 - 05:36 pm: Edit

10 OV DIS on a platform that probably has a huge EW advantage on you is nothing to sneeze at. Yes, finding 8 power on a PF is going to hurt.

Lets look at it...

PFs are fleet elements. Fleets have HUGE drone defense capability, so don't act like adding 10 more drone racks to a fleet is godlike, cause it really just makes it more likely that a thomb takes out a huge number of drones. God forbid the enemy has a SWAC.

Late war fleet are often unimpressed by F torps unless someone is holding the enemy for you to hit. A Centurion looks like a monster on paper, but rarely does much good in a real game.

I specifically mentioned that PF was good against Hydrans/Andros. Both races are fairly ineffective outside a range where the PFs are going to hurt you. Hydran's are either going to have to:

- 1) Drop packs and leave the fighters behind
- 2) Let the PFs attrit the hell out of the fighter group with disruptor fire (I've got an EW edge most likely)

3) Suicide launch the fighters..... this rarely works in fleet action.

Andros don't really have those choices. PFs are too small to bother using a DisDev on. Andros can't engage outside R8 and even break the reinforcement, or outside R5 and break a shield.

Power management is surely a problem on the Lyran PFs.... like the Lyran fleet in general.

PFs I would rate Higher:

- 1) Orion PF. SICK SICK SICK
- 2) Fed Thunderbolt-P. Yeah, no kidding.
- 3) Hydran Howler.
- 4) Tholian-P (phaser)

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike_Grafton) on Thursday, March 27, 2008 - 06:13 pm: Edit

Actually, the Lyran really doesn't need to Overload disruptors. Range 10 normal loads are just fine. With the scout evening up ew you can saber dance quite well with the fighters and out maneuver/ p2&3 the drones.

Rubbish? Dunno. I'd say "unimpressive." But strategically they have a LOT of them.

As for Hyran Pfs you have real deployment issues that aren't really seen in pickup battles.

So MOST Hydrans you will be facing are harriers with all the limitations fusions entail...

And I agree the Tholian P rocks. I wrote a term paper noting how great they are ESPECIALLY if they are the ones with Web generators. Even with the instant global web ruled illegal, you can still build a global web in 3 impulses (impulse 1 2 generate web adjacent, imp 2 the next 2 extend it and impulse 3 the last 2 close it) and then you have a hole (costing 6 power to get to strength one) that you can use a your own little infinite strength shield.

=====

By Andy Vancil (Andy) on Thursday, March 27, 2008 - 06:18 pm: Edit

Lyran PFs suck. Let's see how 5 Lyran PFs stack up against 5 Gorn PFs. Realistically, the best the Lyrans will do is one OL and one standard disruptor, else they slow down too much. But I'll be kind and say that they managed to OL both. They'll also fire p2s. For simplicity, the Gorn is just going to bolt one plasma-F and fire p1s. This is far from the best approach for the Gorn - with two launchers and two PPTs, there are all sorts of neat things you can do, but let's just look at DF.

Expected damage for 5 PFs:

Range	Gorn	Lyran
11-15	15	7
9-10	33	27
6-8	50	52
5	86	52
4	91	63
3	98	88

Range 2 or less, the Gorn is definitely not going to be bolting. So basically, in a best-case scenario for the Lyran, versus the worst-case scenario for the Gorn, the Gorn is significantly better.

=====

By Andy Vancil (Andy) on Thursday, March 27, 2008 - 06:23 pm: Edit

Note on my above post: Range 11-15, the Gorns fired phasers only. The Lyrans fired standard disruptors at range 9-10.

=====

By Jim Davies (Mudfoot) on Thursday, March 27, 2008 - 07:53 pm: Edit

From my POV, the Bobcats are bad because they have to decide disruptor use in EA. One more battery would help enormously, because they'd then be able to OL one off reserve. At R9-10, with no ECM shift, a Bobcat will average 5.3 damage, which is no threat to anything bigger than an admin. So to look dangerous, it needs to break R8 and overload (8.7 or 10.7), and ideally R3 where the phasers get useful (17.7).

But this sucks up a lot of power so the PF lacks either EW or speed. And you don't have any drones or plasma to soak up counter-fire.

Note that most of the Lyran PFs are casual so lack EW support from a PFS or PFT.

eg 16 power -6 (speed) -8 (disr) leaves 2 for everything else. And if you ever drop the packs, heaven help you.

Now the same applies to other DF PFs, but they have either better phasers (Fed, Tholian) or held weapons with major crunch (Fed, Hydran). Even the Bug has 3 proper phasers, and can play games with the Particle.

And they're not even much good against drones, because the P2 can't kill a type-1 reliably and the P3s don't overlap. The otherwise similar G1B is vastly better here.

The best thing you can say about a Bobcat is that it's fairly simple to run, so having a dozen of them in your fleet doesn't clutter up the map too much.

=====

By Marc Baluda (Marc) on Friday, March 28, 2008 - 02:08 am: Edit

I have to say that I see the Lyran PF differently. I don't think it's a great PF, but it's slightly cheaper than most. It has two disruptors, which means that it does better in the EW fight than most PFs (as disruptors have an advantage over phasers from an EW point of view from R9-15 at the least, even though it can only shoot to R10), but it loses on the P-1 vs. P-2 comparison.

What it does fairly well is swat drones and fighters, which is what I would use it for. It's not that great against ships.....

So perhaps it does suck. But it's cheaper!

I compare it to the Japanese Zero - great when it showed up, not so strong in the finish. Now, if you could have it carry a "light ESG".....

But that's NONSENSE!

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Friday, March 28, 2008 - 06:38 am: Edit

Yeah, the Lyran PF is awesome...when it's the ONLY PF.

It quickly slips into the 'mediocre/average' slot.

I never bother to OL the disruptors on the Bobcat (unless there is a special reason); I just narrow salvo the 2 standard bolts and never get closer than 10, if I can help it. Rinse, recycle, and repeat.

The general list of PF Awesome goes something like this, IIRC:

1. The Orion PF. You get to pick your weapons (photons, anyone?), and if you have to, you can burn your packs by power-doubling, which lets you make ONE simply BLASPHEMOUS attack run.

2A. The Gorn PF. With all round phaser coverage, and plasma, you can bolt or chuck torps, as the situation permits.

2B. The ISC PF. Another all-rounder like the Gorn, and virtually identical to it.

3. The Starhawk PF. Fewer weapons than the Gorn, but it has cloak. Properly used, its devastating.

4. The Centurion PF. The Other Romulan Gunboat, has many torps (for a PF), but seriously lacks phaser power. Trade it in for a Starhawk, if you can, but its still very dangerous, like all the plasma gunboats.

5. The Hydran PF's. The vanilla model is the Harrier, the others are so good that there are strict limitations on how many you can take. The basic Harrier is pure Death within 3 hexes; a flotilla of these things can kill a B-10 at range 3 or less. The Hellion is the PF design the Hydrans wish they could replace the Harrier with; it mounts Hellbore armament, and only the deployment restrictions prevent it from replacing the Orion as Best PF Ever. The Howler is an all-Gatling design which eats drones and fighters (and starbases...) for breakfast; again, deployment restrictions prevent it from being rated as Number 2.

6. The Tholian PF. Mounting incredible phaser firepower (for a PF) and using disruptors as a secondary weapon, the all-

phaser version is one of the deadliest PF's around. Plus, they can lay web/pinwheel!

7. Kzinti/Klingon PF's. From a functional point of view, the Klingon and Kzinti PF's are virtually identical, with the Kzinti having better phasers, but fewer of them. The primary weapons are disruptors and drones, and require finesse and patience. Very much on the low-end of the PF firepower scale, as PF's go.

8. The Lyran PF. Incredibly deadly when it first appeared, the Bobcat was cursed with sub-standard phasers but twin disruptors on the standard version. Lacking drone racks, its basically forced to rely on its disruptors to inflict damage, while its phasers are usually used defensively. Its sole advantage? Most Lyran fleets bring MANY MANY MANY Bobcats to the fight, so it makes up in numbers with what it lacks in firepower. And then there is the conjectural Federation PF.

Mounting a good number of excellent phasers and a photon torpedo tube, if it existed, it would rank somewhere pretty high on the list; possibly just behind the Orion.

Note that the WYN don't have their own PF design, and the Vudar can bite me.

Oh, and Andro MWP's, the closest thing they have to "Gunboats".

Andro MWP's suck. On ice. In a dirty glass.

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Friday, March 28, 2008 - 08:50 am: Edit

..and Lyran PFs do even worse in an EW environment against Hydrans. They either have enough ECCM to effectively hit the fighters -OR- they have enough ECM to avoid getting killed by massed range 10 fusion fire. The Hydrans have the advantage in that their carriers usually have enough battery power to swing their fighter's EW power in the needed direction, based upon what the Lyrans do in EA and how the PFS swings things.

Sorry, anything that needs to get to range 10 to damage me doesn't worry me. I'd rather see PFs than ships than can sabre dance at R15 and cause damage without me being able to effectively retaliate.

=====

By Kerry E Mullan (Nomad17) on Friday, March 28, 2008 - 09:04 am: Edit

Well andy as your fighters can only ever get 6 ECCM generated from however many sources you want, I don't think r10 fire is going to be doing much unless you mean firing 10+ ftrs at a single pf to hopefully get through the shield.

most of the time PFs of DF races I see run around with 10 ecm 6 ECCM so there is no shift for fire against ftrs and fighters have a return shift of 2 making fire outside of r2 problematic.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike_Grafton) on Friday, March 28, 2008 - 09:15 am: Edit

The comparison of the Lyran PF to the Gorn is moot. The Lyrans are fighting the Kzinti and Hydrans. With a bit of Fed F111/ A20 combat.

And against them, it does pretty well

=====

By Larry E. Ramey (Hydrajak) on Friday, March 28, 2008 - 10:02 am: Edit

The Lyrans PFs come out WAY before the Gorn PF. Look at the environment they are fighting in...

The Lyrans PF is trying to keep the Lyran fleet from getting gutted by a Stinger swarm. The Gorn PFs are trying to stem the tide of the ISC echelons, stop Andro incursions and fighting FH-AXs.

I dunno.... I'd rather be a Lyran PF early in the PF deployment schedule than a Gorn PF facing the Echelon of Judgement. Call me crazy.

I'm not a big fan the Ph-2 on the Lyran PF. I think the eastern races really got shafted on the phasers on PFs, but thats the breaks.

=====

By Andy Vancil (Andy) on Friday, March 28, 2008 - 11:15 am: Edit

Quote:

The comparison of the Lyran PF to the Gorn is moot. The Lyrans are fighting the Kzinti and Hydrans.

How many people play strictly historical SFB? Lyrans vs. Gorns in general is not a mismatch, but the Lyran PFs are. I didn't compare the Lyran PF to others because I couldn't remember their armaments off the top of my head, but they don't come out well against either of them. As Mike noted, the Hydran PFs range from Good to Too Good to Allow. The Kzinti PFs do fine, as they can either hang back and provide drone support, or close behind a wall of drones.

I just think it's ridiculous that the Lyrans are supposedly THE PF race, when their PFs are the worst in the Alpha Quadrant. Sure, they were first, but where's the upgrade that lets them keep pace with everyone else?

=====

By Ted Fay (Catwhoatsphoto) on Friday, March 28, 2008 - 11:25 am: Edit

Quote:

I just think it's ridiculous that the Lyrans are supposedly THE PF race, when their PFs are the worst in the Alpha Quadrant. Sure, they were first, but where's the upgrade that lets them keep pace with everyone else?

Maybe they aren't as good - but the Lyrans have LOTS of them - much more than the Gorn. (Lyrans can bring 12 to the field - Gorns only 6.) There's valid strategic reason for the "cheap, lots" approach over the "better, fewer" approach.

=====

By John A Schneder II (Keltner) on Friday, March 28, 2008 - 12:30 pm: Edit

Mike Strain,

"Don't mince words Bones, tell me what you really think..."

Why can the Vudar "bite you"??

=====

By Jim Davies (Mudfoot) on Friday, March 28, 2008 - 04:29 pm: Edit

Quote:

most of the time PFs of DF races I see run around with 10 ecm 6 ECCM so there is no shift for fire against ftrs and fighters have a return shift of 2 making fire outside of r2 problematic.

But not in the Lyran case they don't, because most of them are casuals with no PFS/PFT support. So they're providing their own EW and have to drop EM when they fire. 2xStd + 2xP2 + HK + Spd30 + EM leaves 2.4 power, so they have only 6 EW + EM total.

As for a late war refit to bring them up to par with the Eastern races, I'd suggest adding a CW-style power pack with 1 APR and 1 battery. The other things that might help (P2->P1, R15 disruptor, casual PF scouts) aren't going to happen.

Regardless of whether the Vudar can bite Mike, they can probably bite the Lyrans. Worse phaser arcs and 1 less hull, but P1s on the leaders and massive crunch power (12 each!!) from the Ion Cannons which can be held and overloaded.

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Friday, March 28, 2008 - 08:31 pm: Edit

Quote:

most of the time PFs of DF races I see run around with 10 ecm 6 ECCM so there is no shift for fire against ftrs and fighters have a return shift of 2 making fire outside of r2 problematic.

Even assuming a standard flotilla (PFL, PFS, 4xPF), each PF can only generate 6 total EW (2 of which have to be ECCM or

they lose 10 movement). The Lyran PFS has 2 channels, but realistically only has 4 power to spend for lending, if it wants to self protect against long range fleet firepower. So, best case, they have 5 ECM + 5 ECCM with the ability to use their single battery to change to 6/4 or 4/6. I'm not counting EM because they'll drop EM to fire their disruptors (i.e., they'll get their shot off but will not have EM benefits when they get shot).

My fighters, between intrinsic EW, ECM pods, and carrier lending can effectively force the issue, being guaranteed their shot with no shift and possibly gaining a 1 shift on the PFs. Not to mention, STM at range 10....

So no, in an EW environment, Lyran PFs do not trouble me (they are admittedly more troublesome from a true PFT, with a scout channel, but not greatly so) as they die to massed fusion fire as soon as they drop erratics within disruptor range.

6 St-2s will mission-kill a PF. As few as 4 will make a PF a shadow of its former self (half of the B row hits are warp).

So no, Lyran PFs don't worry me as they have to risk death to get their shot; Lyran CWs don't.

=====
By Marc Baluda (Marc) on Friday, March 28, 2008 - 09:39 pm: Edit

What are some thoughts on the same comparison of different races' interceptors?

=====
By Tom Carroll (Sandman) on Friday, March 28, 2008 - 11:13 pm: Edit

Quote:

Note that the WYN don't have their own PF design

Yes they do. The R12.PF1 Freedom Fighter. It's pretty good too with 2 P1s, 2 drones and a Disr.

=====
By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Saturday, March 29, 2008 - 01:45 am: Edit

"Yes they do. The R12.PF1 Freedom Fighter. It's pretty good too with 2 P1s, 2 drones and a Disr."

Knew I forgot something.

Well, its functionally identical to the Kzinti PF, so the same evaluation applies.

As for Lyran 'casual' PFs, if the Stingers are shooting at the PFs, it means they aren't shooting at my ships, so they're doing their job.

=====
By Marc Baluda (Marc) on Saturday, March 29, 2008 - 01:55 am: Edit

Andy Palmer: You only get 4xST-2s against the Lyran PF and that is a give of 3 points. I think you are crazy to assert that your Stingers can beat a Lyran PF in a straight up fight (and you should be very careful about the year of battle). If I had time for SFBOL I'd throw the gauntlet down for a challenge, but I don't. I'll beg for a champion of the cause, however....

And remember, I play Lyrans and think that the Lyran PF isn't that good. But it's a PF, and its a cheap one.

=====
By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Saturday, March 29, 2008 - 09:01 am: Edit

Marc. I'm not referring to a straight-up fighters vs. PF fight - I agree that PFs have the advantage there.

I am referring to a fleet engagement in which the Lyrans have 6-12 PFs and the Hydrans have...some obnoxiously large number of fighters (i.e., a pretty typical situation). I am asserting that the Lyrans have a better chance of success by taking more ships and fewer PFS, for the BPV, because of the fact that the PFs have to get within fighter fusion range in order to shoot.

=====
By Michael C. Grafton (Mike_Grafton) on Saturday, March 29, 2008 - 01:32 pm: Edit

Andy:

"6 St-2s will mission-kill a PF. As few as 4 will make a PF a shadow of its former self (half of the B row hits are warp)."
Compare the BPV. IIRC, you are talking about 60 something BPV of stingers vs 35 or 40 (about) worth of PF.

=====
By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Saturday, March 29, 2008 - 02:24 pm: Edit

Michael. Yes, in a fleet engagement, 24 ST-2 (264 bpv with packs) will take a PF Flotilla (268 bpv with refits) out of the battle in one volley; the PFs cannot come close to doing the same in return.

=====
By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Saturday, March 29, 2008 - 04:41 pm: Edit

If you figure that the ST-2s are firing in the 3-10 bracket and are getting a +1 shift on the PFs (easy enough to do since the PFs just need 7 ECM), they "only" do 56 pts of damage (Avg Fusion Beam is 1.16 with a +1 shift x 48 fusion beams).

That kills 1 PF (~37 damage) and hurts a shield on another.

At that point, the Stingers are "dry".

Even without a shift it's 88 damage (1.83 damage x 48 fusion beams) which kills 2 PFs.

=====
By Michael Lui (MichaelLui) on Saturday, March 29, 2008 - 05:44 pm: Edit

Not quite dry. They still have their Gatlings.

=====
By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Saturday, March 29, 2008 - 06:03 pm: Edit

So? It's the fusions that do the damage from R4-R10. The PFs aren't letting them in close enough to get good use from the gatlings. And, if the Stingers are using their WBP's to attempt to close, the PF's disruptors and phaser-2s just got twice as effective.

In any case, the Stingers will not "take a PF Flotilla ... out of the battle in one volley."

=====
By Michael Lui (MichaelLui) on Saturday, March 29, 2008 - 06:17 pm: Edit

No, they won't do it in one volley. But if there is no EW shift, why do you think the fusions are the only thing that is capable of causing damage? I'll grant you the fact that the Fusions cause the MOST damage, but the average damage from 24 Stinger-2s at 9-15 hexes is 16 points from phaser-Gs. 32 if they manage to get to range 8.

So those Lyran PFs are going to have to plan their attack run carefully if it extends over 2 turns. IE: Start their attack run at 16+ hexes to shoot their disruptors.

=====
By Jim Davies (Mudfoot) on Saturday, March 29, 2008 - 07:46 pm: Edit

I estimate that 20 damage (23 after the shield refit) will make a Lyran PF beyond effective use. That's the #1 shield, plus 1 reinforcement, plus 4 hull, for 6 real internals. These include (on average) 3 warp, 1 btty, 1 disr, 1 P3. That'll take a packed PF down to about 3 warp + 2 impulse, rendering it more or less harmless.

So 24 stingers with no shift at R10 doing 48 x 1.83 + 24 x 0.67 = 104 damage will trash 4 refitted PFs.

Return fire, no shift, at R10 does 5.5 per PF. As narrow salvos, this cripples or kills 4 stingers (8 with packs).

Next turn, we have 2 working and 4 crippled PFs against 16-20 stingers with no fusions.

=====
By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Saturday, March 29, 2008 - 08:09 pm: Edit

If the PFs aren't going to generate an EW shift against the fighters, why spend all the extra BPV on the PF-Scout?

=====
By Kerry E Mullan (Nomad17) on Saturday, March 29, 2008 - 11:56 pm: Edit

Andy a few notes on PF EW. As well this is pretty std doctrine for all DF races PFs.

PF generates 4/2 ecm/eccm.

For the scout it normally can easily go spd 15 as it needs to be range 15 to the flotilla and its EW lent to flotilla lends to itself as well. At spd 15 it can generate 2 channels at 6 ecm and 3 plus batt eccm. This gives 10/6 every other turn going 10/8 on the off batt turns.

Ftrs no matter the source can only go 6/6 and the EWF dies quickly. As the PFs are normally operating in the 25 spd range and ftrs in the 14 spd continuous r8 passes are pretty easy to arrange.

=====

By Kerry E Mullan (Nomad17) on Saturday, March 29, 2008 - 11:58 pm: Edit

Right and with a shift of 2 24 stingers do 48 times .67 plus zero from phasers as one shot or a whopping 32 which kills one pf while the PFs kill like 3 stingers a turn.

=====

By Michael Lui (Michaelui) on Sunday, March 30, 2008 - 07:08 am: Edit

Shoot the scout PF first. If it's going at 15 it will be easy to catch after the other PFs shoot their disruptors and Ph-2s. And they can afford to lose a few and save their Fusions for it. Besides, the PFs will not know which fighter is the EW fighter until it turns on the EW pods because they have to be at range 6 to ID them. If the PFs have 10 ECM and 6 ECCM there is no reason to turn them on until the PFS is in range (unless the PFs give them a range 2 or less shot).

=====

By David Crew (Catwholeaps) on Sunday, March 30, 2008 - 09:17 am: Edit

Kerry: I think Andy is discussing Lyran 'casual' PFs (he mentioned this upthread somewhere) so no PFS in his scenario. Not to say what you stated is wrong, but as you've said elsewhere before - whether the PFS (or PFT with special sensors) is present or not makes a BIG difference for direct fire PFs.

Andy is answering the question "You are Lyrans and have 800 BPV for a patrol scenario fleet against an equivalent Hydran fleet. Should you take 6 casual PFs (good Lyran FnE doctrine), or buy another cruiser?" (Andy says... no).

You are answering the question "You have 800 BPV for a patrol scenario fleet against an equivalent Hydran fleet. Should you take a PFT?" which, as you note, is a subtly different question.

Although it is relevant to the discussion, because as we've just lately had noted - the Lyran BCH and DN ARE PFTs - and thus come with the PFS (as against the BC which does not...).

So perhaps we'll phrase the question this way:

"You hve 800 BPV for a patrol scenario fleet against an equivalent Hydran Fleet. Should you include the BCH + PF flotilla (including PFS), or should you include the BC with casual PFs, or should you take the BC, with no casual PFs, with an additional cruiser in support?"

=====

By Marc Baluda (Marc) on Sunday, March 30, 2008 - 12:58 pm: Edit

I frankly think everyone is working with assumptions that most favor their desired outcome. Here are some general calculations that apply for a casual PF engagement of Lyran PFs:

$6 \times 37 = 222$ for 6 std. Lyran PFs with warp booster packs

$22 \times 10 = 220$ for 22 St-2s with warp booster packs and whatever pods they want to carry.

There is no carrier or PFT - or if there is, assume they are busy or their lent EW cancels eachother's out (this favors the Stingers given they have two squadrons to lend to). Also assume that the PFs and Stingers are tasked with space superiority and are planning to engage eachother and are at WS-III and selected optimal pod configurations.

Questions:

what pods do you put on the Stingers (note that speed matters....)?

what do you think EW will look like?

Now run your damage calculations. I figure that EW will be either a 0 shift or a +1 shift in favor of the PFs, but that depends on the pod selection on the fighters (could go up to +2). Try to take the engagement through 4 turns. I think without WBPs we would all agree the St-2s are lunch meat, regardless of whether the PFs have WBP (although that would extend the battle).

Specify whether your tactics work on an open and closed map. For instance, by way of example, one might note that if you have an open map as the Lyran PFs, you could kill a Stinger/turn from R15. You can only do this once on a closed map.

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Sunday, March 30, 2008 - 01:05 pm: Edit

A couple of notes:

- PF disruptors are Range 10, though the phasers can reach to Range 15.

- WBPs are part of a PF's BPV (though you can take a discount for not having them), so they should be calculated as present.

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Sunday, March 30, 2008 - 01:07 pm: Edit

I would assume the Stingers to be, absent a EWF (common with Hybrid-only fighters) configured with 2 EW Pods.

That gives them a speed of 12 (WBPs off) or 27 (WBPs on) with an allocation for Evasive Movement.

The question is: Do the Stingers opt to go with 6 ECM + 2 ECCM, 4 ECM + 4 ECCM, or 2 ECM and 6 ECCM?

=====

By Ken Kazinski (Kjkazinski) on Sunday, March 30, 2008 - 02:22 pm: Edit

David - why do you have to have 6 PF's? S8.34 states you only need 4 PF's.

=====

By Alan Trevor (Thyrm) on Sunday, March 30, 2008 - 03:25 pm: Edit

Kerry;

I've got to disagree with your "pretty std doctrine for all DF races PFs", for reasons that that Michael Lui mentioned. A slow-moving PFS is likely to be caught and killed. I usually play the Tholians, whose PFs are like Lyrans, but better. And the great majority of the time I only power 1 channel because I really don't want my PFs, especially my PFS, running around at speed-15. This means my total EW for the flotilla is limited to 12 total, split depending on the specific tactical situation. But my PFS lives longer that way. Sure, there are times when I'll power both channels on the PFS. But I would guess that at least 75-80% of the time, the PFS is single channel and the entire flotilla is moving 30 (though the PFS is hanging back at longer range). It gives me less-than-maximum EW but I get the benefit for more turns.

=====

By Jim Davies (Mudfoot) on Sunday, March 30, 2008 - 03:32 pm: Edit

I'd been assuming 6 standard PFs with shield refit: $6 \times 42 = 252$. As the Stingers have more to lose from an EW shift, I'd rather assume they'd have max ECCM, and rely on EM and small target mod for ECM. So in the R10 fire exchange, that's 6 ECCM and 4 ECM. The PFs have 2 free ECCM and 2 free swing, but have to power anything else. So I don't see them having more than 4 ECM + EM, which isn't much help. As such, they might as well have 5 ECCM + 1 from battery. Hence no shift either way.

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Sunday, March 30, 2008 - 05:07 pm: Edit

I was assuming a full flotilla (PFL, PFS, 4xPF) but with a PFT that couldn't lend EW (BCH, etc.).

I was assuming ST-2s from on-map Hydran ships.

IME, PFSs that only go speed 15 in this era die a quick death; my PF EW calculations were based upon a faster speed, one in which the PFs can only get, including lending and built in, a total of 10 EW plus a battery for adjustment. They can possibly assure a +1 shift for the fighter fire but are then assured a +1 shift, possibly +2 on their fire against the fighters.

I readily accept that PFs from a fully capable PFT are more capable and can be safely assured of a +1 shift against incoming fire and no shift to their fire on the fighters.

Our discussion, however, began about the BCH. Taking a full flotilla is a lot of points and, my numbers show their effectiveness is not worth the price, compared to a full ship. Taking just 4 standard PFs is an even worse proposition, as they are then limited to just self-generated EW - these PFs are little more than targets against a Hydran fleet. It is the one advantage Fighters have over PFs in the EW area - their carriers can lend EW to them without needing a Scout Channel.

So yes, in a fleet with a BCH, against Hydrans, I think it is a far better use of BPV to take no PFs and take more warships instead. A full flotilla is, at best a wash, while 4 combat PFs alone are not worth their BPV in this fight. This is primarily due to the lack of scout channel on the BCH, preventing its use as anything more than the method the PFs arrived into battle.

=====

By Jim Davies (Mudfoot) on Sunday, March 30, 2008 - 06:52 pm: Edit

For the (BPV, not EPV) price of 6 casual unrefitted PFs + 4 BPV, one can get 2 unrefitted CWs. For 6 refitted, one can get them with the +, p and power pack refits. Whilst the CW isn't my favourite ship, I'd take them instead of the PFs against most opponents, especially in a fleet action. ESGs, phaser-1s and proper disruptors. Decent shields. T-bombs.

=====

By Kerry E Mullan (Nomad17) on Sunday, March 30, 2008 - 09:43 pm: Edit

Andy and Alan and Michael Lui,

Yeah for std PF flotilla doctrin I find that the PFS going spd 15 works rather well actually, as long as you realize its caveats-ie the PFS actually has to manuever at range and must turn to remain lateral and minimize its closure rate. Of course I assume nearly everyone can do this.

Against ftrs whos max speed is 14 normally withuot packs going I do not see how they are catching the PFS who is at range 20-25 from the ftrs(ie PFs are fighting in the R8 area and PFS is 12 hexes behind that front).

I further cannot see how any DF from ftrs that cannot do damage outside of 10 against a 2 shift are going to destroy the PFS so I have no clue how that is arranged. If you are stating that the hydrans would just turn on the warp packs to close the range(for 2 turns) and then use their entire fleet fire to damage the PFS that is doable with the loss of some 12-15 ftrs(most likely 8 dead and 4-7 crippled but note that crippled is as good as dead in most cases). That would still hit the PFS with 18 or so damage which may hurt it severely. But again losing half your fighting force to do so is a little strange.

Of course against seeking races this doctrine does not hold true, but that was not the question.

=====

By Marc Baluda (Marc) on Sunday, March 30, 2008 - 11:42 pm: Edit

At R15 12xP-2s will kill/cripple a Stinger (and consider double damage from WBP on fighters). Stack on P-3s and you have a bit more damage. I think what most people assume is that a PF needs its heavy weapons at R10. It doesn't - phasers are enough at R15 to deal with fighters, but it's a question of time and the Stingers sweating through the attrition to get closer.

The key is EW - what pod configuration, what shift, what range bracket do the PFs choose (they will be faster).

=====

By Alan Trevor (Thyrm) on Monday, March 31, 2008 - 04:29 am: Edit

Kerry;

But your earlier post which I responded to explicitly stated that what you were describing was "pretty std doctrine for all DF races PFs" and I took that to mean you thought this was how all PF races should run their EW in the great majority of circumstances, against most opponents. That's what "standard doctrine" means. A "standard doctrine" doesn't have to be something you do invariably, and I already indicated in my last post that about 20-25% of the time my flotilla might fight slower. But speed-30 and only powering one channel is my default assumption, i.e. my standard doctrine. If you're now saying that you do this against Hydran fighter-heavy forces (presumably not including Hydrans with lots of megafighters) you probably shouldn't have called it a "pretty std doctrine for all DF races PFs" in the earlier post.

=====

By Alan Trevor (Thyrm) on Monday, March 31, 2008 - 04:58 am: Edit

The discussion seems to be causing a lot of confusion (witness my apparent misunderstanding of Kerry Mullen's post regarding standard EW doctrine for PFs) because of the level of abstraction, and because people are working from different assumptions. If the issue of contention is whether Lyran PFs are a good choice against Hydrans, or whether the Lyrans would be better off with "big ship" force, let me make the following (with apologies to Swift) modest proposal.

I propose that we describe a specific tactical situation, an experienced Hydran player (Michael Lui might be the best choice since I assume from his posts that he plays the Hydrans often) proposes a force within the specified limits and then Andy Foster (who has claimed that the Lyrans would be better off with "big ships") proposes a Lyran force for the scenario that doesn't include PFs, while someone else proposes a PF-heavy Lyran force. Andy would then explain why his "big ship" force has a better chance of accomplishing the objectives than the PF-heavy force while the PF-proponent (any volunteers?) would explain why his PF-heavy force has a better chance.

This might make the discussion more informative than it has been to date by eliminating (or at least reducing) the confusion brought about by contradictory assumptions. Does this seem like a reasonable approach?

=====

By Michael Lui (Michaellui) on Monday, March 31, 2008 - 06:44 am: Edit

If you have a Ranger, Lord Commander, or Mohawk you can cycle fighters through their bays to re-organize the squadrons into 12 fighters with an EWF AND a couple Stinger Hs.

Everybody

All tactics are different depending on the situation. If somebody says they will do this then I will do that. If somebody else says that they wouldn't do that but instead do this then I will do something other than what would have worked on the first persons tactics and should work on the second persons.

Realistically, for Lyran PFSs, they will have 6 points of EW they are loaning to their flotilla because they DON'T want to be caught AND K1.751/K2.52 limits them to 1 channel for loaning EW to the entire flotilla. This means that the flotilla has 12 EW points to spend however it wants to. 6/6, 4/8, 10/2, whatever. A Squadron of Stingers with an EWF will have 14 at range 10+. That's 8 ECM/6 ECCM. If the PFs want to shoot at the EWF without any modifiers then the Stingers will have unmodified shots at the PFs. Most likely they will take a +1 on their phaser-2s so they will not be eating phaser-Gs. That's an average of 4 points at 11-15 (if the PFS continuously blinds 1 channel and fires on impulse 32). Note that the p-2s on the Lyran PFs are FA if they want to fire more than 1. They cannot keep the range open forever if they want to do more than 1-2 unanswered FA firing passes because the EWF will be 3 hexes behind the rest of them.

And I wouldn't burn all of my BPV for the maximum number of fighters I could get. A few of them (like the EWF and the Stinger-Hs) would be sporting mega-packs. It is perfectly legal to mix and match mega-fighters and warp-packed fighters and PFs can't tell the difference unless they are well within Hellbore/Fusion Beam range. Except for the fact that some of them DON'T get crippled when taking 4 points of damage (if they hit one of those).

=====

By Larry E. Ramey (Hydrajak) on Monday, March 31, 2008 - 09:52 am: Edit

DF always works.

Drones and Stingers have to cross possible t-bomb areas.

R10 disruptors do face that problem also

1 T bomb can kill a LOT of stingers. It would only take the shield off of the Lyran PFs. A Huge problem to be sure, but not unrecoverable.

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Monday, March 31, 2008 - 11:13 am: Edit

Larry. To be fair, I do not play with the hidden mine rules (except for minefields, which we use rarely).

=====

By Marc Baluda (Marc) on Monday, March 31, 2008 - 01:41 pm: Edit

Michael, heavy fighters (St-H) and standard fighters (St-2) cannot be in the same "squadron" (which inhibits EW lending). Also, can you break down the EW levels for the fighters by citing source (pods, EWF, small target modifier/EM, etc.)

M

=====

By Larry E. Ramey (Hydrajak) on Monday, March 31, 2008 - 01:44 pm: Edit

I'm pretty sure you can't reorganize a fighter squadron on the fly.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike_Grafton) on Monday, March 31, 2008 - 01:52 pm: Edit

Larry, you CAN if you pull your fighters into the bay of a carrier. I believe it is SPECIFICALLY allowed, though I don't have the rule cite in front of me.

=====

By Andy Palmer (Andypalmer) on Monday, March 31, 2008 - 02:45 pm: Edit

Marc. The ST-H is the assault fighter, not the heavy fighter. Did you mean the ST-S or ST-T? (btw, the ST-H and ST-2 are found in the same squadrons).

Larry/Michael. You can do some reorganization that way - I've done it with SRVs, but you are still limited by squadron size.

=====

By Michael Lui (MichaelLui) on Monday, March 31, 2008 - 05:42 pm: Edit

Marc

2 ECM for small target (can replace with 4 ECM for EM)

2 ECM for all fighters

4 ECM for own pods (can be changed if/when EWF is dead)

2 ECCM for all fighters

4 ECCM from EWF

The EWF doesn't have to use its external pods until the squadron needs the ECCM to preserve its identity, but since it should be lagging 3 hexes behind it would be a dead giveaway.

=====

By Jim Davies (Mudfoot) on Monday, March 31, 2008 - 05:58 pm: Edit

You can have something else lag 3 hexes behind to soak the fire. You're effectively down 1 stinger, but the EWF survives until you need it.

=====

By Alan Trevor (Thyrm) on Tuesday, April 01, 2008 - 01:15 am: Edit

I meant to comment on this earlier, but I forgot.

As Michael Lui points out a PFS can only lend 6 EW points to its flotilla, regardless of how slow it flies. The key paragraph is G24.213, as well as the Section K paragraphs that Michael mentioned in his 06:44 am post today. Kerry Mullen and I were both wrong in believing the PFS even could lend 12 EW points using both channels. I used to know that once upon a time, but someone I occasionally play with managed to convince me that you could lend 12 and at the time I just missed the proper reference.

Well, it doesn't change the way I fly PFs very much, since as I previously stated I would generally only use one channel even if lending from both were legal. But I'm a little annoyed with myself for having let myself be convinced of something that I used to know was wrong.

With 12 EW total, the PF flotilla is still advantaged over the fighter squadron with 6 ECM/6 ECCM since the PF flotilla can tailor its EW for the tactical situation. If the PFs need an unshifted shot more than they need self protection, they can always go to 10 ECCM and get that unshifted shot regardless of what the fighters do (assuming no terrain ECM). But if protecting the flotilla is the top priority the PFs can go to 7 ECM and ensure a +1 shift, or 10 ECM and ensure a +2. That would mean they are also shooting at the fighters with a positive shift, but the PFs are the ones who choose whether unshifted versus unshifted or shifted versus shifted is the more advantageous to them under the specific circumstances. The fighters just have to live with the PF's choice.

=====

By Michael Lui (MichaelLui) on Tuesday, April 01, 2008 - 06:19 am: Edit

It basically means that the PFs are shooting with the same modifiers that the fighters are. Except for the PFS which shouldn't be firing at all. It shouldn't even be within 20 hexes of the target unless the rest of the flotilla is within 5.

=====

By Larry E. Ramey (Hydrajak) on Tuesday, April 01, 2008 - 09:52 am: Edit

PFs are probably HAPPY to take a 1 shift if the stingers take a 1 shift.

PFs can reload.

Fusions hate shifts.

=====

By Michael Lui (MichaelLui) on Tuesday, April 01, 2008 - 09:27 pm: Edit

That's why I'd ignore the PFs in a FLEET BATTLE if they want to take a range 15 shot and circle around for another pass. The PFs are there to kill the fighters and protect the ships and they aren't protecting the ships if they take range 15 firing passes. My fighters will continue on towards the ships unless I can actually hit the PFs for a reasonable level of damage. IE: I'm going to use his FLEET as "pinning terrain".

=====

By Richard Short (Richs32) on Friday, August 01, 2008 - 12:54 am: Edit

I need some advice if possible. I am running an LDR CA against a Hydran Dragoon with 2 fighters. I have been badly over matched in every battle. Am I that poor of a player (I AM relatively new) or is this just a bad match up? The best I have come across is to charge in to about 5-7 hexes at high speed with max ECM and EM and Emer Decel. I fire my disruptors at about range 4, overloaded if possible, and then duck and cover while he erases my ship. I don't dare use the ESG because it removes any chance of him missing with Hellbores. Any ideas?

=====

By Michael Lui (MichaelLui) on Friday, August 01, 2008 - 01:07 am: Edit

Take the long game option. Do range 15 firing passes. You have phaser-1s with disruptors he only has phaser-2s. The gats are there to do narrow salvos if the fighters don't launch. HE is the one that should be having problems with you, not you with him.

=====

By Marc Baluda (Marc) on Friday, August 01, 2008 - 01:25 am:
Edit

Richard, why do you care if he hits you with hellbores? ESGs are AWESOME against hellbores. They ADD to your shields. The fact that they auto-hit really doesn't matter. They neutralize his hellbores.

And don't ever EVER e-decel when playing SFB. Forget the rule exists. Go faster.

=====

By Kerry E Mullan (Nomad17) on Friday, August 01, 2008 - 09:25 am: Edit

Um its an LDR CA!!!

Well use your ESGs at R0 to give you 40 armor against any fire. Use 2 p1 at each ftr at r4 to cripple them and then fire the rest at his ship.

Use speed changes to have the time of fire being at OK speed. The turn after fire you can hit him again as he is empty. Do not E-Decel against a non-seeking race, use speed for maneuverability.

=====

By Jeremy Gray (Gray) on Friday, August 01, 2008 - 11:56 am: Edit

Once the fighters are dead, don't be afraid of the close range knife fight either. Charge up the ESGs as a HB shield and close. Centerline him at range 2 and start the fireworks. 4 Disr + 2 ESGs + 4 Ph-1s + 4(!) Ph-Gs should make short work of a ship with all his weapons split between LS and RS.

You want to work on him from range 15, then when you're ready, get in close where those glorious gatlings can do the heavy lifting. Hold him at arms length to kill fighters, then look for the chance to get in to range 2 (preferably on a turn where he has some or all of his HBs rearming). Range 5-7 is really a bad place to take your shot - gatlings are next to worthless and disruptors (without UIM) are less accurate (and don't hit as hard). This is one of the few cases where a Hydran is at a disadvantage in a close range knife fight.

=====

ISC TACTICS

By Gary Carney (Nerroth) on Thursday, July 17, 2008 - 05:48 pm: Edit

I've got a somewhat unorthodox question for ISC players - what tactics, and weapon options, would you use against a Souldra opponent?

(Would you rather take a plasma variant or plump for a PPD-armed ship, and how would you take on the Souldra in either case?)

=====

By Kenneth Jones (Kludge) on Thursday, July 17, 2008 - 06:55 pm: Edit

Assuming Large Squadron or fleet scale, I would go PPD and use my heavy Plasma as Sabots. Souldra have rather weak shielding as such. It's just strong in one place. By spreading out your hits you can smash them easily.

If year permits make sure to use Sabot torps to make it even harder for the Omega speed limit ships to run away. Save your Rear F's to handle incoming shards. Souldra can run at sp31 but it tends to leave them low on shielding. They have shields or speed not both.

Try keeping the range itself open if you can. DMT are kinda funky. But by keeping the range at fleet scale ranges (15+) you can more easily remove DMTs from play. At R16 it takes 15 damage to remove a DMT from play which is 5 less than a comparable plasma torp.

If range starts at extreme then some judicious plinking of the small fry by your massed P1's will be very effective. Since the Souldra P1 equivalent has a max range of 30. At 31+ you could mass fire and maybe possibly (depending on numbers) mission kill a FF or DD.

<EDIT> Made minor change after looking at S rules.

=====

By Andy Vancil (Andy) on Friday, July 18, 2008 - 12:38 am: Edit

Quote:

Souldra can run at sp31 but it tends to leave them low on shielding. They have shields or speed not both.

Souldra ships have pretty good power curves. Their shields are a little more pricey to operate, but not that bad.

Quote:

At R16 it takes 15 damage to remove a DMT from play...

No, it would take 30 damage. And 29 damage would have no effect.

And firing at 31+ could only work in the case of large fleets. Lower levels of shield attrition will be canceled. A Souldra CA, for example, could regenerate up to 18 shield boxes per turn. Even a Frigate could do up to 12, meaning you would need 36 p1s, assuming no EW shift.

=====

By David Slatter (Davidas) on Tuesday, July 22, 2008 - 05:01 am: Edit

Quick comment on the PPD/Andro Issue

You WANT andros to be within range 4 - unless you have already fired your phasers. By being at short range, Andros throw away their main advantage - regenerating PAs, as you simply pick and Andro and blow it up. So the meiotic zone is not an issue unless you were silly and fired your phasers at long range.

Even if you did fire your phasers and PPDs at long range, and the Andros jumped in, ISC ships still have a lot of plasma they can fire, and there is a limit on how many Andros can disdev in at once. Even if you were a real fool and emptied all your main weapons, you STILL have the rear-facing plas-Fs that you will probably be able to use. Admittedly though, the Andros will probably T-bomb them (those plasma-removing T-bombs).

The main issue then is whether the PPD itself is effective. And that is a bigger problem. Andros are very good at HETs, and generally speedy, at least for 2-3 turns. So, you open up with your PPDs on an Andro, and there is no way those PPDs are penetrating the panels (esp given the Disdev) unless you follow them up with long range phasers - a decision that would have to be taken with care. However, PPDs have a great capability to fill panels. I think their main use would be to fire at an Andro mothership. Not as a serious threat, but in the manner that drones are used. The mothership is left with several awkward options.

- 1) Turn out of the fight (note - a drone like effect)
- 2) Continue the same direction with panels facing you having taken a LOT of damage - not really an option.
- 3) Disdev away - job done for you.
- 4) Disdev towards you with different panels facing you - is now separated from the rest of the fleet and under your guns... - seems OK for me.
- 5) Panel shenanigans.

Option 5 is the ONLY good option for the mothership. So all you have to do is time your PPD fire such that the Andro cannot easily do funky panel dumps for 8 impluses or so, and then come back at you with those same panels fresh.

=====

By David Slatter (Davidas) on Tuesday, July 22, 2008 - 02:22 pm: Edit

Of course, firing PPDs at a satship is a waste. After it has hitted, it's highly unlikely you penetrated any panels, probably managing ~40 pts on the front and 20pts on the rear panels, with the satship ending up running from you (assuming 4 PPDs or so). Burning all your PPDs to make 1 staship run away so it can do panel dumps does not seem a good exchange.

Remember - compared to the ISC, the Andros have no guns. Delete the PPDs off a PPD-heavy ISC fleet (say they are fired), and it still massively outguns an equal BPV Andro fleet at short

range. And probably at long range as well (but the andros panels are then more effective to more than compensate). Andros are the sabre-dance masters - and HATE short range.

=====
By Michael C. Grafton (Mike_Grafton) on Tuesday, July 22, 2008 - 05:24 pm: Edit

So you send a G or S torp out to meet the Andro at range 10 to 15. Enveloped would be good.

He either hops it or runs away. If he runs, shoot him in the arse with the PPD and turn off for some more delay building up the degradation. If he hops it, shoot him with the PPD as soon as he lands and shoot another plasma at him to keep him from closing more.

Example

Enveloped S torp shot to hit him at range 15.

He hops it by jumping from range 16 to range 11.

Shoot the PPD right away while he is closing. Use side slips if necessary to get all 4 pulses.

Fire off another S torp right away to hit him at range 5 or so.

Now he can eat a short range S torp AND your phasers AND an F torp to close.

Or he can run. As soon as you see his rear panels, fire a passel of phasers, a bolted F torp and turn away.

=====
By David Slatter (Davidas) on Tuesday, July 22, 2008 - 08:52 pm: Edit

erm...

a) actually , if it is just 1 torp, especially an s, he just phasers it or uses an anti-plasma bomb. Not a problem. Any small amount of plasma against an andro fleet can suffer that fate.

b) Andros rarely want to close anyway. They shoot at range (?8/15 - can't remember TR range brackets) and then turn/disdev/whatever. So lobbing an S at range 10-15 is not going to achieve anything.

Remember, any Andro that goes to range 5 or less to an ISC fleet is in phaser trouble unless the ISC are spread out... The only caveat is that if the ISC has fired all their plasma and PPDs, the Andros may come out on top with a close pass

=====
By Michael C. Grafton (Mike_Grafton) on Wednesday, July 23, 2008 - 10:23 am: Edit

Are we dicussing a BUNCH of Andro ships? Or a mother ship and her brood?

And the Andro certainly DOES want to close to a range where the "guess when I am going to displace" game is effective. If you displace from range 15 and then displace further away, they are going to get the wad (PPDs, Phaser 1s and some bolted plasma) from an ISC force that then turns and uses some space to rearm their weapons. Andro pursuit has to wade through a passel of F torps.

And the number of Plasma Absorbing mines is limited.

=====
By David Slatter (Davidas) on Wednesday, July 23, 2008 - 01:45 pm: Edit

IIRC, Andros are good at range 12 with their TRs. At that range, most plasma is ineffectual. The PPDs are stong, but won't penetrate PAs alone, and the PPD target cold be displaced away. Phaser-1s aren't much cop either, and if they are fired along with plasma, the andros can Disdev in from range 12.

But the TR is good. So, If the andros can shoot at range 12, avoid range 8, and scare the ISC into holding some weapons in reserve, they are on a winner. That's what they should be using their disdevs to effect.

=====
By Gary Carney (Nerroth) on Wednesday, July 23, 2008 - 06:57 pm: Edit

Speaking of anti-Andro tactics - how would one try to take on an Andro force out in one of the cantonments, where a Concordium player might have the likes of the NAX, NCA, NDD and NFF on hand?

Also, can the CBR generally maintain the distance from a pursuing Andro ship well enough to evade being caught and killed, or do the invaders have anything suited to trying to kill those kind of fast ships?

=====
By Kerry E Mullan (Nomad17) on Wednesday, July 23, 2008 - 07:22 pm: Edit

Against an Andro speed means nothing. If you aren't beating him down the andro can easily go spd 31 with a 12 hex jump towards you. Yeah he can probably only keep this pace up for 5 or so turns but by then it won't matter.

=====
By David Crew (Catwholeaps) on Friday, July 25, 2008 - 10:32 am: Edit

Remember anti-Andro tactics really depend on how big a fleet size we are talking. At the single, lone mothership level (BPV wise) the Andros win. For a Mothership + brood it is usually an even fight - tough for both sides. At the two mothership + brood fleet level, galactics (ISC included) win. I'm sure Kerry remembers our little Operation Unity plasma wing stoush - where we Andros were trounced handily. Once galactics can penetrate mothership panels in a hit the Andros have pretty much lost.

So you really need to preface your tactics with what fleet size you are talking about.

Plasma BTW is excellent at sitting in the tubes and forcing the Andros to run around fast. Non-tourney Andros can't run fast forever (especially sat ships). Once the batteries are drained, they slow down and die. Without weasels, the Andros can't afford to slow down.

=====
By Kerry E Mullan (Nomad17) on Friday, July 25, 2008 - 04:44 pm: Edit

Andros effectiveness and fleet sizes do have have competing factors as in the larger the fleet size the Andro has to be taking larger and larger ships to compensate. As soon as normal alphas can penetrate a motherships PAs then the ANDRO faces an uphill battle.

Yeah the operation unity battles were somewhat poorly organized David. Not saying it was anyones fault or such, but when you are facing 1800-2100 bpv of galactics having 1100 bpv of Andros is a losing proposition. An INT cannot handle the damage of a full alpha fleet even if they are only plasma. For operation unity it was a bloodbath for the andros due to fleet composition.

By the same hand if the ANDROs had put 2 DOMs there(like 2000 bpv) against the gallactics the galactics would have faced a much harder battle.

In a more even BPV battle the Andro loses satalite ships quickly but the mothership can cause quit a dent before it gets into any kind of trouble.

=====
By Gary Carney (Nerroth) on Friday, July 25, 2008 - 08:33 pm: Edit

Well, say that a force at a cantonment has an X-BATS, an NAX, an NCA, a CBR, two NDDs and two NFFs, facing an equal BPV's worth of Andromedans.

Oh, for Andromedan players - I asked a while back over in the Andro thread how you have fared agaisnt either Omega or Magellanic forces. If you have any feedback, could you consider posting it there?

=====
SELTORIAN TACTICS

By Gary Carney (Nerroth) on Monday, June 23, 2008 - 06:46 pm: Edit

Pretty quiet around here, I see...

Anyway, here goes:

Have many, if any, Selt players here have had a go at one or more of the Magellanic races, and if so how have you found the going against them?

(With the use of Shield Crackers against Magellanic shielding, it would be interesting to see whether the phaser and particle cannon suites - and the loads of transporters - made such a matchup more advantageous for a Selt player than a fight against an Alpha or Andro force.)

And, for that matter, have any Selt-Omega clashes been tried, and if so to what effect? (I wonder if shield crackers make a Souldra captain's day somewhat more complicated than it would normally be, as far as allocating blocks to shield facings goes...)

=====
By Robert Eddy (Tar_Zhay) on Tuesday, October 14, 2008 - 03:28 pm: Edit

Hi gang...

I need help with this battle.

-----My Forces:

x1 SELT-BT outstanding crew (PH-2's replace PH-1's)
x1 SELT-CA (PH-2's replace PH-1's)
x1 SELT-TUG-mining station as cargo (PH-2's replace PH-1's)
x1 GORN-CC (No refits) Lost 2 rear PH-1 and all hull (from previous battle)
x1 TROBRIN-SC (An FF scout from the Omega Sector) (14 power and two sensors)
a planet with one moon in high orbit has
6 phaser-4 ground bases (controlling 3 captor mines each)
2 packages of mines around the planet
No ground bases are on the moon.

-----His Forces:

x2 FRA CLA (This is the CLA from the FRA Omega sector)
x2 FED-CL (No refits)
x1 DD (No refits)
x1 FED-GSC (No refits)
x1 FED-BT (one heavy pod, no light)
x3 FED-POL (No refits, one w/Leg Captain)

-----Basic summary:

I am technically out gunned and The GSC has the EW advantage.

The problem is that if I attack him strait up I loose a ship in the Initial prox-photon shot (range 23 to 30) and with his EW advantage can't do enough to his ships before I loose another ship on turn 3.

I have tried to lure him to the planet but lost a couple of destroyers and a frigate not listed in doing that.

My current tactic is to force him around the planet to split up his ships, then beat-up on the ships W/o the GSC.

=====
By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Tuesday, October 14, 2008 - 04:02 pm: Edit

Before I can offer much specific advice... map size? Fixed or floating? Current positions and ranges? Those all matter.

Obviously, you need to force him in close to the planet. Are stalemate rules in effect?

In general, ph-4s should be firing every turn at the target they can do something against - even if it's a POL.

If you need to go forth and sally, Erratic Manuevers will be your friend.

Does the Gorn CC have any CDR repairs left? How about EDR/Labs?

=====
By Robert Eddy (Tar_Zhay) on Tuesday, October 14, 2008 - 07:04 pm: Edit

Sorry..

It is a floating map, no time or turn limit.

The game ends when all of the opponent units leave or are destroyed.

No restrictions on exiting direction.

We are currently using four to six standard maps to track our movement.

This current battle my opponent is entering the map from two different locations.

The Planet is at 3015

The captor mines are place 5 hexes from the planet.

Giving them a range out to 20 hexes from the planet

His group 1 is at 0101 units are not placed yet

His group 2 is at 0130 units are not placed yet

the units are the same as above.

So no S1 to S5 Information, We are using All of D17 Tact intel.

My fleet will start at 5015

According to our campaign setup

All between combat repairs are complete.

All current damage is permanent until I reach a repair point and cannot be repaired by any means.

For new damage, all CDR and EDR are available.

=====
By Robert Eddy (Tar_Zhay) on Tuesday, October 14, 2008 - 07:12 pm: Edit

When all of his ships are together;

The EW from the GSC can over power anything I can generate to four of his heaviest units.

That's why I must separate it from part of the fleet.

This is the third in a series over this planet.

also

There have been a lot of comments about these battles on the fed board.

He has taken their advice and used prox bombardment to hurt my ships and I currently need a new tactic.

Since all he does is fly unload photons and disengage hopping to do more damage than I can repair.

=====
By Kerry E Mullan (Nomad17) on Tuesday, October 14, 2008 - 07:25 pm: Edit

Well start off by limiting his offensive power. Hit the target of his that impacts you the most.

Have the gorn CA approach under erratics with max EW after a turn or two it should be close enough to launch at the GSC. Have all the other ships get lent EW, and fire the PCs twice a turn at one or more targets while moving slowly or even spd 0.

Notably at the following priority considering R30 ish: DD, pol, cl. They have the weakest shielding and the most offensive ability. Take his hits as best you can and keep hitting one ship til he lends it a lot of EW then switch to another.

Fire P4s at every opportunity and keep crushing one shield at a time.

=====
By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Tuesday, October 14, 2008 - 07:28 pm: Edit

What Kerry said, but also consider using PFC (Passive Fire Control) on ships that will not be firing soon, to add to your ECM level IF he is just doing prox-and-run tactics.

More later!

=====
By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Tuesday, October 14, 2008 - 07:31 pm: Edit

By my count he has 23 Photons. That's a lot. Even proxing at 30, assuming average rolls, that's 46 damage. More than you can brick up. This gets better if you can force a shift, but that's hard to do when he's got that GSC. Make him earn it; consider hanging back near the planet with 6 ECM under EM with PFC. Even the GSC will slow down trying to loan 6 ECCM to 4 ships.

=====
By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Wednesday, October 15, 2008 - 12:05 pm: Edit

Another thought:

In general I don't think comments on the campaign set-up are helpful to a tactical quandry; they are what they are.

That said, with a floating map, no time limit or stalemate clock, and proximity photons, you are in trouble.

I would avoid playing his game. Stay near the planet. Keep it between him and you. Brick up your facing shield. Use ECM, EM, PFC and any trick you can to deny him the range-30 prox

shot. Make him work for it. Don't play his game - he will win at it - make him come down and engage you, or bore him to death with 100+ turns of not much happening.

Because otherwise, all that will be "happening" is him kicking the crud outta ya. :)

You can take it a step further. Instead of EM, you can (if you keep your ships TACing or at speed-4 or less) use WWs in conjunction with ECM & PFC to guarantee a shift. Just keep the weasel out at low speed or stopped, and be ready to tractor it and rotate it back into the bay for re-use the moment after he shoots. And, don't forget the small target modifiers if he takes the shot at the shuttle.

Another thing you can do is keep your scout behind the planet, while taking two "shooters" out to the side (but still in LOS of the scout). The scout can't be shot, but it loans the "shooters" EW as needed when they need to fire or avoid being shot.

AFTER he shoots, fire all your PCs, Gorn ph-1s, and phaser-4s at a target you can dent. DD, POL, CL... anything. You can wear HIM down over 100 turns instead of the other way around.

Hope that's of some help.

And, in the future, given the setup and rules of the campaign, I would really avoid fixed defenses (at least the mines). If he can ignore them all day, as he seems to be doing, they aren't worth much. Spend your points on ships that can meet him on even terms.

=====

By Loren Knight (Loren) on Wednesday, October 15, 2008 - 12:15 pm: Edit

Wild Sensor Drogues for faster movement.

Fire at high photon to low shield/reinforcement ratio ships.

=====

By Robert Eddy (Tar_Zhay) on Wednesday, October 15, 2008 - 03:29 pm: Edit

Brigman:

As this is a campaign game and it is my planet he is attacking. I'm severely out gunned and He has EW superiority, I feel in need any extra edge I can muster.

I'm going to scrutinize the PFC rules to find an edge there.

Thanks for the advice

Tarzhay

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Wednesday, October 15, 2008 - 03:44 pm: Edit

Anytime man, hope I threw out something you can use.

=====

By Loren Knight (Loren) on Wednesday, October 15, 2008 - 04:40 pm: Edit

Remember that the planet itself is the ultimate ECM (although cloak lets you move, you don't have that). Crippled ships can duck behind and make repairs. It's a good place to make shield repairs while reloading.

=====

By David Slatter (Davidas) on Thursday, October 16, 2008 - 07:03 am: Edit

I have to agree. Use the planet as your shield. He can't shoot at the defences until he's range 5, whereupon your phas-4s and mines will make life interesting. Further, your 4s are effective out to range ~13 even against heavy EW, giving you a 26-hex diameter shield - plenty enough. Bore him to death. If he does strike the planet hard, that's when you pounce with your fleet.

=====

By Steve Petrick (Petrick) on Friday, October 17, 2008 - 11:34 am: Edit

Remember that Erratic Maneuvers and Passive Fire Control do not stack (D19.25), and worse time spent under erratic maneuvers does not count towards the time needed to gain the EW bonus for passive fire control (D19.25). If you are on passive fire control and have been so long enough to gain the EW bonus [32 consecutive impulses (D19.31)], once you start erratic maneuvers you are back to square one to gain the EW

bonus, i.e., when you drop erratic maneuvers it will take another 32 impulses before the EW bonus is gained (D19.25).

The only value you gain from passive fire control while under erratic maneuvers is that you are saving the point of power that would have paid for your fire control.

So if you run max ECM (assuming your ship is not granted extra abilities by a legendary officer or innate capabilities like an Orion's built-in stealth) and do erratic maneuvers you are going to top out at 10 ECM. If each Federation ship puts up its max of six ECCM (again assuming no innate ability to have more ECCM, such as a Legendary officer or advanced technology) the GSC only needs 24 points of power to cancel the ECM bonus for four ships (four points for normal housekeeping, although it could stay behind the other ships far enough to risk operating its shields at minimal level, four points to power the four sensor channels, and sixteen points to lend each ship four points of ECCM). This leaves it twelve points of power, i.e., a speed of twelve assuming it does not arm, or hold, its own photons. It could make speed 18 by lending the EW on one turn (when the photons of the other ships are fired) using its batteries, then recharging the batteries while the of the other ships are being reloaded.

But the point is that you cannot combine the erratic maneuvers and passive fire control ECM bonuses, so unless some other factor is in force (asteroids, dust clouds, etc.) the maximum ECM the Seltorian ships can have is ten points.

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Friday, October 17, 2008 - 04:22 pm: Edit

Good point about EM and PFC, I'd forgotten that.

You can still get to 12 ECM by launching a weasel, but otherwise, that's it.

I'll throw out the other thought, that if you can't fight him off, it may be better to withdraw and fight another day, rather than lose ships AND have him take the planet anyway.

But I think hiding behind the planet and boring him to death is a valid (if boring) tactic considering the unfavorable campaign conditions.

=====

By Robert Eddy (Tar_Zhay) on Saturday, October 18, 2008 - 03:52 pm: Edit

It looks like that may be my only option if he keeps his ships together with the GSC.

But...If I can get him to split up his ships, I may be able to damage the ship away from the GSC enough to make him think he can't take the planet.

=====

By Dale McKee (Brigman) on Saturday, October 18, 2008 - 07:51 pm: Edit

Robert, good luck. Just keep in mind that's it's probably better to lose the planet, and come back and take it later, than to lose the planet AND all your ships. :)

=====

By David Slatter (Davidas) on Monday, October 20, 2008 - 03:13 pm: Edit

I always consider it the duty of the advantaged player to take the initiative when the disadvantaged player is by necessity forced to use boring tactics to stay in the fight. Especially when the advantaged player is the strategic attacker.

=====

By Robert Russell Lender-Lundak (Rusman) on Tuesday, November 04, 2008 - 06:58 am: Edit

It does not matter what you do Robert...

I will exterminate the vile bugs from my planet and re-colonize it for the righteous cause of the Federation :D

Muhh hah hah hah !!!

=====

By Robert Eddy (Tar_Zhay) on Monday, December 01, 2008 - 01:07 am: Edit

Update on the Selt / Fed battle:

After three battles, I've been able to keep his forces split up so that over half of his firepower stays on the wrong side of the planet. His tactic was try to hit a single unit as hard as he could from beyond range 15, hoping for a critical strike (> 50 damage to one ship) and then retreat after I close. This did not go well for him as I had increased my speed to 30 in some cases. This allowed me to get more than one range 15 shot at his ships. He was about to give up.

The current battle was his last hurra. We are in he decided to use the overload and pray tactic. Over load all photons and narrow salvo an alpha strike. Unfortunately for me I saw this a bit to late and currently have two of my ships with all padding removed some weapons hit and shields 1 or 2 down. My CA is in the worst position, in range of his GSC and range 7 of 7 OL photons and 10 phaser-1 (this is going to hurt). There is no way of overcoming his EW. I suspect that I'll have offensive EW of 6 on my CA and all of his ships will be lent 6 ECM. All that are available to fire will probably generate 6 ECCM.

I have a possibility of boarding one ship but won't hold my breath (with a shift of two or three). I think I will reinforce the shield that will be hit on impulse one and go max speed (see if I can lure him into the planets firing range).

=====

By Gary Carney (Nerroth) on Monday, March 08, 2010 - 10:06 am: Edit

Say if someone wanted to run a Seltorian arrival campaign in the Middle Years, having them arrive in, let's say, Y150.

(In such a campaign, one would keep the Selts restricted to what ships they could build and field from the Burning Torch of Vengeance - and for arguments' sake, one might assume a lack of heavy Klingon co-operation and keep the three-boom hulls away from them, too.)

While the Selts would perhaps be more powerful, pound-for-pound, versus unrefitted Alpha ships of equivalent hull displacements, they would have limits on the size of hulls they could put into action.

What kind of challenges might such a Tribunal force offer in such an event?

(Indeed, just how much of a headache would they give the Holdfast of that era?)

=====

By Kevin Humar-Barrett (Cheethorne) on Monday, March 08, 2010 - 12:32 pm: Edit

Why wouldn't the Klingons provide heavy support, in fact did they really provide that much support anyway?

It seems that the Seltorians suffered from a real lack of ingenuity when it came to their ship designs and engineering issues in general, so coming up with the three-hulled ships might not have been very hard for the Klingon engineers. Other than some technical advice like that (and for t-bombs and wild weasels and things like that), I don't think the Klingons gave the Seltorians much besides a barren planet and operational freedom. As for the Tholians, in Y150, they don't have any ships larger than the C-class cruiser, so the Seltorians can field larger ships.

I think the biggest obstacle would be the political situation. In Y150, there is no general war going on and no formal state of war between the Klingons and the Tholians. I'm not exactly sure of the reasons the Klingons never dedicated themselves to destroying the Tholians, but I believe it was because of expected losses and they didn't want to weaken themselves compared to their neighbors (at least until there was a valid reason to do so, like during the General War and rebuilding a pass to the Romulans). Of course, never underestimate the idiocy of Seltorian tactics that dictated sending hulls and squadrons against the Tholians almost as fast as they could be built instead of actually forming a real strategic.

Overall, even with minimal support from the Klingons, the Seltorians would prove to be a huge threat to the Holdfast, which might encourage them to allow the Federation to intervene in their defense, which would likely be enough to stop the Seltorians from winning (since the Federation wouldn't

want to see the Tholians fall to Klingon allies). In the end, a wide war between the Federation and the Klingons might occur or a stalemate might be reached with the Tholians existing only with the support of Federation ships.

=====

By Gary Carney (Nerroth) on Monday, March 08, 2010 - 12:49 pm: Edit

Rather than no alliance, perhaps one might say the three-boom ships need design techniques which only matured at the time of the General War, and were unavailable prior to the development of ships like the D5 (for whatever reason).

In any case, the point would be to limit the access to these ships, and make the Seltorians 'get by' with their M81-derived fleet.

=====

By Kevin Humar-Barrett (Cheethorne) on Monday, March 08, 2010 - 01:22 pm: Edit

I can live with that reasoning.

In such a case, the Seltorians would still have a clear advantage in large hull capabilities, but only if they were patient enough to build up reasonable ship squadrons to use their advantage.

Without the benefit of quickly built attrition units (fighters and especially PFs, which the Seltorians fell in love with), the Seltorians would need to rely on their heavy hulls to win battles against heavily fortified Tholian bases, which means they would need to the time to build substantial numbers of them.

However, as I said, given the Seltorian tendency to attack as quickly as they could, they would probably build a single large hull ship combine it with some small hull ships and throw it against the Tholians. I imagine that given the lack of real ships in the Tholian fleet and the comparable high quality of the Seltorian fleets, the Seltorians would eventually be able to wear the Tholians down using this tactic, but it would take years.

As I said before, the largest unit the Tholians could muster would be the C cruiser and it would have to go against CL and CA cruisers from the Seltorians. In the small ship categories, the two forces are far more balanced, but strategically, I would say the Tholians would be doomed without outside intervention from the Federation.

=====

By Loren Knight (Loren) on Monday, March 08, 2010 - 01:36 pm: Edit

I think you need to simply ask yourself, what level of friendship should one work with an alien species and how fast?

For the Klingons to start sharing all sorts of engineering expertise would require a fast friendship and they don't even have that with the Lyrans.

Promises and overtures to friendship are all well and good but time proves those things out. The Klingons offered some basic concepts like Gunboats and such, gave the Seltorians the basic materials and a planet to keep their promise from.

But don't you think the Klingons asked about Shield Cracker/Web Breaker technology? Why would the Klingons help the Seltorians reengineer their ships when the Seltorians refused them this vital technology?

Pressure of the General War against the Feds and Kzinti was serious and the Seltorians were doing what the Klingons needed; relieving pressure on a less important front (but not so unimportant as to be abandoned because they still needed to reconnect with the Romulans).

Also, the Klingons knew that the Seltorians were masters of an entire galaxy that they had wrested from the Tholians. In other words, the Seltorians represented a potential future threat as a very powerful conquering empire. You cannot take back knowledge, and giving knowledge to the Seltorians means giving it to the entire Seltorian Empire. Such a thing is bound to come back a bit you.

Gunboats were about to be considered obsolete and so facing them in the future, while a problem, would not be insurmountable. Gunboats are a fairly limited technology as

well. However, starship engineering is another matter. That kind of information is not a closed door. In fact, it is a door that swings both ways.

I'm not SVC, and the above is not official. Just my opinion.

=====

By Terry "Full Stop" O'Carroll (Terryoc) on Monday, March 08, 2010 - 05:11 pm: Edit

I think the Klingons were in a formal state of war with the Tholians; certainly, they never recognised the validity of the Holdfast's existence (except possibly after the GW and as a necessary evil for the fight against the Andromedans) and had the Tholian Border Harassment Squadron constantly raiding the Tholian borders.

It is historically known that the Klingons did help the Selts build some ship classes like the NCA and BCH which did not exist in the M81. They presumably also helped them develop transporter bombs, suicide shuttles, and weasels, which were not in use in M81.

The Klinks might have wanted web breakers, but no Milky Way empire ever succeeded in copying ANY extra-galactic technology. So obviously there was some kind of basic issue with that, which prevented it.

What I think would have happened was this: The Seltorians, backed up by Klingon ships, attack the Tholians with massive numbers. (Tholian Border Squadron, Home Fleet, and perhaps some ships from the Imperial War Reserve as well.) The Selt ships are not very numerous, but their web breakers overcome the only thing preventing Klingon victory and the Klinks overwhelm the Tholians in a few months. Once the Tholian Dyson Sphere is captured, the Klingons betray and destroy the Seltorians. The Selts may try to resist or not, but the Klingon numerical advantage is so large that the outcome is never in doubt.

=====

JINDARIAN TACTICS

=====

By Kevin Humar-Barrett (Cheethorne) on Monday, April 14, 2008 - 11:01 am: Edit

I have the old F1 Module. I can see from the above posts what the differences are in general between the old F1 and the revised F1, but I have a few questions about these changes.

- 1) Did these changes cause any of the SSDs to change dramatically?
- 2) If it did not change the SSDs, what is the new energy requirements for the WRG and MRG?
- 3) If the SSDs did not change, is it worth buying F1 again to get the new rules?

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Monday, April 14, 2008 - 11:21 am: Edit

I wouldn't say it was worth it as, even revised, the Jindos are still broken.

Their small metal-hulled ships are OK, but the rock ships still just default to playing "sit-and-spin" as their only tactic. And, if you're playing Jindo, you want to play the rock ships, right?

The Jindarian weapons were added to the MRB rules, so you can use that instead of F1 as a rules source.

WRGs charge for 3 warp power and hold for 1.

LRGs charge for 1 warp power and hold for 0.5.

=====

By William T Wilson (Sheap) on Monday, April 14, 2008 - 09:04 pm: Edit

I'm OK with the rock ships being that way. I mean, it's a rock. You just have to design scenarios appropriately. Don't let the Jindarian take all rock ships. Make him take one rock and two metal or something, then it's better.

=====

By James Hallmark (Jhallmark) on Tuesday, April 15, 2008 - 03:22 am: Edit

Gary,

Isn't it against the BBS rules to answer a rules question the way you just did?

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Tuesday, April 15, 2008 - 06:14 am: Edit

blinks

No...no, it's not.

suppresses urge to kill

=====

By James Hallmark (Jhallmark) on Tuesday, April 15, 2008 - 01:13 pm: Edit

Mike & Gary,

I was intending my comment as a friendly reminder. However I am curious about the rules for this BBS.

=====

By Jean Sexton (Jsexton) on Tuesday, April 15, 2008 - 03:13 pm: Edit

Hi James,

I'm Jean, ADB, Inc.'s WebMom. The rules are over there

<====

under Documentation. The important parts are the Board Posting Rules and Getting Started.

I think of the BBS as the Steves' home. If you wouldn't say something to someone face to face, don't write it. If you wouldn't say it in mixed company, don't write it. If you wouldn't say it in front of someone else's teen, don't write it.

Be polite, don't be rude to your hosts (the Steves) or to their other guests (your fellows on the BBS).

If you think someone was rude to you, you may say so and then contact me or the Steves. You may not respond in kind. It may take me a bit to respond, but I will. (If I am to be gone for an extended period, you will see a notice of that in the Dear Jean topic and you may wish to contact the Steves or another moderator. (See Utilities, Contact.))

Don't do flame wars. They are rude and are not tolerated on this BBS. Please feel free to alert me to one I have missed.

If I delete something, the Steves have a copy 99% of the time. (There are times it is just so obviously needing deleting, that I don't send them the text.) It may take me a bit to compose an email that says what I want it to, but you will get an email explaining where you erred. You may appeal my decisions to the Steves. They may overrule me, but realize that has not yet happened.

Here is the BBS Map (slightly outdated): http://www.starfleetgames.com/documents/BBS_Map.pdf

If you have more questions about the BBS, feel free to ask them in the Dear Jean topic.

Jean

WebMom

=====

By Kevin Humar-Barrett (Cheethorne) on Wednesday, April 16, 2008 - 07:29 am: Edit

I must have missed something, because I have no idea how he answered my question incorrectly?

I suppose he didn't address the question regarding whether the SSDs were changed between the original F1 and the revised.

But is that a rules question?

=====

By Peter David Boddy (Pdboddy) on Sunday, August 03, 2008 - 12:09 am: Edit

I just read that the Jindarians have been changed, and have ordered the new book.

What I am curious about is, how are the bombers handled (are they internal or external?), and has anyone tried a bomber equipped rock? Overpowering? Underwhelming?

=====

By John Wyszynski (Starsabre) on Sunday, August 03, 2008 - 12:22 pm: Edit

Jindarian asteroid ships can carry bombers both internally and externally.

=====

By James Hallmark (Jhallmark) on Sunday, August 03, 2008 - 04:54 pm: Edit

I have not tried it yet but I have visions of taking a Jindarian XBB with bombers against a Dominator.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike_Grafton) on Sunday, August 03, 2008 - 07:07 pm: Edit

What is the date of the Jindo change?

I have the Jindo module, but it isn't "new."

=====

By Kenneth Jones (Kludge) on Sunday, August 03, 2008 - 07:32 pm: Edit

Michael,

ADB revised the Jindarian module roughly 3-4 years ago. It was mostly rule changes. SSDs didn't really change at all. The biggest rules change is that Rail Guns are now 2T arming weapons.

=====

By Stewart W Frazier (Frazikar1) on Sunday, August 03, 2008 - 11:21 pm: Edit

There isn't a BB, there's a DN and XDN but no (real) BB...

=====

By Alan Trevor (Thyrm) on Sunday, August 03, 2008 - 11:25 pm: Edit

Peter,

I believe James Hallmark probably meant the DNX, which is in Module F1. The Jindarians don't have a BB so far as I know. But they do have a DN and, because it is built into an asteroid, they were able to convert it to X-technology. No "metal-hulled" dreadnought could take the stress of an X-tech upgrade. But an asteroid gives you so much more mass and volume to work with.

=====

By Peter David Boddy (Pdboddy) on Sunday, August 03, 2008 - 11:28 pm: Edit

Ah, I know about the DN and DNX... I was just curious, hehe, I have the old F1 from 1994. I just ordered the revised one... and so I had thought that they'd gotten a few new SSDs into it.

=====

By James Hallmark (Jhallmark) on Tuesday, August 05, 2008 - 12:15 pm: Edit

I meant BBX. No it does not exist. But I keep asking for it.

=====

By Alan Trevor (Thyrm) on Wednesday, August 06, 2008 - 12:00 am: Edit

James,

Hmmm... Okay, but I'm a bit dubious that your method of referring to a BBX (or XBB) as if it already exists is likely to actually get one accepted. It's more likely just to confuse people. You might consider formally starting a topic for a Jindarian battleship and make your case as to why it should exist. That (if you can make it sound interesting) should at least get people talking about the idea.

=====

VUDAR TACTICS

None were posted during 2008.

=====

SCENARIO TACTICS

=====

By Ezekiel P. Carpenter-Hyland (Admiral_Zekedak) on Wednesday, April 16, 2008 - 06:31 pm: Edit

I'm setting up for SH81 "Radey to the Rescue", and am looking for advice on commander's options for the Federation CVA group.

Here are the ships in Y175

CVA+, ECL+, 2xDEA, 12xF-14, 12xA-10, 2xSWAC

The need for drone speed upgrades for the first turn is clear, but after that I'm not so sure. T-bombs/BPs/DCs may also not really be needed.

Given that I'll probably lose a DN+, CAR+, CLD+ & DDG+ in exchange for the C9A & D7A on turn 1, I'm worried that spending a bunch will make it impossible to catch up in victory points.

Any thoughts?

=====

By Richard Sherman (Rich) on Thursday, April 17, 2008 - 03:58 pm: Edit

Check your special scenario rules first. There may be additional specific information about what COI you can/can't get.

For drone speed upgrades, in most scenarios, you and your opponent don't have to pay for these; there is usually a rule that says "all drones are considered medium speed" or words to that effect.

As far as other COI, I'd definitely recommend buying your full allowance for extra DC. TB are a good choice too. Because you are fighting Klingons, you will also have to spend some points on BP, or you risk losing ships to capture. Remember the number of transporters he has, and know that the Klingon WILL be buying extra BP.

Lastly, you might consider some Commandoes as well, just in case an opportunity to use one shows up.

Don't forget to save a few points for special warhead on a few drones as well. ECM drones are a good choice, as well as maybe a few swordfish (for offense) or MW (for drone/shuttle defense)drones.

Big scenario...good luck.

=====

By Ezekiel P. Carpenter-Hyland (Admiral_Zekedak) on Monday, April 21, 2008 - 01:38 pm: Edit

All drones get speed 20 for free (Y175), but that will make it impossible for them to hit the stasis ships before Klingon reinforcements arrive unless the carrier goes in to point blank range. As such, I plan to pick up one round of speed 32 drones for the carrier escorts and the F-14s. My real concern is bagging enough of the reinforcing Klingon ships to make up the points lost on turn #1 (I expect something like Fed-450 to Klink-680).

As for this being a big scenario, I played it back in the late 80's from Captain's Log #3, but am now giving the revised version from Module R3 a go. The new set-up puts Klingon stasis ships between the Federation forces while the rest of their ships enter the map edge. As such, the scenario appears to be as much the Klingon fleet rescuing their SFG ships from Radey.

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Monday, April 21, 2008 - 02:31 pm: Edit

I don't think you can get fast drones unless its at least Y178....

=====

By Ezekiel P. Carpenter-Hyland (Admiral_Zekedak) on Tuesday, April 22, 2008 - 02:37 pm: Edit

If that's the case, the Klingons will be in worse off as the C9A and D7A will each have to keep multiple stasis fields active if they hope to score any drone hits before Federation targeting comes back on-line. While I'll leave it to my opponent to work out Klingon tactics, doing so will prevent the SFG ships from both moving AND firing full disruptor spreads. As such, I expect initial Federation losses to be much lower.

=====

By Stewart W Frazier (Frazikar1) on Tuesday, April 22, 2008 - 08:11 pm: Edit

The Klingon player shouldn't forget that atWS-III, he can have (ship launched) drones deployed from a Turn 0 Impulse 28 launch (also applies to CAP fighters).

=====

By Kerry E Mullan (Nomad17) on Wednesday, April 23, 2008 - 09:04 am: Edit

ECH in order to keep the stasis field operational he needs to be speed zero. Most likely what happens in the scenario is T1

the KLI keeps some fed ships in stasis while releasing some to their destruction.

In other words most likely one of the smaller ships will get a couple T4 drones while a sc3 will get the other 4 t4s and their DF will clean up those 2 ships. Scatter launches should take care of a third ship. The following turn the KLI forces will probably start moving after impulse 8 most likely under weasel. Of course in the initial imp he will be hitting a ship with drones and DF before they move off. So the fed forces have to use high spd to get close and threaten the KLI stasis ships or the initial fleet will be blown up for no downside.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike_Grafton) on Wednesday, April 23, 2008 - 10:07 am: Edit

Plus the scatter pack drones closing to range one before the field is dropped should be huge...

=====

By Ezekiel P. Carpenter-Hyland (Admiral_Zekedak) on Thursday, April 24, 2008 - 08:57 pm: Edit

With turn 0/imp 28 drone launch, Klingon speed 20 drones will hit impulse 4, one impulse before any ships released from unpowered stasis fields will be able to fire. As such, I expect these drones combined with direct fire will toast my CAR+ and DDG+. This leaves the DN+ and CLD+ in stasis while the two frigates go free.

As for Klingon scatter packs, there is no way one from the C9A can release before my CVA gets within SWAC range at speed 30 (this would apply to turn 1 drone launches too if some are out from turn 0). A scatter pack launched from the D7A is another story, but I'd bet my FFG will be able to take it out.

=====

By Richard Sherman (Rich) on Friday, April 25, 2008 - 10:41 am: Edit

Without fast drones, I'm not sure anyone gets 0/28 launches. Read the WSIII rules carefully.

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Friday, April 25, 2008 - 11:54 am: Edit

Per (S4.13) "Drones placed on the map at start may not be placed within three hexes of an enemy unit."

=====

By Trent Telenko (Ttelenko) on Sunday, December 07, 2008 - 05:18 pm: Edit

Has anyone had a chance to look at/play scenario SL.269.0 Cost of Division from Captain's Log 37?

It seems to hinge on weapon status as a decisive factor in the scenario set up.

The Federation shows up with a NCS (12xF-18B+, 6xF111 no mega packs allowed by set up), 2x DWR escorts, 1xNCA, 2xNCL, 2xDW, a FFV (6xF-18B+ no mega packs allowed by set up) and a FFR all at weapon status III, speed max, at the 01XX map edge.

The Feds come in with Photons held and overloaded, two administrative shuttles each prepared per ship, and eight fighters on the board, up to 24 fast drones on the map, with the ability to add 32 more by the second impulse of the scenario from ships and fighters.

The Romulans are split between two great houses and two levels of weapon status.

House Pentalion has a police base station (WS-II) at 2214 with six G-II fighters, a series of ground bases on one planet hexside (2215 E) that includes a power base, four GB P-1, two GB PI-F and a medium bomber base with six Cohort-1 bombers all in a power grid at WS-II. None of the fighters or bombers have mega or warp booster packs.

House Pentalion also has space units to include a LAC docked at the BS (WS-I), a Police flag ship (WS-2), a armed cutter (WS-II) and three security skiffs (WS-II) within five hexes of the 2215 planet at speed 3 the previous turn.

House Aurellius has a Commercial platform with cargo pods at 2216 in standard orbit of the planet (WS-I), a Mining facility and

a civilian operations base with two landed seeker skiffs in a power grid on the planet at 2215-B (WS-I).

There is a House Aurellius Prime corvette (WS-II) within three hexes of 2216, speed 1 the previous turn.

There is a House Aurellius SAH with six Tribune PF's within three hexes 2217, speed 3, (WS-II).

There is a House Aurellius convoy, within three hexes of 2216, speed 0, (WS-I).

It consists of the following:

- Large plasma-F armed freighter with command skid, Type-1 self-defense skid, standard duck tail.

- Large freighter, general skid, type-2 self defense skid, standard duck tail

- Large Q-ship

- Small Aux-Scout

- Small Plasma-f armed freighter w/power skid & standard duck tail

- Small Freighter w/general skid and standard duck tail

- Small Freighter w/Type-3 self defense skid, & power duck tail.

The Romulan WS-I units have no shuttle prepared, so all seeking weapons targeted at such units require weapons fire or T-bombs to stop.

The Romulan WS-II units get a single shuttle prepared and a wild weasel is top priority for those units that can have them.

Note as well that the Pentalion Police garrison only gets two lunched fighters & bombers total while the SAH can only launch a pair of PFs.

The Romulans also get reinforcements by House. Pentalion gets a KD4 and a KF4 while Auellius gets a Fast Sparrowhawk(+) some time after turn #3 when either House roles a cumulative #13 using ine dice per turn..

The two Houses get a 30 % BPV bonus for units of the other house the Feds destroy.

The Feds get three cumulative 60 BPV bonuses for the destruction of the Pentalion police Base Station, the Pentalion Police HQ (all bases) on 2215-E and the House Aurellius Dillithium facility (all ground bases) on 2215-B.

These victory conditions force the Romulan players to protect their own units first and the Feds can use their drones to separate the two houses via their targeting.

=====

FLEET TACTICS

=====

By Kevin Humar-Barrett (Cheethorne) on Tuesday, March 25, 2008 - 02:50 pm: Edit

I am playing Lyrans in a non-historical campaign and I am unsure of how to play Lyrans effectively in a fleet battle or what ships to put in the fleet.

One important detail about the campaign is that we are progressing forward in time and ships become automatically available when we reach the year that the Master Ship Chart says they are available. We are starting in Y167 and we are following the S8 restrictions for what can be in a single fleet, but we are not using a modified command rating (so what the ship charts says is the CR is the CR).

I know a fleet needs a scout and a large flagship, and when PF Tenders become available, they are good to have as well (although not as crucial for Lyrans as the DNs can carry a PF flotilla) but beyond that, what is a good composition for a Lyran Fleet?

=====

By comparison, I know how to build an ISC Eschlon Formation and I know a powerful Klingon fleet would have a dreadnought, a scout, and ten D5s, and while the campaign won't prevent that, it is extremely unlikely. So I would like to make fleets that are fairly realistic, but still good (a mix of size-3 and size-4 ships, led by a size-2 ship).

Should a Lyran fleet contain a Mauler? Should it have a fleet carrier and its escorts? Is the Lyran War Cruiser a good unit to use in a fleet (it has relatively few Phaser-1's)? I just don't know the answer to questions like these.

Also, what kind of formation should a Lyran Fleet use? The ESGs seem to make fleet formations difficult to use. I already know general fleet tactics, so what I am primarily looking for is specific information on what the Lyran take on fleets is.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike_Grafton) on Tuesday, March 25, 2008 - 03:02 pm: Edit

Kevin

- 1) The Lyrans have a BUNCH of excellent scouts, including the CWS and SR with a Scout pallet (or PFT pallet).
- 2) The Lyran early ships are nothing to brag about, but they can be converted UP in size to the next class and then they become very competitive.
- 3) The Lyran Carriers, despite the history, are not bad at all. The escorts are pretty average.
- 4) The Lyran Leader classes (DWL and CWL) are every bit as good as the next class up (the DWL compares to the CW and the CWL to the NCA).

=====

By Jim Davies (Mudfoot) on Tuesday, March 25, 2008 - 05:00 pm: Edit

It depends a lot on who your opponents are. If you're up against plasma, you'll need fast ships (eg war cruisers with power packs). If Gorns, take carriers for the drones. If Roms, ESGs are good for subhunting and NSM-sweeping. Unless your opponents have a lot of drones or hellbores, the ESGs won't see much use until you get to knife-fighting range, by which time the fight has degenerated into a furball so you should be able to use them normally. Just remember to allocate tractor or you'll see your own ESGs being used on your own ships.

=====

By Jeff Laikind (J_Laikind) on Tuesday, March 25, 2008 - 05:50 pm: Edit

A carrier is likely to be your only source of ECM drones, which may also be of help against some opponents.

=====

MAGELLANIC TACTICS

By Gary Carney (Nerroth) on Friday, July 04, 2008 - 03:06 pm: Edit

I tried asking elsewhere, but maybe here is a better place for it: What kind of tactics, if any, have players found useful when flying the Y-era Eneen and Baduvai fleets, and does either fleet stand up moderately well against a W- or Y-era fleet from the alpha Octant?

=====

By Ken Burnside (Ken_Burnside) on Saturday, July 05, 2008 - 10:13 am: Edit

Gary: For the Eneen, you're more or less flying Feds with wierd shielding. The Y-era Baduvai are lobbing swarms of mass drivers.

The usual tactics of "concentrate fire" apply.

You can see why the Eneen pushed the Baduvai back, and why the Baduvai, with full warp technology and CPAs, made up most of that difference in short order.

=====

By Gary Carney (Nerroth) on Saturday, July 05, 2008 - 10:18 am: Edit

Well, it does certainly look like the Eneen, with the heavier hulls and weapons, would be the more likely of the two to hold their own against W- or Y-era Alpha fleets - but has that been your experience, or are they too disadvantaged in comparison?

=====

By Gary Carney (Nerroth) on Sunday, July 13, 2008 - 08:37 am: Edit

When it comes to flying Eneen fleets in the era after the inset of TL12 technology, but prior to the commissioning of the Eneen 'war' classes, what would be a good means of getting the most out of the kind of fleets that an Eneen player would have to depend on?

Or, to be more precise, one could presumably use a small force made up of CLs, BDDs and DDs equipped with forward-firing NBs in a doctrine predicated on the use of these ships' forward-firing firepower (which, by and large, the Eneen wanted to escape, given the lessons taught by the Baduvai use of CPA-armed warships) - but when it comes to larger fleets led by a CA, how best can the Eneen cope?

=====

By Kevin Humar-Barrett (Cheethorne) on Wednesday, March 26, 2008 - 09:40 am: Edit

Thanks for the advice so far.

My opponents are Hydrans and Kzinti (fairly typical for a Lyran).

Against Hydran fleets, my ESGs will be really good barriers to his Hellbores.

I like the idea of using my carriers for ECM drones for my fleet.

=====

By Ezekiel P. Carpenter-Hyland (Admiral_Zekedak) on Friday, March 28, 2008 - 06:43 pm: Edit

While maulers are good for hitting high value targets, particularly slow or immobile ones, I would make sure I had a well devised plan before investing in one for an open space battle. Getting a mauler to deliver more damage than a standard CA or CW in these situations requires the fleet to be organized around this unit. Using a mauler properly will also probably get it killed. The trick is to be flexible and take advantage of the distraction it makes.

=====

By Vincent Matteo Ferrara III (Vincentferrara) on Saturday, March 29, 2008 - 09:36 am: Edit

If you want to avoid cheezy munchkin fleets, here's an idea:

1. Each player takes a fleet from the Admirals Game. Maybe add some CWs, DWs, NCAs, etc. Or come up with some other ship list that will include a variety of ships.
2. Each player divides his fleet into six groups.
3. Roll a die to determine which of those groups you will play in the battle.
4. To avoid a player short changing one or two of his groups in order to stack the others, hoping the gods of the dice will be kind, your opponent has the option of forcing one re-roll if he doesn't like the fleet he will be facing. If that same fleet comes up again - well, those are the breaks. At this point you've had two chances to get stuck with your all FF group.

=====

By Kevin Humar-Barrett (Cheethorne) on Wednesday, April 16, 2008 - 03:40 pm: Edit

I'm not specifically looking to eliminate cheeze munchkin fleets, I am trying to find a good, balanced fleet to build for the Lyrans. The Jagdpanther Light Cruiser seems like it would be really good in a fleet battle. Not only is it available very early and has all the flexibility that six NWO boxes give it, but it has 3x Disruptors and 8x Phaser-1's, which is far better than the War Cruiser.

It has slightly less power and definitely less shielding, but it is cheaper and in a fleet battle, I would assume that there are either bigger targets to go after (like command cruisers and a dreadnought) or smaller targets to go after (scouts and war destroyers mostly). So it should fit perfectly into a large fleet engagement.

I'd probably build a large, balanced fleet like this:

- 1x DN
- 1x Scout (a CWS, DWS, or SC)
- 1x CA
- 3x JGP (Jagdpanther)
- 2x DWL
- 4x DW

As for organizing the fleet, I still don't really know. I guess something involving a couple of clusters of ships in a few hexes so that all the ESGs of one cluster can be used to protect all the other ships in the same cluster.

It might be harder to do than have every ship in the same hex, but in that lay out, blowing up one of my war destroyers, will damage every other ship in the fleet and that just seems like a bad idea to me, but I still want to use clusters to use my ESGs to best effect.

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Wednesday, April 16, 2008 - 04:28 pm: Edit

I'm not sure that's really a "large, balanced fleet" as it has only 1 Cruiser (two with the Scout). You generally see more than that, so this is kinda unusual.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike_Grafton) on Wednesday, April 16, 2008 - 05:00 pm: Edit

Actually, the Lyrans SHOULD be historically short of CAs. With conversions to DNs, tug builds and such they should be wallowing in lots of CW based hulls (CW/ NCA/CWL).

The CWL is almost as good as the CA or NCA.

And if you want an UBER MC 1 ship, take a combat tug with a battle pallet. About the equal of the BC IMHO.

=====

By Ezekiel P. Carpenter-Hyland (Admiral_Zekedak) on Wednesday, April 16, 2008 - 06:14 pm: Edit

Looks like a reasonable fleet, tho having three JPG's and no CWs/just 1 CA is a bit odd from a -historical- perspective. But it's your fleet so hay...

I noticed the ship filling your scout slot is wide open. I suggest getting the best one you can, even if you have to downgrade a JPG in the process. Lyran ships can be power starved, so having a strong scout is a big help.

=====

By Tos Crawford (Tos) on Thursday, April 17, 2008 - 12:58 am: Edit

You do realize that they only built two JGP historically, right?

=====

By David Slatter (Davidas) on Thursday, April 17, 2008 - 05:54 am: Edit

I don't think I've ever seen an F&E battle featuring both of the Lyran JGP. And it should be bourne in mind that the chief function of the single, early-war JGP is usually as the first Lyran (non-auxiliary) carrier.

=====

By Kevin Humar-Barrett (Cheethorne) on Thursday, April 17, 2008 - 09:01 am: Edit

So a more historical layout would replace the 3 JPG's with a CWL and 2 CWs?

I realize that the Lyrans didn't build a lot of JPGs historically (although they probably should have).

Does the number of size-3 vs. size-4 ships look about right or is there too many of war destroyer ships?

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Thursday, April 17, 2008 - 09:49 am: Edit

Most GW fleets would be nominally (i.e. the "By the Book" TO&E (Table of Organization and Equipment) something like:

DN

CC

2xCA

CWL

2xCW

3xDD/DW/FF/FW

Scout

The small ships are there as "screen". The big ships (CA, CW hulls) do the heavy lifting.

Now, based on what's actually available, all of this changes.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike_Grafton) on Thursday, April 17, 2008 - 03:11 pm: Edit

The problem with building a lot of JGPs is every one built is one less CL hull to grow up to be a BC (and eventually a BCH)!

=====

By Richard Sherman (Rich) on Thursday, April 17, 2008 - 04:06 pm: Edit

I think you can justify taking one JGP, but not more than that. Gary Bear has the gist of it, so an S8-legal group could be:

DN

CC (or BT?)

CA

CA (or Mauler or CV other combat variant)

CWL

CW

JGP (configured as a carrier or commando ship or ???)

DWL (or DWA if a CV is taken)

DW

DW (or DD or FF or MP?)

CWS (an excellent scout)

=====

By Tos Crawford (Tos) on Thursday, April 17, 2008 - 05:00 pm: Edit

But in the case of the Lyrans you have early GW and late GW. Early GW the catamarans are common, late they are rare, having been converted to X or built/rebuilt as trimarans. So Richard's fleet would seem to be a good early GW fleet, but by late GW the Lyrans would prefer to field something like this:

DNH

BCH + 6 PF

CCX

BC

NCA

CWL

CW

PFW + 6 PF

DWL

DWV + 8 Z-YC

DWA

CWS or SCX to taste

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Thursday, April 17, 2008 - 05:48 pm: Edit

Ah, the joys of rule nitpicking.

Tos, nice fleet. Not sure it's legal.

1. You have 3 (infamous) PFTs, one too many under (S8.34): the DNH, BCH, and PFW.

2. You don't have enough followers for the CCX as, under (S8.361) only the NCA qualifies. (No listing in the rule for the BC to qualify to follow a CC.)

3. You don't have enough followers for the CWL as, under (S8.361), neither the PFW nor the CWS count to fulfill it's followers.

4. Looking at #2 and #3, above, the DWL can't be taken due to (S8.362) the larger ship's leaders don't have full followers.

=====

By Tos Crawford (Tos) on Thursday, April 17, 2008 - 07:19 pm: Edit

1) SVC just ruled that the Lyran DN's could eschew the PF requirement.

2) The CCX is not a CC, it's the standard X-tech heavy cruiser (their being no CAX). A closer reading of (S8.48) leaves the intent in doubt.

3) OK, you got me on that one. Didn't know I couldn't count my non-combat units.

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Thursday, April 17, 2008 - 07:45 pm: Edit

1. The DN can eschew the PF requirement by declaring that it never received the PFT refit. The DNH does not have that option.

2. (S8.48) "Races without a noncommand heavy X-cruiser may substitute CCX ships for CAX ships in a squadron of three heavy X-cruisers."

This means you can use a CCX to satisfy the leader requirements of another CCX. But, in this case, you are using it as a Command Cruiser. You could get by (with a bit of

munchkinism) by having two CCXs and a NCA and have one CCX "following" the other using (S8.48).

=====

By Tos Crawford (Tos) on Thursday, April 17, 2008 - 07:47 pm:
Edit

Oddly I think I can get around the CCX leader question by making the CCX the flagship.

=====

By Tos Crawford (Tos) on Thursday, April 17, 2008 - 07:48 pm:
Edit

Gary, you didn't read SVC's comment far enough:
"Historical data indicates that at least one Lyran DN (later refitted as a DNH) was never given the PFT refit"

=====

By Tos Crawford (Tos) on Thursday, April 17, 2008 - 07:57 pm:
Edit

For purposes of (S8.36) I would tend to think of the BC as an early NCA, and therefore legal to be led.

I've asked both of these question in the question on ships topic. Please review my question and clarify if necessary.

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Thursday, April 17, 2008 - 09:08 pm:
Edit

Tos, I read all of SVC's comment on the Lyran DN/BCH PFT issue.

In his own words, applying to the original writing of the rule, "my traditionally sloppy rules writing, the rule didn't portray what I thought I meant" has struck again in this case and I hope that this gets rewritten for official publication.

There is too much vagueness, internal contradiction, and unresolved game balance issues in the referenced ruling.

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Thursday, April 17, 2008 - 09:10 pm:
Edit
OK.

I posted my take on the CCX/Follower issue.

There's noting that I see that needs any clarification on the Lyran BC-as-follower item.

=====

By Kevin Humar-Barrett (Cheethorne) on Friday, April 18, 2008 - 10:09 am:
Edit

I didn't realize that there should be so few size-4 ships.

I knew the various empires didn't really like them that (easier to kill than a cruiser and not enough firepower as a cruiser), but I figured that each empire would be forced to field a considerable number of them simply because they could be built faster and easier than bigger ships.

Which would also explain why they fielded war destroyers and then heavy war destroyers because they didn't have the numbers to group so many cruisers in one place.

So my proposed fleet would probably replace two or three of the war destroyers with more cruisers. And then I would have options of replacing a few of my cruiser hulls with things like carriers, maulers, PF Tenders, etc.

As for the S8 rules, if battle cruisers (but not BCH's) are not grouped with heavy cruisers for purposes of fielding command cruisers, how do the Klingons use their D7 Battle Cruisers?

=====

By Tos Crawford (Tos) on Friday, April 18, 2008 - 11:00 am:
Edit

Kevin, you may benefit from an F&E perspective on your question as you have moved from tactical considerations into strategic considerations.

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Friday, April 18, 2008 - 11:07 am:
Edit

The BC being referred to is the Lyran BC, which is a different hull than their CA-hull class. Don't confuse that with any ship that has "Battlecruiser" in it's text name (like the D6, D7, and Kzinti BC).

Klingon D7s are lead by D7Ls.

The reason for so few SC4 is that they don't survive long in full fleet combat. Their use is in smaller actions and the "pinning" type operations (see in F&E).

Fleet Tactics

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike_Grafton) on Friday, April 18, 2008 - 11:37 am:
Edit

And C7s.

The C7 rocks!

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Friday, April 18, 2008 - 11:40 am:
Edit

Huh? The C7 isn't a command ship. Flagship often, yes, but it doesn't get "followers" for purposes of (S8.36).

=====

By Tos Crawford (Tos) on Friday, April 18, 2008 - 01:01 pm:
Edit

Its not a leader, but is 'command ship' defined?

=====

By Gary Bear (Gunner) on Friday, April 18, 2008 - 01:45 pm:
Edit

(S8.36) is titled (S8.36) LEADERS, COMMAND SHIPS:, so I'd say it's interchangeable.

<edited by author>

=====

By Tos Crawford (Tos) on Friday, April 18, 2008 - 01:50 pm:
Edit

Cool. I'm just in the habit of referring to a CC, CWL or DWL as a leader so the usage was new to me.

=====

OMEGA TACTICS

=====

By Gary Carney (Nerroth) on Thursday, July 17, 2008 - 05:51 pm:
Edit

I asked the other half of this question over at the ISC thread, but I guess I'll add this part here:

If you were a Souldra captain (or squadron commodore) taking on an ISC ship/squadron, be it focussed on plasma or PPD variants, how would you try to take the Concordium force on?

=====

By Andy Vancil (Andy) on Friday, July 18, 2008 - 12:23 am:
Edit

One-on-one should be OK, but the larger the forces, the more the battle tilts toward the ISC. Your strengths are that you are good at long ranges -- even at range 20, a DMT is hard to shoot down, and you have a lot of them. If you can spread PPD damage over a lot of shield banks, you can regenerate a lot of the damage.

On the down side, the ISC is also good at long range. Against normal shielding, the large damage output of the PPD is mitigated by the fact that it is spread over several shield facings. Against soul shields, you run into the problem that you don't have very many total shield boxes, so even if you have them all on the right facings, there might not be enough of them. Things get really bad when you start facing EPTs.

If you can stay in the sweet spot, around range 18-22, where his weapons have dropped off a bit but your DMTs are still good, then things should go well. If he tries to charge in, you can counter-charge, unloading everything, and then phasing out.

=====

By Gary Carney (Nerroth) on Sunday, July 27, 2008 - 07:04 pm:
Edit

Thanks for that, guys.

Another question - if leading a large Iridani fleet against an Andromedan or Souldra battle force, what would be the best means of bringing the Invaders to heel?

(I'm assuming none of the B-variants are present.)

Also, how does the Man-O-War compare to other battleships in the game?

=====

By Gary Carney (Nerroth) on Friday, August 08, 2008 - 07:16 pm: Edit
Hi guys.

There's a discussion going on over at the FC forum, in which the matter of the Souldra use of Shards has arisen - particularly, which (if any) Shard types are 'essential' to Souldra tactics... or, at least, in the case of trying to convert them to Fed Commander.

On the one side, it is argued that the Souldra only need the use of the vampiric Black Shards to be both characterful and effective (in the way that the Hydrans only need one Stinger type in FC) and that the other Shards should, at best, be left to Borders of Madness, along with the likes of the CV.

On the other, it's argued that the Black Shards are not enough - that the Souldra ships are not effective enough without also keeping either Red or Violet Shards on the table.

Personally, I'd lean towards option A - but for those of you more familiar with using them in games of SFB, which side would you favour - or is there another option worth considering?

=====

By Glenn Hoepfner (Ikabar) on Friday, August 08, 2008 - 08:25 pm: Edit

And might I suggest, if you have any comments to Gary's post, do so at the FC forum to avoid duplicate like discussions.

=====

By David Jannke (Bigslowtarget) on Sunday, December 07, 2008 - 02:58 pm: Edit

Ran a 900 point fleet battle with Chlorphon vs. Trobrin yesterday twice: once open map, once closed. Fleets: Chloro 8 CA, Trobrin 1 DN, 1 CC, 2CB, medium scout carrier no fighters.

Result was different in nature, but identical in final result for both fights - a Trobrin stomping.

Both sides seemed to agree that neither had made any major mistakes. The first round the Trobrin were a bit surprised by the SC quick built asteroid field, but implemented standard following and damage mitigation results to avoid damage. The second time they were able to maintain speed through the asteroids by use of tractors and properly adjusting to the speed breakpoints. The SCs did make torps pretty pointless and the fleet was able to cast 84 hexes of asteroids every turn so maneuver was ...challenging.

So, tactics recommendation? You can probably win pretty much any open space battle against an opponent who uses shields and normal movement at 350 bpv or higher by taking as many 108 point CAs as you can and trying to maintain range 23-30. Your auxiliary weapons will neutralize seeking weapon threats and help maintain the range. Don't bother getting a scout, your phasers don't need it.

=====

By Andy Vancil (Andy) on Sunday, December 07, 2008 - 03:51 pm: Edit

Note that the BPV of the Chlorophon CA is 118. This was in the errata and the Omega MRB.

For the BPV, the CA is still nasty. Even better in some ways is the DD, with 75% of the CA's phasers for 2/3 the BPV.

I would not want to fly against a Chlorophon fleet in open space, especially with the Trobrin. In general, the Phons are very effective in their historical role, in that they can convince enemy fleets to leave. They are less effective on the offensive - when it comes to actually destroying opponent ships, they have a tougher time. If the Phons were attacking a fixed Trobrin installation, the battle would be a bit tougher for the Phons.

=====

By David Jannke (Bigslowtarget) on Sunday, December 07, 2008 - 11:18 pm: Edit

Thanks for the update on the BPV - seven instead of eight might have made a difference.

The trick seems to be that they can keep their distance and still do energy efficient and shield piercing damage.

=====

By Paul Stovell (Pauls) on Monday, December 08, 2008 - 05:54 am: Edit

David,

The Phon won't do so well against more direct fire (DF) race like the Maesron or Kolighar that don't have to chase the range. Although the EH is good depending on the size of forces the DF races may have enough firepower to down a shield and do internals whereas the Phon merely down shields this can be a loser to the Phon in the long run. That said at 900 points and an open map the Phon are very strong.

=====

ATTRITION TACTICS

=====

By Ezekiel P. Carpenter-Hyland (Admiral_Zekedak) on Monday, March 10, 2008 - 07:27 pm: Edit

And another four months have come and gone...

Here are reports on my PF campaign using the U9 rules from the K module. I am playing the ISC vs. Romulans just after the civil war in Y186 (see posting on August 28, 2007 for background).

Round 1 battles

Sector-2

ISC: 1xDD, 1xflotilla (2x phaser variants)

Romulan: 1xSkH-A, 1xCenturion flotilla (no variants)

Results (ISC victory)

ISC: Sunk-1xPF; Crip-1xPF

Romulans: Sunk-1xSkH-A, PFL, 2xPF; Crip-1xPF (just all weapons)

Comments

The ISC won by absorbing seeking plasma and returning with bolts. A misread on plasma firing rates (2 can be launched on the same impulse, not just after an 8 impulse delay) might have allowed these tactics to work. In any case, I would not try it again without the phaser variants.

Plasma supply is a real problem for ISC PFs, requiring reload breaks as early as turn 2. As such, I see them being hard pressed to ever drop their warp packs.

Daisy-chain PF explosions are a real danger. These little units make a big pop. Still, it is hard to spread them out in plasma vs. plasma flotilla duels

Regular Fleet units MUST work hard to stay in formation. This was death for the SkH once Romulan PF numbers dropped off.

Sector-3

ISC: 1xCL, 1xFlotilla (2x plasma-D variants)

Romulan: 2xSeaH-A, 1xCenturion flotilla (no variants)

Losses

ISC: Damaged-1xCL

Romulan: Sunk-1xPFL, 4xPF, Damaged- 1xPF

Comments

The Romulans adapted the ISC approach of plasma bolting, but fired only on the CL. The ISC used a combination of bolting/phasers to cripple followed by seeking-F/D kills.

Reducing enemy flotilla firepower is critical. While the CL was nearly crippled (and should have been but for missed bolt narrow-salvoes from both Seahawks), the ISC firepower quickly became overwhelming.

Seeking plasma-Ds are really hard to use in high-speed battles against plasma enemies. They were handy for bolting, not counting against PF bolt limits, when a few extra damage points were needed.

Remaining

Sector-4

ISC: 1xFlotilla (standard)

Romulan: 1xSpH-A, 1xStarhawk flotilla (modules unknown)

Comments

ISC hope to kill one Starhawk in exchange for no more than 2 of their own PFs. This will have campaign significance, leaving

the Romulans with an understrength flotilla after reinforcements.

=====

By David Slatter (Davidas) on Wednesday, March 12, 2008 - 10:23 am: Edit

Have you tried towing the scout PF with the ship? That allows it to lend 6 EW points to the flotilla (which includes itself IIRC), and 6EW points to the ship, for a minor reduction in ship speed.

Or is that illegal?

It may not be such a great tactic in plasma ballets where speed is vital and plasma is little affected by EW, but for direct-fire exchanges, with the main part of the flotilla ~10 hexes in front of the ship, enjoying top whack EW protection.....

=====

By Alan Trevor (Thyrm) on Wednesday, March 12, 2008 - 12:36 pm: Edit

David Slatter,

I can't site the exact rule (I don't have my books handy) but I'm about 85% confident that a PF scout can loan EW to its flotilla (including itself) or its tender. but it can't do both at the same time, even with two scout channels.

=====

By John A Schneder II (Keltner) on Wednesday, March 12, 2008 - 02:51 pm: Edit

David Slatter,

K1.752 prohibits the scout PF from lending to both the flotilla and the PFT, even with separate channels.

=====

By David Slatter (Davidas) on Thursday, March 13, 2008 - 12:08 pm: Edit

Oh well - guess the tender can always loan to itself - IF it has the power. Is that what is happening? PFS and PF/PFL go at max speed, or close to it, with PFS loans to the floatilla with all its spare energy? Meanwhile, the PFT goes slow, hangs back, perhaps lobs some defensive plasma, and puts up as much EW as it can? OR is this all a high speed plasma-ballet type thing, with the PFT simply trying to stay out of trouble as it is at the wrong end of the EW equation?

=====

By Trent Telenko (Ttelenko) on Saturday, March 15, 2008 - 04:23 pm: Edit

Has anyone played SL162.0 "Things aren't always as they seem" from CL #17?

The set up is a Klingon Gunboat flotilla jumps a Federation police convoy of two small armed freighters, a SAV with 12 F-18, a small q-ship and a police cutter.

All units are weapon status zero because the Gunboats are sneaking up on the Feds and the feds are stood down from trying to nail an Orion raider.

The Gunboats have only speed 20 type I drone and the G-1L has a scatter pack of six type-IM drones.

The Federation cutter has a full load of t-bombs and the SAV has an MRS shuttle.

The Feds can buy special drones and commanders options with up to 25% of their drones being fast drones.

The gunboats have warp packs and the Federation fighters and shuttles don't.

=====

By Scott Tenhoff (Scottt) on Thursday, April 03, 2008 - 10:29 am: Edit

I'd like to get other's opinions on capturing PFs.

Does it happen often, (I assume not), but if you try, how successful are you?

Reading the rules, it's stacked severely against the boarder.

1) Only 1 enemy BP allowed

2) 1 Defending BP

3) 1 militia called up

4) The control space can be given up (yeah the ship become uncontrolled) for BP damage.

So it sounds like its extremely hard to capture a PF quickly.

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike_Grafton) on Thursday, April 03, 2008 - 11:19 am: Edit

Well, you FIRST need to do a Hit &Run Raid(s) to kill the darn control space.

THEN you board and fight it out until you can kill the other guys BP. IIRC, uncontrolled ships cannot self destruct.

Otherwise the darn PF has too many chances to run around, play shield games and such.

=====

By William T Wilson (Sheap) on Friday, April 04, 2008 - 02:19 pm: Edit

There's no real value in destroying the control space with a H&R raid first. Uncontrolled ships can still self destruct, and you always have one designated "temporary control station" even if your control spaces are all destroyed. Defenders gain no advantage from their control station (not even Klingons, whose PFs don't have security, IIRC).

Converting a crew unit to militia is an option. This still does not guarantee you will win, as it is still possible for 2 defending BP's to roll 0 casualty points (or for the capturing ship to beam over another boarding party next turn) leaving the issue still in doubt.

If you convert a crew unit to militia, the PF will be undermanned. Being undermanned is extremely bad, worse than being uncontrolled.

Giving up your last control space (even the temporary one) as a casualty results in the ship being captured, not uncontrolled, so probably you would not want to do this. The determining factor for capturing the ship is the last control space, you do not need to kill all the defending BP's also.

Assuming the defenders do call up a militia unit, it will take a minimum of three turns to capture the PF, probably more like six or eight, but that is not really out of line with the number of turns required to capture an ordinary ship. The only difference is that you have to beam your attacking BP's over one at a time rather than all at once.

Overall, PFs seem about as hard to capture as a regular ship. It is actually probably easier to capture a leader, as you can send over two BPs, one a commando (to block self destruction), and then take damage on the non-commando BP. Realistically, capturing a PF at all means you have a PFT of your own to tow it home with, or a friendly planet/base in the scenario, as otherwise, what are you going to do with it? So, given that you managed to down a shield on the PF to beam BPs over with, just shoot its engines off.

=====

By Michael Lui (Michaellui) on Friday, April 04, 2008 - 05:54 pm: Edit

The victory conditions may make it better to capture a PF than blow it up. It is still considered a ship. Also you don't have to use as many boarding parties as a normal ship. And, depending on the ship, you could attempt to capture an entire flotilla all at the same time ON ONE TURN.

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Sunday, July 13, 2008 - 12:09 am: Edit

Fed CAR+ vs a Klingon G-1 flotilla. EW rules in use, floating map, standard victory conditions, WS-3 for both sides. Y183.

Fed starts in 00xx hex row, facing any, speed any.

Klinks start 42xx row, facing any, speed any. They have the typical flotilla (Leader, 4xcombat, scout).

Commander's options in use.

Drone selection as normal, but to keep things simple, the leader and combat PF's have only type-I fast drones in their racks.

Does the Fed have a chance of winning, or is disengagement his best option?

=====

By Richard Sherman (Rich) on Sunday, July 13, 2008 - 12:46 am: Edit

Mike:

Flotilla has the EW advantage because of the PF scout. Fed would like to nail it, but a responsible Klingon player won't give him the shot.

Flotilla also has a tremendous speed and maneuver advantage. Nothing the Fed can really do about that if he wants to be able to shoot anything.

Flotilla outguns Fed at range 10 or less, so Fed wants to try to use those big P1s and photons beyond that range. Problem is, can't do that and maintain distance through speed/maneuver.

Since you're starting so far apart, it's probably worth it to the Fed to try ONE high speed (well, as best as you can manage using a mid-turn speed change to pick your intercept point) pass to try to nail one or maybe two (if you feel lucky) PFs, and then just boost to disengagement speed.

IF you DO gamble and go for one pass, and further gamble and go for 2 PFs thru the EW shift, and you win that gamble (ALOT of "ifs" there), then you MIGHT consider sticking it out. But I'd estimate that about 49 times out of 50, you're best off just leaving.

=====

By Kenneth Jones (Kludge) on Sunday, July 13, 2008 - 03:32 am: Edit

If it was 6 regular PF's the Fed would still be at a disadvantage. But with a SC handy you can pretty much give up the ghost. The Feds are the one race (IMO) most effected by a negative EW shift.

Go for a long range (r12-15) shot on one (or two) PF's if its a campaign where it costs to replace PF's. If the SC gets into R15 peg it. If not go for the Leader+1. If it doesn't then get the \$%#@ out of dodge. Your costly cruiser is gonna get creamed for cheapo attrition units. .

=====

By Michael Lui (Michaellui) on Sunday, July 13, 2008 - 06:29 am: Edit

If the Fed got the chance to even out the BPV through Legendaries/Outstanding Crews, then he may have a chance. Otherwise he's fighting a losing battle.

=====

By Tos Crawford (Tos) on Sunday, July 13, 2008 - 10:34 pm: Edit

Rack a sensor drogue and an MRS. Put up 8 ECCM with 4 more ECCM lent from the MRS. Load standard photons. Arrange for the G1S to reach range 30 near the end of the turn and fire photons narrow salvo. You have a 1 in 6 chance of doing 32 damage, which will wax his Scout if it hits. Prox photons hit better, but won't do enough damage to hit anything vital.

If you miss, collect your toys and bug out.

If you hit, pick up your toys and send out a mayday.

The more interesting scenario here is you hit. The remaining G1s are armed with 10 A-Racks and 5 ADD racks. You aren't hitting them with drones so scatter packs are useless. Load up on ADDs and keep the other two shuttles armed as wild weasels. Flying an ECM drone or two isn't such a bad idea either.

Power up full overloads and keep the distance as open as possible. You won't be able to evade them for long, so turn in to fight. With luck you've got 4 overloaded photons facing 5 G1s. Your toys give you the EW advantage, and as long as you keep your ship between the G1s and your MRS it's going to be difficult for the G1s to do anything about it. On the other hand, with 10 inbound drones you can pretty much kiss off any attempt to use your phasers offensively, so it all comes down to your photon dice. The problem is 16 damage isn't enough to hurt a G1, so at best, regardless of the range, you are a threat to two G1s. The other three G1s can close to range zero with near impunity, delivering about 60 damage (before drone hits).

Now you've got 30 internals, empty photons, empty phasers, a dead MRS and Drogue (what else did the G1s have to use their ADDs on?) vs. 3 undamaged G1s. Its flee or die time for the CAR, possibly both.

=====

By Ed Crutchfield (Librarian101) on Sunday, July 13, 2008 - 10:57 pm: Edit

The fed in this case has no choice, but to run. BPV wise he is outnumbered better than 2 to 1. Generally speaking not many Fed capatians are suicide prone. The Fed has no real advantages he can work with. He could retrograde, but the ECM will kill him, if he puts power to EW then he slows down and the PFs catch him. The BPV advantage in this case is way too large. He retrogrades and calls for the local FF squadron to join him and even things out. All the advantages are in the PFs court. His only real hope is that the PFs come in from separate locations where he can engage 1/2 of the squadron at a time.

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Sunday, July 13, 2008 - 11:13 pm: Edit

Replace the G-1's with a Starhawk/Centurion flotilla.

Same set-up, etc.

Will carronade be a factor, or is that only a Gorn thing?

Yes, I know the ridiculousness of the premise...this is part of a debate between me and Doug Howard....

=====

By Andrew Harding (Warlock) on Monday, July 14, 2008 - 01:41 am: Edit

If I know I'm fighting PFs I wouldn't use a Fed CA!

If the rules in force permit the Fed to take a safe 1/6 narrow salvo then he should take it and bug out whether or not it hits.

If not he should just run. Note the PFs can get 14 ECM at range (small target, self generated, lent) which makes them tricky targets even if permitted a speed 31 drogue. Without EW clipping range 8 once for an OL photon shot is a reasonable idea, giving a chance at a PF kill in return for some internals but the PFs probably won't permit a clean oblique shot. Even if given the chance the Fed needs to time it well and be eligible to disengage on the turn of the shot because he won't get another.

If using standard victory conditions the Fed should win - he can avoid combat until turn 3 and then disengage, giving away 1/4 of his BPV but earning several hundred points for surviving a superior force.

In general PFs beat ships but there are exceptions. The ISC are particularly good floating map PF duelers as they can hurt them at range and have the rear torps to buy space to turn around for another shot. I'd still want rather more than a CAR's BPV if taking on a whole squadron.

=====

By Douglass E. Howard (Doug_Howard) on Tuesday, July 15, 2008 - 12:00 am: Edit

Mike strain,

If you want to fight out CAR+ vs Flotilla I'd be all up for doing it by PBEM, assuming anyone volunteer's to moderate the scenario.

IMO although outbpv'd/outgunned at point blank range the CAR+ has at least an even chance of succeeding/surviving the encounter, it comes down to the captain flying the ship and not just all the numbers tossed around.

The EW for PF's is great and all but...

One thing missed in giving it the EW advantage is the sheer volume of power it will take for the PF's to generate that and stay at top speed...

The nimble ship modifier goes away at range 14.

The swing points and built in ECCM (not ECM) are subject to standard maximums and not extra's above that so keeping them up can be detrimental to causing damage etc.

But then I'd rather fight it out by PBEM than talk it out endlessly every once in a while...

=====

By Mike Strain (Evilmike) on Tuesday, July 15, 2008 - 04:02 am: Edit

You know what?

Never mind.

=====

By Michael Lui (MichaelLui) on Tuesday, July 15, 2008 - 06:27 am: Edit

Doug

It is very easy to generate the power necessary for the PF flotillas EW. You just have to decide how much of what type you want. With the PFS in the flotilla all the PFs can have 12 EW points and not slow down from 30 for only 2 points of power, 7 from the PFS. This gives them 2-12 ECCM and 0-10 ECM depending on what you're facing, not counting EM or nimble ship modifiers, and the PFS can use its dial-an-EW-rating scout channels to adjust it after the CAs EW is declared for the turn (not counting batteries).

That means that the CA is going to be shooting through a 2 shift unless the its MRS/EW drogue is deployed. And those don't last long.

=====

By Douglass E. Howard (Doug_Howard) on Tuesday, July 15, 2008 - 12:51 pm: Edit

All the numbers crunchers:

There's a huge number of variables in any tactical consideration and this can be endlessly debated. I'm not going to endlessly debate. The name of the game is "Star Fleet Battles" not "Star Fleet Debate Club" (after all SVC doesn't own the next gen license as far as I know). I'll take on any of you with the CAR+ versus any pf flotilla (with the sole exception of Orions PFs they skew the curve to much). Ya'll are getting lost in one aspect of the fight, the EW potential, and effectively end the fight before it begins.

Quote:

You know what?

Never mind.

Mike,

You mentioned my name in posing the argument. Lets dance it out on PBEM. Not going to happen FTF since we live 1800 miles or so apart.

That's all I have to say on this for now and will gladly, happily play it out by PBEM (or FTF if you're local to me). Cheers.

=====

By Kerry E Mullan (Nomad17) on Wednesday, July 16, 2008 - 08:40 am: Edit

Douglass,

=====

By chance do you have SFBONLINE? If so I can do a couple or more battles against you this weekend or whenever is good for you.

It supports both PFs(of all races) and the feddies. I will most likely be playing the std KLI PFs as they give the fed a chance. I really see the plasma races as auto killers here as well. With any discr race PF the Fed maybe able to take a couple down with him.

You know one from his DF and the other from his explosion.

=====

By Douglass E. Howard (Doug_Howard) on Wednesday, July 16, 2008 - 12:22 pm: Edit

Sorry, don't have SFB online. PBEM is fine though if you're not fairly local to Harrisburg, PA.

=====

By John Smith (Johnsmith) on Friday, August 15, 2008 - 03:37 am: Edit

Anyone ever used the Frax PFs? How are they compared to the Lyran PFs and Tholian PFs?

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike_Grafton) on Friday, August 15, 2008 - 11:39 pm: Edit

IIRC, the Frax PFs are most like Klinks and WYN.

=====

By Gary Carney (Nerroth) on Saturday, August 16, 2008 - 08:09 am: Edit

Hi.

How do the non-Alpha attrition units stack up in comparison to the kind of fighters and PFs used in the Alpha Octant?

For example, if one was to take on Souldra Shards with an ISC Squadron or flotilla, or to duel against Iridani or Trobrin or Baduvai gunboats, or Maghadim or Drex fighter squadrons, or a formation of Andro MWP's.

Also, how do Andro MWP's fare against Omega and Magellanic attrition units?

=====

By Peter David Boddy (Pdboddy) on Monday, August 18, 2008 - 11:06 am: Edit

Has anyone taken Douglass up on his challenge?

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike_Grafton) on Monday, August 18, 2008 - 09:40 pm: Edit

Gary,

Non alpha attrition units would have great difficulty with many ALpha PFs and later generation fighters. The biggest issue would be speed. Alpha PFs with packs just are so powerful.

And the fighters would usually be faster and equipped with hordes of seekers...

=====

By John Smith (Johnsmith) on Tuesday, August 19, 2008 - 03:01 am: Edit

Frax PFs have 2 Disr (FX and RX) and no drones. Thus they are closer to Lyran or Tholian PFs, except their arcs seem better for running battles. Just curious if that makes much of a difference.

=====

By Gary Carney (Nerroth) on Wednesday, August 20, 2008 - 05:08 am: Edit

Michael,

So even the more powerful Omega PFs (Mæsrion, Iridani, Trobrin) or heavy fighters (Skiff-H, Render) can't cut it?

But even if they can't, can they do the business against Andro MWP's?

=====

By Michael C. Grafton (Mike_Grafton) on Wednesday, August 20, 2008 - 07:49 am: Edit

Haven't tried it out, but the Alpha PF Packs are HUGE.

Most Alpha pfs can go speed 31 and fire all/ most their weapons every turn.

=====

By Richard Sherman (Rich) on Wednesday, August 20, 2008 - 11:26 am: Edit

Gary,

My guess is they can hold their own, or even have an advantage, against Andro MWP's.

The MWP isn't really all that competitive by themselves. With only 2 P2 and limited to a top speed of 20-21, they're just not that offensive. What they are good at is soaking up damage if they can get their opponent to shoot at them.

Which is where their strength lies. Accompanying a regular Andro warship, 6 of these can become enough of a nuisance that the opponent just CAN'T ignore them, hopefully opening an attack run (or escape path) for their "big brothers."

I would think opposing PFs (Alpha or Omega) should do fine at chewing them up. At least, that was my experience the 2 times I've played against MWP's (once without PFs [as Fed], and once with a few PFs [as Klingon]).

=====

By Douglass E. Howard (Doug_Howard) on Saturday, August 23, 2008 - 03:54 pm: Edit

Peter,

No takers at the moment. I'm not playing on SFBOL but will play out a scenario like that in PBEM or live. Moderator is available for PBEM.

=====

By Gary Carney (Nerroth) on Monday, August 25, 2008 - 09:01 am: Edit

I see.

END OF 2008 ARCHIVE

I have to admit that the thought of Omega being short-changed like this - especially considering that due to the afterburner system in Omega gunbot engines, you can't fit booster packs to them - but I was hoping that there wouldn't be that much of a discrepancy if one wanted to take an Omega gunboat flotilla against an Alpha one.
Sigh.

=====

By Trent Telenko (Ttelenko) on Wednesday, December 03, 2008 - 10:18 am: Edit

Let's revisit this from July 2008.

Fed CAR+ with X-1R refits to Phasers (w/limited aegis), Photons, AWR & Batteries (Shields, Drones and seeing weapon control are all non-X) vs a Coalition PF flotilla. EW rules in use, floating map, standard victory conditions, WS-3 for both sides. Y182 to Y183.

Fed starts in 00xx hex row, facing any, speed any.

Klinks start 42xx row, facing any, speed any. They have the typical flotilla (Leader, 4xcombat, scout).

Commander's options include a sensor drogue and an MRS (non-X) for the CAR+

Drone selection for Klingon G-1's as normal, but to keep things simple, the leader and combat PF's have only type-I fast drones in their racks.

The Lyrans and Romulans can have one other combat variant of their choice.

Romulan Starhawks can have only one PI-D armed MRM for their combat PFs.

Evaluate with either "thin shields" or Y183(+) refitted shields on the PFs.

=====

By John Smith (Johnsmith) on Saturday, December 06, 2008 - 08:09 pm: Edit

I've got a question about megapacks. Specifically, how do packed drone fighters (especially the F-14/F-15 and F-111) stack up value-wise to PFs?

I've used megapacks in precisely one pick-up game, where they were used on some Stinger IIs. They seemed a very good value then, but they provide the two things that Stingers need to be threatening, speed and durability. They seemed a much better value than the Hydran fusion PFs. Maybe even a better deal than the helbore PFs.

However, drone fighters aren't usually trying to get close fast. Do mega-packs really make them enough better to be worth their cost? And what about the Fed ph-G fighters, who can launch an run or close effectively (and who already have large drone loadouts but limited control channels)?

My guess is that they're not worth the cost over WBPs for these types of fighters (possibly excepting the ph-G fighters), but should be placed on assault fighters (i.e. the A-10/A-20, Z-D/Z-H, etc). Can anyone with real experience flying various packed fighters tell me if I'm on the right track, or way off course?

=====

By Alan Trevor (Thym) on Sunday, December 07, 2008 - 12:32 am: Edit

John,

I think you are generally correct that drone-armed fighters need megapacks less than other fighters do. But as to whether they are "worth the cost over WBPs", it's very dependent on the specific situation. I usually want my fighters to be megafighters, even if they are drone-armed*. But if I am short on points and looking for some way to economize, I would be much more likely to downgrade a Klingon or Kzinti fighter squadron to WBPs than a Romulan squadron, for example.

*I should add that I usually play Tholians or Romulans so I have less experience with drone-armed fighters. Both those races' fighters need megapacks more than drone-armed fighters do and that may cause me to want to megapack my drone-armed fighters when I do play a drone using race, even if that is not, objectively, the best use of BPV.

=====