Author: Simone Fantini (---.dialup.tiscalinet.it)
Date: 05-05-01 03:46

Hello everybody, happy to join this forum.
First of all I want to say that BFWWII is an excellent game and that our tests in Italy
have been very very very succesfulllll !!!!! mmaammmaa mmmmiaaa !!!!
Anyway the problem at the moment seens to be that we need more and more scenarios, more
cards and more units.....but as ex-player of rules like Rapid Fire (bleahhh) and the
french Section d'Assaut (much better), do you think could be a good idea build up a
"card table" to give a value in points to the units (ex. a tiger,30 points, a russian
BT, 10 points excetera) adding an extra value for the status of the unit (veteran +10 ,
row +2 excetera excetera)?
This could allow beginning player like us with not a lot of units, to start encounter
game with same forces in points or defensive games with the attaker with a exact
proportion of forces 2:1, 3:1 depending of the masochism of the players.....
I known this is not proprely an historical point of view, but all players starting any
game ask this: do we have same possibility of winning?? Consider also that we are in
Italy and also when you FART (opppssss) became a competion........
The f****** latin system....
Thankssssss
Simon

Re: Units Value

Author: Mark Hayes (---.hwrd1.md.home.com)
Date: 05-06-01 13:12

Simone,

I'm glad to hear that BF is catching on in Italy. I've worked on Italian cards
recently, so we do plan to publish them eventually. We never use a point system when
setting up a game, and quite frankly, I wouldn't know where to begin. Perhaps you could
use the system from a current rules set as a base, work from there.

Mark

Re: Units Value

Author: Sandro Matteoni (62.98.134.---)
Date: 05-07-01 03:05

Hi Simone,

Nice to see some italian people on this forum.
Here, in Florence, we are starting to test BF amd trying to build unit's cards for thr
early war (the blitzkrieg in France).
Drop me a line to exchange our experiences.
In oru mail we could write in italian too..:))

Sandro

Re: Units Value

Author: Mike Amore (---.ny.us.ibm.com)
Date: 05-07-01 09:05

Ciao Simone e ciao Sandro,

I have begun to test BF last week and I like them !!!
The problem is to have simple scenarios to learn the rules.
Is it possible to have on this web-site some start-scenarios published by authors ??
For example : infantry vs infantry, tanks vs AT guns and so on....
Sandro, please join Kampfgruppe ML (in italian language) where we are discussing about
these rules with other guys....!!!
ciao
Mike
***CLUB ''I CONDOTTIERI''
Milan---ITALY

Re: Units Value

Author: Richard Burnett (---.sherman-oaks-03-04rs16rt.ca.dial-access.att.ne)
Date: 05-08-01 21:13

Your idea to place a value on certain units or manuever elements hits a very important
area in scenario design.
A "points value" system, and there have been many has certain "advantages" and
"abuses". The game may construct, using points, a reasonably sized scenario using the
points as a kind of "budget", that is, it tends to check the gamer who wishes to use an
entire historical order of battle which may be too large for the game system,. However,
points systems produce some of the most ahistorical or freewheeling orders of battle--
points never conform to historical OB's. Points may also be used to place value on
certain items on the table defining a ?mission?, that is, so many points to hold that
hill. However, many gamers are not satisfied with a game won or lost on points.
Some game authors/rules writers etc will use points as an easy out to not have to
present any historical scenarios, yet offer no help as to how best use the point values
to produce a scenario.
Others rely on historical OB's and figure that everything else will somehow work itself
out withut any kind of mission for each side.
If Rich H is considering this idea, he will probably weigh in with a set of scenario
design definitions and limiits on the point system
to include a points system to define the sides missions and objectives

Re: Units Value

Author: jim davis (---.dallas.navipath.net)
Date: 05-10-01 10:10

The object in using point systems should be to compare the Units, not to buy the
individual tanks or troops. I worked out a very usable system for CD, and we found for
instance that a German Inf Bttn was worth three USSR Bttn. It helped a lot in scenario
design to have that information to work with. One problem I had was I produced a
formula to account for the factors in the rules to say how valuable an item or unit was
in the rules (not real life), and people wanted the math done for them. It was enough
of a pain to work out the values of common equipment and troop types and a few common
co and bttn values. I had players wanting complete lists of equipment and obscure
units. I have fiddled with converting the system to these rules, but havn't had time to
do a complete job. I did enough to believe the basic concept will still work. (the CD
work was published in MWAN a couple of years ago.
I will see if I can work out a satisfactory formula, or if anyone is interested I can
post some of the common unit values from CD and you can use them as a general
guideline.
Jim Davis

Re: Units Value

Author: Craig Burnett (---.prem.tmns.net.au)

```
Date:    05-13-01 07:01
```

I don't like points values per 'capita' at all. But then again, one of the harder
obstacles to overcome with new systems is when they are (like BF F&F etc) pure scenario
driven. That is, ther is actually a psycholigocal problem to just turning up somewhere
with something and taking someone one - even if both are germans, or both Russians etc.

Anyway - who can say how many T-34's = 1 Tiger etc?

I did use a method of valuation based on the BF books VP's though - it went OK.

Play Balance

Author: Jesse Seals (63.214.252.---)
Date: 08-19-01 23:15

Any tips on balancing a scenario.

With no point values we seam to have problems bringing equal forces to bear even in meeting engagements.

As an example we tried the basic 2 against 1. 2 companies of mounted Panzergreniders with 4 Pz IV's attacking. Against 1 US Inf company 3 shermans, 2 Jeeps and a P47. Both sides with 1 FO for fire support.

The US was never in the game partly due to poor judgement and understanding on my part. But mostly due to overwhelming fire power. One LMG, 1 Mortar, and 3 bazooka teams for the US. Why bother putting an Inf company on the board I was toast.

Today the US won a meeting engagement with 1 Armored Inf company 3 shermans and 2 Jeeps. Meeting 1 Panzergrenider Co, 3 PZIII's and a command tank. Again both with an FO for off-board fire support. I won but only due to an unbelievable string of dice rolls the P47 taking out 3 squads on its straffing run and a single fire mission from my 105's called in by a disordered tank killing 3 squads. Better lucky than good I'd say. A turn before the German command tank had moved close to my Infantry and routed 9 squads in my manuever check half of them panicked amazing what one MG will do. I love 1's ;-) Although I won I still felt out gunned especially on the Armor side panzerfaust everywhere PZIII's with a better gun and armor than my Shermans.

Reply To This Message

Re: Play Balance

Author: Mark Hayes (---.nhc.navy.mil)
Date: 08-20-01 07:44

One of my favorite balanced games pits an American infantry battalion with a couple of platoons of armor support against a German infantry company (with a Stug and an AT gun) dug-in in hedgerow country. Use hidden markers for the German set-up and you have a nicely balanced scenario.

Mark

Reply To This Message

Re: Play Balance

Author: Rob Wubbenhorst (---.houston.rr.com)
Date: 08-20-01 08:39

I was the German commander on the other side of those dice rolls. The P-47 did a tank bust mission on a PzIII that only disordered it, but got a strafing second pass against 5 of my Inf. in the open and whacked 4. Nice shootin' Tex...

As for the disordered Sherman calling in Arty, shXX happens in the woods. Dice must come into play for everybody.

Jesse and I were hoping for some kind of point or rating ability to match up various ME's for some sense of balance. Attack & Defense roles for each side should modify the points available.

We're not proposing DBA for WWII, but some sense of equating forces would be great.

Here's our typical scenario planning: "What do you have painted?" "What did you just

buy that you want to play with ?" "I'm attacking so I'll take x2 MEs as you, but what about air or arty?"

We've been going with no German air vs. Americans and P-47 always available. German Stuka is usually available vs. Russians, but our Sturm has yet to hit the table.

American 105s, German 120s, and Russian 122s have made it into every game... we like using combined arms.

I also usually take understrength German Inf. ME's due to not having enough 251s painted yet, but this also seems realistic for Western front action.

Any ideas on how to begin testing some sort of system? Should we use firepower points in 0-2 or 0-5 rangeband divided by # of T and V units or is this getting way to tedious?

Regards, Rob

Re: Play Balance

Author: Ken Natt (---.server.ntl.com)
Date: 08-20-01 13:26

We played exactly the same system as you Rob initially, the "what's painted" system. Now we have enough kit (usually) it is down to judgement as to what will work. Can I totally agree with Mark on the Bocage scenario - it's a blast. I also have to say that I dont think a scenario needs to be balanced, and in fact it is usually the unbalanced ones that are the best as balance often results in stalemate, and is a sod to do - also remember that the allies need a streight majority in VPs, the Germans need a 3:2 victory. If you think the scenario is unbalanced swap sides and play it again. We just played a really small game based on "Barkmanns Corner" - it only lasts a few turns one way or another so we got two games in one night's play. In the first the German murdered the US - an abject lesson in the superiority of the Panther, the next game poor old 424 was over-run by a series of aggressivly handled M4s. I can't see the effort of trying to get a points system to work being worth the end result.

Ken

Re: Play Balance

Author: Rob Wubbenhorst (---.houston.rr.com)
Date: 08-20-01 17:24

Ken,

Sounds good re/ your strategy of small game, play it twice switching sides. I like it.

We played 9 turns in 4 hours yesterday. There was no combat until turn 4. We're getting better about not referring to the rules, but it still takes time with only two players.

We found 1 infantry ME with a platoon of vehicles to be the limit of our C^3 ability.

Can you post the OOB and map for "Barkmanns Corner"? How many turns did you go each game?

I think we need more scenario posts here for the '44-'45 range. Most of the ones on the Extras page are early war or larger than 2 players can field in lead or push around the table. Ideally games would last 5-6 turns, then you could go for 2 games in 4-5 hours.

Regards, Rob who screamed "Achtung Jabo!" as death rained from above yesterday...

Re: Play Balance

Author: Al Griffith (---.proxy.aol.com)
Date: 08-21-01 09:23

I usually balance scenarios by giving the US lots more artillery than the Germans. I usually give them at least twice as much off-table artillery support as the Germans. If the Germans are in prepared defensive positions, I give the Americans even more artillery. The US army wasn't dumb enough to attack dug-in Germans without massive artillery support.

I've always subscribed to the view that the biggest single reason for the German defeat was the overwhelming superiority of Allied artillery.

Re: Play Balance

Author: Rob (---.core.hp.com)
Date: 08-21-01 13:10

To successfully prosecute an attack, a force of 2 - 3 times that of the defender is usually needed. This can increase to 5 - 6 to 1, if an attack is going against well-prepared defenses (e.g. the Siegfried Line), or when attacking a town.

Re: Play Balance

Author: Al Griffith (---.proxy.aol.com)
Date: 08-21-01 13:24

But you don't necessarily need a numerical advantage in tanks and riflemen on the ground. With a crushing superiority in artillery and/or airpower an attack can succeed even if the numbers of tanks and infantry are more or less even. Personally I find games that rely on the attacker having a simple numerical superiority a bit dull and a bit cliched.

Re: Play Balance

Author: Rob (---.core.hp.com)
Date: 08-21-01 14:25

I concur, but was merely pointing out this fact to people that are surprised when 2 : 1 odds don't work out the way they had expected.

It didn't always in real life either.

Re: Play Balance

Author: Greg Lyle (---.proxy.aol.com)
Date: 08-21-01 15:41

Normal military tactic dercsibe:

a 4-1 ratio as a win or go down with your ship.

a 3-1 ratio as a close win or tie or even a loss (the best ratio)

a 2-1 ratio as don't even try it, unless you have vastly superior equipment.

a 1-1 ratio consider defense.

Re: Play Balance

Author: Nigel Perry (---.defence.gov.au)
Date: 08-21-01 17:51

The oft quoted need for the attacker to have a superiority of 3:1 in combat power to succeed is a bit misleading. It only holds for attrition warfare and not manoeuvre warfare. Admittedly, most wargame battles are attrition based so it is probably an accurate tabletop requirement if the defender has a properly prepared defence.

To cut a long story short, there is a great article on the RAND website which discusses the explanation of the 3 to 1 rule for a Lanchester Equation based analysis (hence attrition warfare).The 3 to 1 superiority is the point at which the loss rate for the attacker equals the loss rate for the defender. Any lower and the attacker loses strength at a higher rate than the defender. More than 3 to 1 and the defender reaches his break point first.

I am aware of the shortcomings of Lanchester based analysis, but you would be suprised how much faith is placed in them by the modern military.

Nigel Perry.

Re: Play Balance

Author: James Baker (66.61.32.---)
Date: 08-21-01 21:27

One good type of scenario is to have unbalanced forces but give the stronger side extremely difficult objectives. Long ago in the modern incarnation of this game (at a convention in 1988-which shows how long this has been going on), the Soviets were immensely stronger and the U.S. had to delay without regard to losses. The game ended when the last U.S. unit remaining disordered the last Soviet vehicle that could fulfill victory conditions. We stood up and realized that we had been playing for 14 hours straight.

Point system

Author: Bryan Libertore (---.shv.bellsouth.net)
Date: 02-24-02 00:24

Do you folks have a point system for Battlefront?? It would be nice to be able to just throw down some points some day and play a nice quick pick me up game instead of searching thry scenario after scenario...anyway if someone has come up with a point system I sure would like to take a look at it..

Thanks

Bryan

Reply To This Message

Re: Point system

Author: Dave Choat (---.hyatsv01.md.comcast.net)
Date: 02-24-02 12:06

We much prefer to plunk down actual formations, albeit true that the Wehrmecht had some pretty ad hoc formations at times. Don't page throught the scenarios, just look at the TO&E stuff and make it up. Points are a bit too gamey.

Say the US is attacking somewhere in France late war. It could be a Regimental Combat Team with some arty support and some attached armor vs an understrength german infantry unit with mortar support. Of course they are dug in and probably can hope to get some assault guns and a few half tracks to save their butts if they can hold out long enough. Or perhaps they only need to hold out for 6 or 7 turns and then leave? Think of what you like in a scenario and then plug in the bits that exist.

Dave

Reply To This Message

Re: Point system

Author: Doug Knoop (---.mdo.net)
Date: 02-24-02 18:05

Points can make it seem too cheesy or ad-hoc, but, they do make the quickie after work pick up games much easier.

One of our more ambitious and experienced players has put together quite good lists that utilize the "required core troops/limited specials/one rare" troop choices as well as a fairly accurate point cost system that makes infantry worth their weight in gold, armor gets really expensive really fast, and those fancy German tanks are generally not worth it.

If we can come to terms with my constant demands for more arty then I think it will be perfect!

All that being said I think it is more useful as a tool to get the hardcore number crunching gamers to relax and play a smaller scale. I prefer scenarios when I can get them; and find the people and minis to run them.

Reply To This Message

Re: Point system

Author: James Baker (---.mtc1.cox.rr.com)
Date: 02-25-02 04:55

There was a massive forum thread several months ago on this subject. Use the Search option of the forum header to find it.

Re: Point system

Author: Craig Burnett (---.prem.tmns.net.au)
Date: 02-25-02 06:18

No Way.

Every time I've played a set of WW2 rules the points system comes up.

We play with a base battlegroup as an 'area' for selecting on-table combat groups. After each contact between these forces, each side adds 1 or 2 other things - essentially Manouvre Elements, or FSE's, other support, higher level asset etc etc.

There's no suggestion of points or any need, just by following the actual TOE's in the rulebook. There's also no suggestion of Discipline Ratings, because we stick with the system suggested. A time frame gets all the selected things for both sides from their 'contemporary' opposition weapons.
Eg.
At the moment we've mostly played mid-1944, with my mate choosing from 5th Panzer Division. I use my Russians from an Infantry Division. To date our contacts have risen to a Pz IV Coy, an armoured Panzergrenadier Coy and a Motorized Engineer Coy for the Germans vs a Russian rifle battalion, with an artillery battalion and some T-34/76's. We've worked out it will take us about 12 games to get to our basic 'full' strengths. Then I'll use my Germans vs his Russians using much the same process.

With my kids, I let them choose what they want to do, but using the same guidelines.
(So far I've managed to produce a member of the SS PanzerKorp,
A Committed Tank Brigade Commissar and General Patton MK2, all in the one house).

There's better ways than this too to generate simple 'turn-up' games, without too much pre-game brain drain, we don't have the time.
The other thing is, the scenario's in the book and on this site are first rate - we've promised ourselves to do an exact historical scenario at Easter.
Anyway,
Cheers
CRB

Re: Point system

Author: randyh (---.kable.com)
Date: 02-25-02 17:35

Reading the thread below on the King tigers is exactly why a point system is not just idle idea. Sure you can bring your elite King Tigers but at what cost? Using the "just use the toe" standards of BF these vehicles and support units are the same as a Mk4 unit, with vastly different capabilites. And yes they had a point system in WW2 real life. Germany chose King Tigers and elite units. Allies chose massive amounts of Shemans, t-34's etc. Plus they had more points to use.

Re: Point system

Author: Craig Burnett (---.prem.tmns.net.au)
Date: 02-25-02 18:39

There are other armour games based entirely on points values - designed to be that way.

Then the points themselves come under the microscope to be valued for 'balance'. But what's that?

When we choose the combat groups for a contact, they are aligned so that not everything can be everywhere. If Matt uses the KT's 'here', they are not available 'there'. This way when everything gets churned into the pot, opposition forces with basic operational orders function with what they have, against what they get. Groups cannot be robbed by Peter to pay Paul - we use what we have.
So the Germans with the better quality armour and crews are already limited at the higher level (ie pre-game). Also, there is no need to enforce the use of a single vehicle or platoon 'only'. It tends to stem naturally from requirements.
The combined German 'collection' is around 200 stands strong, of which (to date) 4 are the 'controversial' Kingys' (with the other 3 coming). The Russians are just over twice as strong.

Of course no mention has yet been made of the IS-II regiments 9 vehicles plus riders. James will get into that I'm sure.

Aircraft. We let everyone have one. It's really quite a buzz with 4 or 6 models flying around the table buggering-up everyone's plans with 'fly-by' shootings, bombings and other forms of mayhem. With second passes for the more successful, several aircraft are often 'on-table' all at once. So too with random bombardments walking through or turning up from who knows where. Maybe that's just life in 15mm (woops 1/100th) scale Eastern Front...............

CRB

<u>Reply To This Message</u>

Re: Point system

Author: <u>R Mark Davies</u> (---.proxy.aol.com)
Date: 02-25-02 19:27

Oh God,

I just spent the best part of an hour writing a lengthy reply to this thread for the argument against points systems (including bloody 'Victory Points'), and my connection crashed - AAARGH!

To cut a long story short, it doesn't take too much imagination to come up with a simple, basic scenario. If you subsequently find it to be a walk over for one side or the other, tweak the balance next time, or change the tactics - preferably the latter. For Christ's sake, I have thirteen-year-old cadets doing their own research and balanced, non-partisan scenario writing - how much can it take for adults to manage to do the same without arguing?!

Tonight, we played a scenario where an 'Experienced' Soviet Motor Rifle Battalion, supported by a 'Veteran' armoured group of IS-2s, ISU-152s & T34/76s, plus considerable artillery, scout cars and elite Razvedchiki was beaten off by two companies of 'Trained' German infantry, supported by a PaK 40, an 88, and a platoon of panzerjagers in lightly wooded terrain. It was all down to the German commander's (Cadet Richard East, 13, now known as Hauptmann von Ost, Ritterkreuz) superior use of interlocking arcs of fire from his AT assets and fiendish panzerfaust ambushes in likely chokepoints, combined with his realisation that 'he who defends everything defends nothing' - thus managing to achieve local superiority against over-confident Soviets at every stage. So much for 'points'!

Mark

<u>Reply To This Message</u>

Re: Point system

Author: Craig Burnett (---.tmns.net.au)
Date: 02-26-02 05:29

These 13 year olds RMD, they have the giz. (Ballsy buggers).

CRB

Re: Point system

Author: Doug Knoop (---.isinet.com)
Date: 02-26-02 10:12

It seems we can all agree that a point system is not necessary for enjoyment of the
game, but I still hold that it is very useful in transitioning the number crunching
mercenaries of the 25mm world away from the magic and silliness of some of the more
aggressively marketed games. Not everyone is immediatley fascinated by the combined
arms tactics of the game and compromising by letting them have a degree of control on
force selection, even outside the bounds of reality a little, is a good way to draw
them in.
I've seen it happen, just one game can turn a player from the darkside, and teach them
that big tanks aren't worth much when they're destroyed by infantry.

Re: Point system

Author: randyh (---.kable.com)
Date: 02-26-02 12:41

I agree to a point (get it points). Our group has no problem with arriving at
scenarios using the toe's. We favor the attacker in most cases with a superior force
and the defender with less. Or sometimes suprises. But waht happens when you go outside
the freindly groups. Not all are amicable to the good natured selections as you
present. Also If I am playing someone elses scenario and I am completely overun by a
superior force, I can justify the results by the point blalance. Or as Von Ost, I can
crow about the defeat my X force inflicted on a superior unit. And just to keep
whipping the horse. Scenarios are great and add relevance, but what about a call to a
friend to bring x number of Germans, 1944 vs X number of British and met me at hill 102
at 1pm tuesday. A lot less planning there. Thats where real suprises come in as to what
is he going to bring to the table. Two tigers or 15 mk4's (exageration of course).

Re: Point system

Author: R Mark Davies (---.proxy.aol.com)
Date: 02-26-02 17:40

I suppose it all boils down to why you wargame. For me, it's about love of history,
mental stimulation and social interraction. For some, it's just about winning.

Mark

Re: Point system

Author: Andy Thurlow (24.92.176.---)
Date: 02-26-02 20:02

It's been very interesting reading the different points of view on a "points" system. I
wargame for very similar reasons as Mark. I enjoy historical, "reality" based gaming,

that brings some sense of the challenges that commanders actually experienced on the battlefield. I certainly enjoy winning, but if I can put up a good fight against superior odds, and still "lose", I still enjoy the game.

The problem is, I can see where historical wargaming has also alienated itself from the bulk of new gamers (ie. the Warhammer 40K crowd). I don't play Warhammer, so I may be talking out of turn, but it seems that the attraction of this game is in the flexibility and creativity that this allows the gamers to create their units. They tend to personalize the units they paint and game with.

I personally prefer the TO&E process of creating a Battle group, but that doesn't mean that we shouldn't "step out of the box" and try something different. It's all a matter of taste.

Just my 2 cents,

Andy

Re: Point system

Author: Craig Burnett (144.139.11.---)
Date: 02-27-02 04:52

I agree 100% with that Doug.
My own method with the boys may have been heavy, but would have been ultra-heavy and a possible turn off if I didn't let them have those super-weapons.
Most of my boys mates use those-not-to-be-mentioned "other" games - but a couple have played in one of our [real ones - not my words] games.
The biggest difference so far is all our stuff is actually painted, I've noticed and they all want to buy some now too.

Pretty soon we'll probably have a true-to-life Hitlerjugend, Komsomol and whatever!

Cheers,
Craig

PS: If points works for you use it. I can see the value in a number of situations, but how many 75mm Shermans equal 1 Tiger Tank?

CRB

Re: Point system

Author: Craig Burnett (144.139.11.---)
Date: 02-27-02 05:03

Randyh,
I like the turn-up-and-take-it-on type game too. One of the earlier problems we faced here, initially from F&F early days was the lack of a "logistic" capability to balance work, life and games to organize exact historical scenarios. So it became a case of "turn-up". That escalated to some complete madness over about 6 years.

With BF, nothings really changed much - it's still a case of turn up! But when we 'plan' one, we like the almost exact approach youv'e mentioned:

"Ok, I'm using what I had last time plus this".

Chuck out a couple of hills, bunches of trees, swamp sounds good, built-up area there (no thats a pain in the a__), throw a road through there.....

.....hold on, am I playing the Russians or the Germans?........

Cheers
Craig

Re: Point system

Author: R Mark Davies (---.proxy.aol.com)
Date: 02-27-02 07:26

Gents,

Something that has been mentioned before are the superb series of books by WRG (I
forget the titles right now - 'Programmed Wargame Scenarios' and something else?).
These books have a variety of scenarios based on real-life tactical problems of the
sort you might be presented with at the RMA or West Point and the balance of forces is
presented in three settings for each scenario - Ancient, Horse & Musket and Modern. The
terrain, political background and strategic situation (along with consequences of
victory/defeat) is the same for each setting (just insert the names of countries &
places to suit your own historical setting). We keep these at club in case anyone
hasn't the time or energy to plan a scenario prior to turning up at club, and very
useful they are too.

Mark

Re: Point system

Author: Matt Fensome (---.cpc.uea.ac.uk)
Date: 02-27-02 09:10

Firstly, regarding the earlier point about the flexibility of Warhammer's force
selection process being one of its main attractions. I think there is definitely
something in this, but disagree that a similar flexibility is not possible with
historical forces. Indeed, the army selection system in the BF rules works along very
similar lines; pick your 'main' units (i.e battlegroups or companies) and then pick n'
mix from the huge lists of attachments (pioneer platoons, panzerjaegers, recce elements
etc).

The problem with points systems is that they are nowhere near as accurate as many
people seem to think. The effectiveness of any unit relies not only on inherent factors
- such as weapons, armour or training - but also on such nebulous considerations as the
terrain being fought over, and even the composition of the enemy force. Any points
value is just an 'average' estimation of a unit's worth in a number of different
situations. In reality, you're just as likely to create balanced forces by objectively
eying up the terrain, scenario etc. and 'negotiating' with your opponent.

Besides, there's nothing like letting your opponent have those Tigers, and then
whupping him anyway . . .

Re: Point system

Author: Michael Turner (---.nipr.mil)
Date: 02-27-02 09:16

I didn't want to jump in but,
I prefer to base all of my games on a "force ratio/OB's" vs. points system, but I don't
think that point system players are all about winning and that point system gamers "are
bad people". When I develop scenarios I use some numbers(read points) to "check the
block" and see how I did matching up OB's. This helps me to decide what experience

certain units should be, etc.
I guess what I'm saying is that I use OB's, but the point system I personnally use
helps me to ensure the scenario is somewhat "balanced" and check my work when setting
up the fight. Point system shouldn't be for individual systems they should be for OB
units, that way you don't stray into that gray area of "unrealistic" situations.
Mike T.

Re: Point system

Author: Jonathan Perry (---.statefarm.com)
Date: 02-27-02 10:36

I have played the "dark side" of wargaming. The points systems used are NOT a big
attraction. They are a necessary evil for a system that has no real historical basis to
draw from. We can look at the King Tigers used by the Burnetts and talk about the
historical problems with using them and how they fared in battle and what caliber of
crewmen manned them. Tough to do that with trolls or elvish cavalry. So you have to use
points.

Sadly, (due in no small part to the caliber of gamer that is drawn to them) the point
based systems used by the Dark Side results in munchkinism to a truly horrible degree,
and much bashing about why this or that combo ought to be outlawed because there is no
way that this OTHER combo of points can hope to prevail.

Yech.

Having said all of that, there is a way to do this and make it work. For those who
don't want to reinvent the wheel, back when Command Decision II was doing their CD
Quarterly publications, CDQ #14 had a simple point based system for 1944-1945 gaming.
Rather than assign a point value to each stand, they assigned a value to each company.
Perhaps a company of Panthers would be 5 points, a company of Russian infantry would be
2 points, whatever. The point being that they assigned a small point value to what we
would call a Maneuver Element. Players would simply take however many points they
wanted. Perhaps a single company, perhaps two battalions. Each player would announce
how many points they had (but not what they took), and a ratio would be obtained. A
table would be rolled on for each side (secretly), modified by the ratio, and this
table would give the players their orders and victory conditions. As the game goes on,
a player can request more reinforcements, rolling for them on a table. If they come in,
the ratios are redone and another roll on the Orders and Victory Conditions table is
obtained.

The great part about this is that it encouraged the player to make do with what he had,
because calling for reinforcements carried a VP penalty, and your new mission might not
really be to your liking.

I think Greg Novak wrote the article (he seemed to write everything else for CD!) and
if he didn't, he could at least point me in the right direction as to how I would get
permission to reprint some of it (the tables, in particular) up here. If the BF powers-
that-be don't mind.

Re: Point system

Author: randyh (---.kable.com)
Date: 02-27-02 11:59

My group recently did a south pacific battle (different rules). The US assualted a
small island Enubuj as part of the Kwajalien campaign. One battalion of Japanese
infantry, one coy of Japanese naval infantry, One coy light tanks and some support
weapons. The US assualted with a reinforced RCT. Points approximetly 4 to one in favor
of the US. The last Jap Killed a stuart light tank declared victory and commited hari

Kari. I was the jap. I felt my skillful defense was inspired and costly to two battalions of US infantry. Could I win the battle, not any more than Custer could have. Point allow you an alternative value to setting up a game. It is not a dark wargaming side it is an alternative. And it seems a lot of other people seem to feel there is some need for this. Which obviously this group, that thinks Germany won the war, finds any way but their way,to be from the dark side.

Re: Point system

Author: Paul Elvidge (213.249.135.---)
Date: 02-27-02 12:48

For what it's worth I have two comments on this thread and its precursor.

Firstly I am surprised at the tone of one or two of the postings from people whose opinions I have come to respect over the time I have read this forum. Being derogatory about people who hold different views to yourself is not worthy of anyone.

Secondly the TOE/OB solution to the force composition problem is hardly less flawed than the points solution. Fielding sub-units of a standard composition is almost as unrealistic as fielding anything you want within a points limitation.

Regards to all and well done to those who have offered constructive suggestions.

Paul

Re: Point system

Author: Doug Knoop (---.isinet.com)
Date: 02-27-02 13:00

Randy, nice work on the defense there.

But, I think you missed the point of the 'dark-side' comments as they were in the gentle ribbing vein and not a criticism (as more than a few of us probably did/do play those 'other' games) and I don't think anyone here is of the opinion that the Germans were anything other than what they were.

Re: Point system

Author: Jonathan Perry (---.statefarm.com)
Date: 02-27-02 13:20

Yeah, Randy missed that "dark side" is Games Workshop and it's products. Not point based systems in general. Some of them ('88' by Yaquinto Games, or Star Fleet Battles) work quite well.

Paul - the method I described had players drawing their sub-units from a chart based on the type of overall organization you were fielding. That is poorly worded.....

If you choose to be drawing your Kampfgruppe from a German Infantry Regiment, you would be able to buy infantry companies, support companies (different system here), towed panzerjaegers, and maybe a plumped up cost for a few Stugs. If you were drawing your Kampfgruppe from a PzGr Regiment, you would have motorized inf, mech inf, Stugs, real tanks, etc. But you would NOT have regular leg infantry. That is what I meant. So it is a point system based on maneuver elements, not stands. And those maneuver elements had to arguably fit into a greater whole.

Re: Point system

Author: Craig Burnett (---.prem.tmns.net.au)
Date: 02-27-02 18:23

RMD,
That's the 'Red/Blue' book by Charles S. Grant: it's the one I use for just about everything. I mentioned it once before ages ago.

CRB

Re: Point system

Author: Craig Burnett (---.prem.tmns.net.au)
Date: 02-27-02 18:45

Paul,
The anti-points people most likely draw from prior experience where 'pure' points only systems function only in that manner. Ancients is the worst. Group selection or scenario design system stem from re-creation. Points usually (but not always)from an artifical or fictional base. The up-side is points create the concept that if each side has 'the same', then the game is 'balanced' and theoretically opponents unknown to each other or outside regular opponents can simply set up and play a game. I assumed the 'Dark-Side' was GW games and not necessarily points systems all-round.
I'm on the receiving end of those Tigers - but I'll get them eventually. After all, I can lose lots of Russians and replace them. Sometimes my German infantry and StuGs are on the wrong end of IS-II's, I'll get them too.
Either way there are obviously lots of good ideas floating around on this forum to draw from - which I do all the time.
But Randy, no-one here is an apologist for the SS either.
CRB

Re: Point system

Author: Matt Burnett (144.139.7.---)
Date: 02-28-02 03:55

To Mr. Mark Davies,
Could you tell me Richard East e-mail address or send him mine?

Matt B.

Re: Point system

Author: R Mark Davies (---.proxy.aol.com)
Date: 02-28-02 16:19

Hi Craig,

I thought it was you who mentioned it - there's at least one other book as well (two I think), but I admit it's years since I've looked at them. I'll have a look in the club cupboard to see what the titles/authors are next time I'm down there.

Hi Matt,

He's not on the web, I'm afraid (and I'm afraid I'm not allowed to give out details on my cadets in any case - protection of young people and all that; you never know who reads these things - certainly a few dodgy characters!). I'll pass on your e-mail address to the lads though. That said, one of my NCOs is working on a squadron website,

where we hope to post up scenarios, pictures of models/armies and after-battle reports.
I'll let you know when it's up and running, but don't hold your breath (first I have to
persuade our committee to pay for a phone line AND an ISP account - time for another
sponsored silence I think)!

Mark

<div align="right">

Reply To This Message
</div>

Re: Point system

Author: Ken Natt (---.server.ntl.com)
Date: 03-01-02 09:21

I dont like points systems - they bring out the worst in me, and I dont believe they
are really needed. However, if someone were to come up with one I would not be standing
in line with my pile of firewood, stake and rope.

If we play pick up games, we tend simply to agree (horse trade) a main BG to draw from
and the number of MEs and get stuck in.

One of the things this thread has highlighted is that some players do like points, and
if it sells a few more sets of rules then maybe BF should look at it, but for God's
sake keep it simple.

Ken

<div align="right">

Reply To This Message
</div>

Re: Point system

Author: R Mark Davies (---.proxy.aol.com)
Date: 03-01-02 17:41

Ken,

I don't know if I can get over the shock of you being the Voice of Reason and me the
Witchfinder General! :o)

Mark

<div align="right">

Reply To This Message
</div>

Re: Point system

Author: Craig Burnett (144.139.9.---)
Date: 03-01-02 18:27

Reverend Witchfinders and Voices of Reason:

I don't mind trying anything, so if someone is going to come up with something that's
workable, it might be worth a look - I can see the advantage for parents/guardians of
junior players.

Anyone for tennis?

CRB

<div align="right">

Reply To This Message
</div>

Re: Point system

Author: randyh (---.kable.com)
Date: 03-04-02 11:48

My apologies to the board. I referred to the Japanese as Japs and that is inappropriate. I was caught up in the game decription and not trying to offend anyone.

Re: Point system

Author: Craig Burnett (144.139.12.---)
Date: 03-05-02 03:19

Randyh,
Japs are Japs and thats that - also more 'kind' than can actually be produced.
CRB

Board Etiquette

Author: Dave Choat (---.arl.army.mil)
Date: 03-05-02 11:31

No Craig, Racist and perjorative terms are not acceptable here. Imperial Japanese Army, Naval Landing Force or the combatants terms for their units are what is fine. Some things are best left elsewhere. I hope that it is not necessary to construct the manifold reasons why we should not use certain "colorful" historical language for various types of troops or nationalities on this forum. This is not a matter for debate. If you wish to argue the merits of this find another forum more suitable for it. Tey www.teachingtolerance.org for one, or www.splcenter.org (the Southern Povery Law Center run by famed civil rights lawyer Morris Dees). I am certain their views would be cogent in this regard.

Dave Choat

Re: Points Systems

Author: Nigel Perry (---.defence.gov.au)
Date: 03-05-02 17:33

Getting back to the thread...

I was reluctant to enter this debate, being somewhat opposed to points systems, but in response to several indications that some method for quickly choosing forces for a pick up game would be welcomed I have posted on my web site (http://home.vicnet.net.au/~wswa/wswargam.htm) a very beta idea I'm working on for doing just this.

WARNING: it has not been extensively play tested and I'm aware of a couple of problems that I'm working on, notably with Russian artillery when attacking.

Suggestions and comments on the proposed method are solicited. Please note that this method was inspired by the approach proposed by Brittania Miniatures in their rule set "Take Cover"(C).

Nigel Perry.

Re: Points Systems

Author: Nigel Perry (---.defence.gov.au)
Date: 03-05-02 18:19

One thing I forgot in my previous post, I loaded the latest version of the procedure
onto my web site this morning but it won't be accessible until the administrator
updates things which may not be for another 24 hours.

Nigel Perry.

Re: Points Systems

Author: Craig Burnett (---.prem.tmns.net.au)
Date: 03-06-02 02:19

Dave,
Come on Dave that's not rascist, it's just how it is.
Send your civil rights lawyer out for a reality dose mate.

regards,
CRB

Re: Points Systems

Author: Matt Laing (---.wi.rr.com)
Date: 03-06-02 13:29

I think that a point system is not necessary for several reasons:

1.) The unit ratings are already somewhat subjective, adding another layer of
subjectivity will only cause more problems.

2.) Unless a point system is carefully thought out you may find very a-historical
formations on the battlefield. Like the many variations of a well known fantasy game,
using a point system will most likely encourage and allow new recruits from the fantasy
genre, or other players that are unaware of real combat formations, to field say an
entire company of King Tigers every time that they play without any regard to the
historical accuracy of such a formation. There are of course ways around this. As
Johnathan P. suggests, a point system should be based on already established maneuver
elements found in the rules rather than a stand-by-stand basis.

3.) As Dave C. already pointed out, the rules book already provides ready made
formations that you would typically find during WW2.

4.) Also unlike fantasy games, historical sources exist that show what the doctrine was
for a particular nation when attacking and defending during WW2. These sources shoud be
the model for the forces needed to play a pick up battle. For example: in a pick up
game I usually allow a 2 or 3-1 ratio of attackers to defenders(a regiment vs. a
battalion). The defenders will be allowed to start the game in improved positions (at
least). Of course this isn't representative of every WW2 battle but it is by no means
a-historical. I have played many pick up games like this and found them to be fairly
balanced games.

Matt

Re: Points Systems

Author: Kevin (63.160.4.---)
Date: 03-07-02 18:10

I guess I'll enter into the foray here also on this topic. I am in favor of some kind
of "point" system. Before you role your eyes let me explain that when I say "points" I
am not looking for a figure equals x number of points and you build from there. I would

like to see some kind of quantifiable identifyer (number, letter, etc.) to relate unit
A of one side to unit A of another side. An american armored infantry company compared
to a german panzergrenadier company. I would like to be able to see at a glance the two
and use a comaparative factor to determine their "relative worth" to each other and
against other units. While I agree that historical scenarios are interesting and can
generate a good game, I've played games that use point systems and have had good games
with them also.
Games that use points and games that don't use points are still just that games. A
point or comparative system to me personally is just a way for me to generate a battle
quickly. For those of you who would wonder why I don't spend my time researching
historical battles? I work, my wife works, and I have three young children. I barely
have time to play much less spend time doing quality research for a wargame. For me
personally this type of system makes my life easier. For others that have the time,
expertise and willpower to research historical battles and generate scenarios for them
PLEASE continue to do so. And a favor could you put them on this sight so I could take
advantage of your work. I would really appreciate it.
Thanks
Kevin

Reply To This Message

Re: Points Systems

Author: Loris (---.25-151.libero.it)
Date: 03-16-02 14:06

Ok, I'm coming from the Dark Side, and I find myself very disoriented from the TOE, i'm
not an Historian and don't know anything about the organization of the WWII armies, i'm
trying to learn from the Wargame....

What i can say is that if you don't want to use a point system, you can use the TOE,
but you can put'em both in the game....

And another thing, in Italy the most used rules set is DBx, and one of the great things
about DBX is that you can make a Tournament, that's a great way to make the game
popular...

Sorry for my english,

hi
loris

Reply To This Message

Re: Points Systems

Author: Craig Burnett (---.prem.tmns.net.au)
Date: 03-17-02 05:03

Loris,
What youv'e said makes sense - either use the TO&E or use your own personal points
system - but you cannot have both.
There's nothing wrong with your English either - it makes perfect sense to me.

Thanks and regards,
CRB

Reply To This Message

Re: Points Systems

Author: Mark Hayes (---.elkrdg01.md.comcast.net)
Date: 03-17-02 22:18

Loris,

Your English is better than Craig's. :-)

Mark

Re: Points Systems

Author: Craig Burnett (---.prem.tmns.net.au)
Date: 03-18-02 04:10

Ok, Hayeseys back...

It's all true, my English sucks.

CRB

Re: Points Systems

Author: Bob Hart (144.139.71.---)
Date: 03-18-02 04:53

There has been much back and forthing, to and froing on points systems. I would like to
see one(a very simple one) for the simple reason that if I am designing a scenario, I
would like some way of making a rough check that I have balanced the forces. Is a 1944
German Inf Bn (-) with some regt'l support going to provide enough opposition to a
Commonwealth Bn (+) with Mike missions?
Despite the 'pure' wargamers saying they do appreciate having to fight real life
battles, there are some who want a reasonable chance of winning! If I can balance the
scenario in some way, then I have more chance of having a satisfied wargamer using
Battlefront.
Everyone would like to feel their wargame was always balancing on a razor's edge as to
the outcome right up until the last. But if the only Victory conditions are " hold your
positions more than 5 turns and you have done better than real life" , then I think you
lose a Battlefront wargamer, if not a modern wargamer.
I think a points system, something like a german coy is 5 pts, dugin add 3 more points
with one registered fire mission from the battalion mortars, add another point vs an
American mech Inf coy 7 points with a pl of tanks, add 2 points so roughly equal = go
for it. That would help tremendously.
As an aside, how much more effective does the group think having the defender in
improved positions/ dug in, etc make him?
I might add I like Nigel's suggestion about a quick pickup game flowchart and have used
it a number of times. But when designing a scenario, it doesn't help.
Regards
Bob Hart

Re: Points Systems

Author: Loris (---.25-151.libero.it)
Date: 03-18-02 14:29

ok, thank to all for the answers...
and i agree with anything written by Bob, it's the same thing i was thinking of.

I think it's a great way to make the games more popular, that's a great way to make new
friends (apart writing on BG forums!! :-))

hi to all
loris

Re: Points Systems

Author: Craig Burnett (144.134.215.---)
Date: 03-19-02 05:51

I'll go with Bob's idea - hey Bob, if you already use something like that to generate
BF games, could you e-mail it to me, ta.

Regards,
Craig

Re: Points Systems

Author: Kevin (207.43.74.---)
Date: 03-19-02 16:21

I've re-read this thread again and seen that additional posts that have been included.
And I would like to add that I have played historical games for a number of years now.
I have played ancient points based games and other historical games and I have also
played historical games that don't use points. I have in general over the years enjoyed
both types of games.
The point systems games allow myself the wargamer an additional tool to use to develope
a scenario. And as a gamer speaking in general the more "tools" that are made available
to me the better able I am to fully enjoy the game. I classify the use of points into
the same catagory as the artillery tutorial found on this website. A tool for use by
gamers to further enhance their gaming pleasure.
For those that don't want to use points don't. For those that do take the time to do
alittle reasearch and play balance and come up with a system. If you do please share
with the wargame community. I personally appreciate any and all tools that others do to
help enhance my hobby/passion.

Kevin

Re: Points Systems

Author: Craig Burnett (144.139.1.---)
Date: 03-20-02 04:47

Kev,
You should check out on the rest of the site where they've got a very nice MG Beaten
Zone template and a spotting tool, terrain affects and a few other little charts/tables
not on the play card, plus lots of other things that make the game easier, such as the
Close Combat Calculator - right tools for right job, so to speak.

Regards,
CRB

Re: Points Systems

Author: Bob Hart (144.139.73.---)
Date: 03-21-02 03:00

Craig,
I am currently working on a first rough draft, hopefully to be done over Easter, when I
can get a couple of days to myself. I intend to try it out and see if there are any
glaring errors before I burst into print.

Having said that, I ask again, what do people think is a reasonable advantage for troops in improved positions? Is a company in improved positions worth two companies not in improved positions?

Any opinions?
Bob

Re: Points Systems

Author: Mark Hayes (---.nhc.navy.mil)
Date: 03-21-02 07:54

Bob,

My honest answer to your question is, "it depends," which is why I don't use point systems. I trust my own judgement to take into account all the relevent factors, rather than points, in designing a balanced scenario.

I know that that answer isn't very helpful, so let me offer a suggestion on how to look at the value of different units. A Russian company in improved positions might be twice as effective in the game. However, a German company, because of the large number of machine guns represented in the units, might be THREE times as effective when dug in. In any event, I think two to three times as effective is probably right under most circumstances. Anyway, consider the circumstances that the unit is in when assing points. In an urban environment, a submachine gun company would have a greater relative value than if it were operating in the open field.

Best regards,
Mark

Re: Points Systems

Author: randyh (---.kable.com)
Date: 03-21-02 17:15

AHAH the crux of the problem. Using only me's a equivelants you admit there is a difference between a Russian company and a German one. If a point system was used the German company would be worth more to start with and if in improved postions even more so. German company worth 4 pts X 2 for improved position would be 8 pts. A Russian company in improved positions 3 pts X 2 would be only 6. (rough example) Then as you lay out your scenario attacking a German dug in company 8pts, at 3 to 1 odds, (standard attacking odds) would require 8 Russian companies or 24 points of Russian to&e's. Points don't take away anything, they are a tool for setting up games.

Re: Points Systems

Author: Bob Hart (144.139.71.---)
Date: 03-22-02 04:48

I am trying to broad brush this and don't want to get bogged down. First thoughts seem to lie in the region of
1. A simple system (got to be, I'm trying to use it)
2. Something that does not depend on a central referee to determine.
3. based on the cards since they are the building blocks for ME and BG. get a basic value for each card and the rest follows.

Say a base unit/card is 2 points. + or - discipline rating for good order. If Inf ie non-V, then + the firepower factor vs Inf at 2-5". This allows Russian SMG units at -1 to still have a value of 1, unless they are raw. Damn, raise the start point to a base

of 3, then raw russian SMG (RU-18) are 3 - 1 for firepower at 2-5" and -1 for Raw gives a calculated value of 1.
veteran german Inf are 3 + 1 for vet +1 for firepower at 2-5" = 5.
So Raw Russian RU-18 need five squads to match a veteran german GE-44.
Sound about right? Russian RU-17 are 0 at 2-5" so a trained squad comes out at 3. So about three are needed to equal a GE-44, and at 3:1 odds 5 are needed to defeat one German veteran GE-44.
if you just use the modifiers for fire combat, an improved position is a 1 difference so a veteran GE-44 in improved positions is a 6, an experienced or trained is a 5.

What about armour? Since armour depends on guns and armour to become an effective weapon system (gee, did they talk like that in 1945?) how about we add the weapon value at 5-10" and the front armour value to a base three?
So we have a RU-03.1 (T-34/85) at 3 + gun at 5-10" +6 and the front armour rating + 4 to equal a trained or experienced 13.
A GE-04 Panther is 3 + 6 + 5 for a 14.
A GE-03 Pz IV H is 3 + 6 + 4 = 13.
A US-02 Sherman 75mm is 3 + 4 + 4 = 11 and a 76mm is 3 + 5 + 4 = 12.

The system would allow raw troops to field more since they suffer a -1 in their points and would allow other units to be able to combat elite and veteran since they would also have to pay more for their units.
Okay, so it's still early days and still has a few rough edges but does this sound as though it is feasible?
Bob

Re: Points Systems

Author: Matt Fensome (---.uea.ac.uk)
Date: 03-22-02 06:06

Okay, my last attempt to sabotage the points system . . .

How much is a German 88mm AT unit worth in woods against a company of Shermans? Priceless, yes? Okay, BUT what if the opposition has no tanks and plenty of artillery? I hope you can see what I'm getting at . . .

Matt Fensome

Re: Points Systems

Author: Mark Hayes (---.nhc.navy.mil)
Date: 03-22-02 06:30

Bob,

Don't forget the scaling effect. Most units are worth more than the sum total of their parts. A battalion of 7 T-34/85s is worth 91 points. A company of 6 Panthers is worth 84 points. I'll take the Panthers every time. :-)

Mark

Re: Points Systems

Author: Bob Hart (144.139.71.---)
Date: 03-22-02 06:34

Matt,
I am not advocating a points system for every game. This is what is known as a gross

error check for scenarios. It always sounds great to set up a scenario and those with a bit of experience can nearly always achieve a balanced one.It takes time and experience to achieve that level of expertise in scenario design.
However, someone earlier made a very good point that he had limited time to wargame and would like to quickly throw together a game without having to do research in books he cannot afford using time he cannot spare to get a scenario.
I see the point system as a way for a scenario designer to do a quick check that the whole thing is roughly balanced.
If someone started using my embryonic and very rough point system to argue he should be allowed an extra anti-tank gun because the points are not quite equal, then that is when I decide I don't need the aggravation of playing against that person.
Bob

Re: Points Systems

Author: Craig Burnett (144.139.5.---)
Date: 03-22-02 07:26

Bob,
Whatever youv'e used there will be fine by me. Any finer details can come later - but I'll give that a play-test go for a while in some games here and see how it runs.

Thanks for that,
Regards,
Craig

Re: Points Systems

Author: Bob Hart (144.139.71.---)
Date: 03-23-02 02:40

Mark,
I know what you are saying. And we haven't even started on indirect fire yet!
I think I would be happy with the calculations as they stand at the moment. If the T-34 Bn came out at say 30 points and the Panther Coy was 91, then I would feel I needed three T-34 Bns to equal the panther Coy. As it is, I have a rough parity so I would not expect a steamroller effect. Properly handled the T-34's should give the panthers run for their money. Anyone want to bet on the outcome?
Remember too that the different armies used different numbers of vehicles. A Soviet Tk Bn was about 21 tanks (real numbers) in 1943. That was just a touch higher than a BCOM Squadron at 17 tanks! I always worry when people start to use Bns in scenarios without really understanding what that really was on the ground!
Again, let me stress I do not suggest this system be used as a 500point army pickup game system!! All I want is some system to make sure I haven't written up an unbalanced scenario!
Bob

Re: Points Systems

Author: Craig Burnett (---.prem.tmns.net.au)
Date: 03-23-02 23:39

Bob,
Once you've got a draft to go, I'll sling it at the kids in a trial - that works well. Already the concept has appealed to them in that they can now put together a contact with at least a guide on what to use, rather than throw everything in as 'wanted'. The learning process to understand TOE's is well understood, but that idea of maintaining a 'sort-of' equitable chance for both opponents, is a good instruction tool too.

Regards,
Craig

Re: Points Systems

Author: Mark Hayes (---.elkrdg01.md.comcast.net)
Date: 03-24-02 00:52

Bob,

I'm not trying to discourage you (well, maybe I am :-) but just point out what I think
are limitations on a point system. Your efforts will certainly fill a void that some
folks believe is there.

Best regards,
Mark

Re: Points Systems

Author: Bob Hart (---.prem.tmns.net.au)
Date: 04-04-02 06:34

Craig, and others,
Having done a number crunch over Easter, I suggest the following crude method of seeing
if a scenario is roughly balanced. Remember, I wanted it to be able to be calculated
off the cards with little mathematics.
For Inf, take a base 3, add the firepower factor vs TG at 2-5" (good basic Infantry
ranges). eg all Inf except Rifle armed Russians come out at 4pts, Rifle armed Russians
at 3 points, all LMG and MMG at 5 points.
IDF base of 3, add 0 for firepower at 2-5 , add 2 pts for being able to IDF, add IDF vs
TG and add 1 if large template. 81mm comes at 6, 3" mor at 5, 60mm at 4, 2" at 3.
Tanks. Base 3, add gun factor vs V at 10-20" , add front armour rating.
Sherman, Cromwell IV , T-34/76 come out at 10, Pz IVH, Sherman 76, T-34/85 are 11,
Panther and Tiger, Comet and Firefly are 13, M26 and JgPanther are 14, King Tiger 15
and JgdTiger 18.

Looking about right order of magnitude so far.

Perhaps add 1 point if Veteran and 2 points if Elite. Drop a point if Trained or Raw?

Now the easy part. When designing a scenario, it is odds on that it will be an advance
to contact. ie the attacker has to come on the board, find the enemy and defeat him.
Obviously the defender should be in defence, ie improved positions, Dug-in, etc. I
suggest one of two approaches be used. Either up the defender total by 50% for every
unit in improved positions and by 100% for those dug-in and the attacker gets an equal
number of points OR regardless of the amount of dug-in/improved, give the attacker
between 2 and 2.5 times the points total of the defender. DO NOT DO BOTH!
example: German experienced coy , 9 x GE-44 = 9 x 4 = 36. Plus HMG GE-50 @ 5 Plus
Commander GE-46 at 3 = 44 points. If all in improved call it 66 points or if all dugin
call it 88 points. Option 1, Attacker has either 66 or 88 points to fight with. Option
2 Attacker has 44 x 2 = 88 points.
Given the uncertanty of hidden counters with dummies, this should be not a bad ratio.
Remember, this is for scenario design. The scenario designer can play around with the
fortce mixes to get a good looking matchup. I don't expect an exact point match. This
is a gross error check to see if the forces end up roughly equal, taking into account
defenceworks etc.

One basic problem with scenario design. The time frame!

All staff officers, when given a problem like this, do a quick time and space

calculation to see if they can do the job. Say the scenario calls for you to exit
troops off the far end of a 6' long board. If your tanks are Shermans, then they move
cross country at 8". Even if they were on a perfectly flat board, with no opposition,
they would take 9 turns to do so. I assume that basic tactical rules apply, ie
leapfrogging with overwatch. If caterpillaring, then it will take longer. If there are
any breaches to be done, ie hedgerows, fording streams, etc, then add a turn for each
breach.
So if you give the attacker only 10 turns to exit the far end of the board, unless he
does the charge of the light brigade, he will not be able to make it. Now throw in the
need to find enemy, move into an attacking position and actually attack and you need to
add at least four or five more turns.
So please scenario designers, give the attacker a chance to get there, wherever there
is!

sitting back waiting for the inevitable replies
Bob Hart

Re: Points Systems

Author: Loris (---.25-151.libero.it)
Date: 04-05-02 08:55

hei, i think it's a good system, and i will try it...
I think you are going in the right direction....

thanks

Loris

Point System?

Author: Adrian (140.142.204.---)
Date: 12-02-03 18:04

Has anyone ever attempted designing a point system for Battlefront WWII for quick pick up games etc??? I've always found this a nice addition to a set of rules.

Re: Point System?

Author: R Mark Davies ()
Date: 12-02-03 18:15

Hi Adrian,

There's been A LOT of discussion here over the last few years - try a search - there have even been some put forward and it's all on the forum here somewhere.

However, the problem is that points systems just don't really work. A friend of mine writing another set of 15mm WW2 rules was nagged into adding a points system before publication and has spent the last couple of years dealing with questions - not about tactics, rules, organisations or scenarios, but about why a Panzer IV H is 5 points more than a Pz IV G...

What is more, points systems tend not to refelct real organisations or tactics - it all seems (to me) to be about getting away with finding the most undervalued units in the lists, thereby getting more bang for your buck! Just tae a look at the Flames of War site for some examples (a 'competition winning' army that consisted entirely of T34s and T70s for example - without an infantryman or gunner in sight!).

Sorry - I could bang on about this all day. It's my morbid fear of competition gamers that does it... ;o)

Cheers,

Mark

Re: Point System?

Author: bruce henderson ()
Date: 12-02-03 19:48

The only thing I find points good for is to make Armies to sell to finance my other 'proper' wargaming. Parity isn't always a good idea in a game.
Actually, the only time I've enjoyed a points game is in Peter Pig's "Ak-47" building fictional armies.
For WWII this site has way too many OOB's and scenarios to be lazy and rely on a points system. This is not true of some ancient armies etc. so some guidelines and conjecture (a points system) may be necessary.
I have also found SkirmishCampaigns books translate well to Battlefront WWII and provide excellent, tense games with scenario objectives that reflect one's (historic) forces. I have built enough Russian and German stuff (41-43) to run any of these scenarios so don't really need points for a pick-up game; just need to turn to a page!
If you have to use points find Squad Leader and base it off that, or use Steel Panthers.

Re: Point System?

Author: terry haney ()
Date: 12-02-03 20:40

I don't care for 'point systems" as RMD says, they make for unrealistic games, FOW is a
prime example.

If you research your period, WWII or whatever, you'll know what works for pick-up
games. Better stop now.

Terry

Reply To This Message

Re: Point System?

Author: Bob Eldridge ()
Date: 12-04-03 08:32

I concur. Any points system is by nature arbitrary, and leads to unrealistic games.
Best to research historical situations and set up games based on those. There's tons of
material floating around about virtually every theater of war.

Reply To This Message

Re: Point System?

Author: Jim ()
Date: 12-04-03 18:46

So let me see if I got this right. Any set of rules with a point system is a bad set
and all players are forced to use the points system even if they dont want too.

Wow, I didnt know those little numbers were so powerful.

Reply To This Message

Re: Point System?

Author: Mike ()
Date: 12-04-03 20:18

No, you don't have it right---Bob said arbitrary---and arbitrary doesn't necessarily
mean bad. IMO, most BF players appreciate the more historical flavor gained by using
actual battle OOBs or researched TO&E's rather than tally up points for units ala
Flames of War.

Different strokes, etc.

Reply To This Message

Re: Point System?

Author: terry haney ()
Date: 12-04-03 20:44

IMHO - point systems make it a game.

Historical research make it a wargame.

Terry

Reply To This Message

Re: Point System?

Author: Mark.Hayes ()

```
Date:    12-04-03 22:49

Jim,

I think the consensus opinion is that point systems are bad. The rules set in question
may still be great. I used to like playing FIREFLY and CHALLENGER, but I never used the
point system.

Mark
```

Re: Point System?

```
Author: Jim ()
Date:    12-05-03 19:58

I think the consensus opinion has already voted with thier combined feet and are
playing FoW.
```

Re: Point System?

```
Author: terry haney ()
Date:    12-05-03 21:49

FoW is an attempt by the Gamesters of Triskelion to takeover historical wargaming,
subsituting points for quatloos.

Resistance is futile, you will be absorbed. : * )

Terry
```

Re: Point System?

```
Author: R Mark Davies ()
Date:    12-06-03 13:54

Hi Jim,

Please don't take my remarks as a criticism of FoW - I haven't even seen a copy of
their rules, let alone read or played them. If I did (I expect I will one day), I just
wouldn't use any form of points to determine scenarios - I have more imagination than
that. As with Mark Hayes, I've played WRG, Firefly, etc, not to mention countless
Naploeonic, Ancient and SYW rulesets, almost all of which had points systems that I
only used if forced to by the game master. I find a scenario-led game to be MUCH more
satisfying - all the better if it is a well-researched historical scenario (but it's
not necessary, there are countless hypothetical or set-piece scenarios that can be
played out - indeed, WRG do whole books full of them) - and there are more historical
scenarios available freely available on the web than I could EVER find time to play!
```

Re: Point System?

```
Author: R Mark Davies ()
Date:    12-06-03 13:55

Sorry for breaking up this post - my computer doesn't like big posts these days :o(

As I said - there is no criticism here of FoW (good luck to them) - only the players
who fill their forum (and others) with pointless (excuse the pun) and non-historically-
```

based discussions about what they should fit in their allocated amount of points.

cheers,

Mark

Re: Point System?

Author: Dan ()
Date: 12-06-03 16:45

Points systems have a limited value in historical gaming. Designing combat forces based on points encourages players to optimise their points, rather than focus more on strategy and tactics. It leads to "points gaming".
Also, most points based systems focus on the combat value of a unit/weapon system rather than their economic values. For example, in Firefly the Tiger I is 370 points compared to 300 points for a T-34/76, based solely on their combat capabilities (armour, weapon, mobility, silhouette, etc.). Yet in reality, the economic value of a Tiger I would be 3 or more times that of a T-34/76 given the disparity of resources and material to build them. The Germans simply could not build enough of these expensive weapons because of their high cost in labour and a resources, and not because they ran out of "points".
Points (based on econoomic values) have a value in determining a winner or loser in economic terms, but not otherwise I prefer BF's reliance on historical OOB to re-create historical battles.

Dan

Re: Point System?

Author: Peter Palmer ()
Date: 12-06-03 17:56

I guess it depends whether you have the resources and the time beforehand to arrange a game. What happens to the enthusiastic newcomer who doesn't have the benefit of either of those things but wants to play a pck-up game with whoever he meets at the club?

Points systems are not bad in and of themselves, slavish adherence to them is. Just as slavish adherence to theoretical OBs and TOEs is artificial.

Re: Point System?

Author: Peter Palmer ()
Date: 12-06-03 18:04

Finally, I'd rather introduce new gamers to the hobby and thus exapnd my possible pool of gaming opponents by whatever means works than arbitrarily limit my gaming to a small pool of *knowledgable* people. I've seen too many prospective gamers put off the hobby by nitpicking anoraks and rivet counters to have much sympathy for "Only historical research will do" Balancing scenarios is difficult enough, and trying to come up with a workable *historical scenario* given the limited gaming time available at a club meeting is just adding to the frustration level.

Don't get me wrong, I'd rather play a researched scenario over a pick-up points game, but given the choice between gaming or not gaming, I'll take the game anytime. And that's the raison d'etre of points systems, to allow people to play with a minimum of pre-game preparation where time is in short supply.

Re: Point System?

Author: bruce henderson ()
Date: 12-06-03 20:08

Back to my point then of pre-researched scenario books a la SkirmishCampaigns. No problems finding a pick up game with these. As I said, I just turn to a page, and whammo, there's a balanced, researched scenario - For Battlefront WWII on the Eastern Front I have over 50 scenarios with 8 or so variant forces for each. Who the heck needs to waste time with points? I also find it takes quite a while to count out an army and figure how much a Marder I costs as opposed to a Marder III. It can get ridiculous. The only fun I've had with points is if a computer does it for me or if I'm playing AK-47 where points are an intrinsic part of the game.

Reply To This Message

Re: Point System?

Author: terry haney ()
Date: 12-06-03 20:20

What historical commander could pick & choose the composition of his command?

Reply To This Message

Re: Point System?

Author: Mark Hayes ()
Date: 12-06-03 22:59

Whatever method one uses to establish the forces for a game (historical research, points or SWAG - scientific wild-ass guess) victory conditions, terrain, and player ability can destroy the most carefully constructed balance of forces. I have run scenarios at conventions that, after careful design and numerous playtests, I was sure they were as balanced as humanly possible. Then I would have one player that players much better or much worse than everyone else, and the game balance is destroyed.

IMHO, the bottom line is try to balance a scenario (taking into account all the things mentioned above, not just forces) as well as your experience will allow, and just have fun.

Use the Tables of Organization to organize a basic infantry or combined arms force. If the game is a meeting engagement make the ratio of forces about 1 to 1 (ie. 2 infantry companies vs. 2 infantry companies or 1 armored task force vs. 1 armored kampfgruppe). If one side is defending in average terrain with hidden unit markers, make the ratio about 3 to 1). Only with experience will you be able to create a well balanced scenario between two opponents with equal abilities.

Mark

Reply To This Message

Re: Point System?

Author: Peter Palmer ()
Date: 12-07-03 04:25

"What historical commander could pick & choose the composition of his command?"

Ever heard of Mission planning or Task resourcing at battalion level?

Most Battalion Commanders will determine the forces allocated to a specific battlefield task. The implementation of those forces in achieving that task is the responsibility of the Officer in command of the aloocated forces.

"No problems finding a pick up game with [Skirmish Campaigns]"

All very well if you know about them and have access to them. What many of us who have
been wargaming for any leangth of time do is take our general knowledge of wargaming
for granted. The newcomer to the hobby today is very often unaware of WW2 History
outside of recent hollywood or TV movies. There just isn't the public consciousness of
WW2 that there was in the 70s and 80s. Just as a reminder of perspective, the 70s are
as far removed form todays youth as they were from WW2.

As Mark Hayes has intimated, Balance is ephemeral no matter how good a scenario
designer one might be. getting the game's victory conditions right is usually the best
way to make for a mutually enjoyable game. The problem with many points systems is they
tie the Victory Conditions in with the points system, which is a mistake. Points
systems are a mechanism to allow a fast set up of a gem, not the design rationale
behind winning and losing.

Also a good points system can be designed around historically typical TOEs with options
of reinforcing elements or even understrength units that matched the conditionns under
which a commander might face having to allocate tasks.

I'll reiterate, Points systems are no more evil than any other mechanism used in a game
design. They are a tool, not a cornerstone. All people are asking is for a tool that
will help them play games. If one can't see that, then I hope one will be happy with an
ever decreasing circle of gamers, because this hobby doesn't help itself by decrying
attempts to cater to the less-well informed.

<div align="right">

Reply To This Message
</div>

Re: Point System?

Author: Peter Palmer ()
Date: 12-07-03 04:39

"Only with experience will you be able to create a well balanced scenario between two
opponents with equal abilities."

For the newcomer to gaming, historical miniatures in particular and WW2 specifically,
this just isn't an enjoyable introduction to the hobby, hence the appeal of a points
system. I'm not saying that a points system is compulsory, by no means. I'd rather not
use points myself, but If I was starting out with no knowledge or background
familiarity, I'd be looking for some method that allowed me to use my miniatures oon
the tabletop as soon as possible. Miniatures gaming has to compete against the draw of
other recreational activities and as such, anything that eases the initial transition
is welcome. Frustration at a failure to get anywhere will do more to drive people away
from the hobby leaving it with a poor reputation (and it's not like the hobby as a
whole is particularly well thought of by non-aficionados) and thus decreasing the
likelihood of newcomers in the future.

<div align="right">

Reply To This Message
</div>

Re: Point System?

Author: loris ()
Date: 12-07-03 04:43

some things to say for me:

1) The sheer number of posts on this topic tell us that Point System it's not a
secondary argument, it's something that someone need and someone hate... and someone
both :-) (like me)

2) As i said time ago, from an Hobby point of view, a point system is a necessity if
you want to make a tournament, wich is one of the means to increase the number of
players very very much (just look at FOW, you can't say it isn't a success)

3) The problem with Historical scenary (that i love) it's that i never have all the models i need... and this is a problem if you are a newbe... i have only a battallion of infantry and a company of shermans, if i have a point system i can play with 'em and be sure that the scen is , somehow, balanced.

4) I just ordered the FOW book, i want to use it to introduce some "dark side" players to the WW2 period, when they will need more historicity and Real Wargaming (and they'll need for sure if they play FOW....) , than i will introduce them to BFWW2...
I'm like Pushers, i will start with small free doses, tham i will make them play some of RMD scenary....hahahahahahahaha AND THEY WILL BE MINE!!!!!
sorry...

Loris

Re: Point System?

Author: Peter Palmer ()
Date: 12-07-03 05:44

First you reel them in and get them interested, then you help them with research, etc. Soon you find that they bring a fresh approach to long cherished opinions and rationales.

Today's neophyte historical gamer could be tomorrow's Scenario/ campaign expert. We all have to start somewhere, but these days, the neophytes don't have the starting background knoweldge that we had. Even amongst my peers at school, the fact I had parents who'd served during WW2 was notable rather than the norm.

Re: Point System?

Author: Arrigo Velicogna ()
Date: 12-07-03 11:32

Point System...

Point Sysem doesn't make a pick up game balanced. tounraments doesn't necessarily attract more people to the hobby (I was almost pissed off by tournsaments)

And somewhat we are misled by the word balanced... battles are rarely balanced and the more balanced often are the more annoying. If you want balanced tournaments make the fianl effect balanced not the single battles. And also if you wanto to balance the single battles better to create balanced victory conditions than point pased armies. Long ago a friend as amstered a Combined Arms tournament without points. The referees have created competitive scenarios based on the army list presented by the palyer and twisted the thing feeding replacements from battle to battle.

IMHO points tend to make gaming sterile noyt interesting or balanced. The only ecception are the Peter Pig point system in many of their ruleset who create some interresting situation acting more as scenairo generator than simple point system. This is the way to follow if one want to use his head otherwise one can simply follow the GW lead and be assymilated until the Enterprise creww will make the collective sleep and autodestruct...

Arrigo

Re: Point System?

Author: Peter Palmer ()
Date: 12-07-03 20:38

I'm not claiming that Points systems are balanced per se. I just feel that arbitrarily
dismissing them as an option is counter-productive in the medium-long term. As for
tournaments, I don't like the stresses or the highly competitive mindset that seems to
pervade _most_ competitions, but in general tournaments provide a common meeting place
for gamers from disparate geographical locations to meet and play each other.

Re: Point System?

Author: terry haney ()
Date: 12-07-03 21:01

"mission planning and task resourcing at battalion level" remf.

If point systems help newcomers to historical gaming , wonderful. Mentoring them also
works, setting up scenarios(points system or otherwise) that work to involve them in
the appreciation of military history.

That's all folks,

Terry

Re: Point System?

Author: Dan ()
Date: 12-08-03 02:14

IMHO no one is dismissing points systems out-of-hand. There has been due considerations
regarding a points system for BF. There was ample discussion last year on this topic.
What most opponents of a points system seem to object to is that such a system tends to
create more problems than it solves, and furthermore it doesn't really fix the problems
of play balance, nor facilitating pick-up games.
A points system along the line of FoW is definitely not the way to go. Just look at one
of their 1500 pt. soviet force; composed of KV1, SU-152, T-70 and BA-10 drawn from
regular conscript and guard formations. This is definitely "points gaming". Many of
their other game forces are tank heavy, while others are realistic.
I like Bob Hart's suggestion about have a points system for checking and balancing a
scenario for design purposes only, not for designing forces for pick-up games or
tournaments. The points grading would use single digit numbers to roughly approximate
the combat capabilities of MEs, and not individual stands, and force selection would be
guided by the OOBs and TOEs.
Personally, our club hasn't encountered a need for points when playing BF. Our club
members are helpful to new players to any gaming system played at the club. If new
players don't have ready access to experienced BF players or local resources on WW2,
the BF web-site is a great resource. Check the postings and often new players have
asked about building a new combat force.
In the end, a points system isn't necessary to solve problems of play balance or
attracting new players.

Remf

Author: Peter Palmer ()
Date: 12-08-03 04:10

Terry,

I've no wish to get into a public slanging match. If you choose to toss insults from

the safety of a blind address, that's fine by me.

Re: Remf

Author: Matt Laing ()
Date: 12-08-03 11:48

IMO FoW has a pretty good point system. First off you have to purchase units based off of a real TO/E. You can't just buy 10 mg platoons and go at it.

Secondly, some people imply that being able to purchase an all armored force in FoW in historically inaccurate. Given the scale of the FoW game, there is nothing wrong with this approach as there are numerous historical accounts of company and platoon sized armored units acting, albeit briefly, without infantry support.

And finally, there is ample historical evidence to support the hodge podge make up a typical FoW army.

Many point system haters are as guilty of fielding a-historical forces and units at full TO/E so I dont see that an anti point sytem argument is relevant. I remember an Italian Theater micro armor game at Historicon run by a prominent gamer. The German OOB boasted more Tigers than were ever in Italy.

Re: Remf

Author: Roger Kumferman ()
Date: 12-08-03 12:58

Matt -

I gotcher Tiiiihhgers right here!

Re: Remf

Author: terry haney ()
Date: 12-08-03 14:16

Mr. Parker,

No insults intended.

I'm proud of my remf background.

S-3 clerk, HQ, 4th Battalion, 39th Artillery, SP

Re: Points System

Author: Adrian (140.142.204.---)
Date: 12-08-03 17:29

WOW! I never thought i'd start quite an engaging conversation...

The reason I asked about a point system is covered by those of you who discussed issue the "newbie" to wargaming and World War II wargaming.

I don't have a huge historical background in WWII history and I don't have the money to buy numerous expensive books on the subject.

Myself and the other person I play with who are trying to get into this genre using Battlefront WWII rules don't have the money or time to buy and paint the forces needed to cover most of quite large scenarios on this website. We are only concentrating on Americans and Germans and hovering around a battalion plus each. If we wanted to play the scenarios listed we would have to go out and purchase new minis and paint them for just about every one of them.
I've looked at skirmish campaigns and they seem reasonable but again every scenario adds another miniature or something we don't have and aren't getting any time soon. We had hoped to build our basic forces and get a good amount of smaller games in before we built up our forces or switched to another nationality.
As a new historical miniature wargamer I think this is one of the killers of this hobby! The amount of miniatures and research needed just to play your first game! A reason why games like Flames of War and Warhammer Ancients and DBA/DBM are catching on big time with new players like myself. It allows the players to start small and have fun and then over time collect those large armies and historical knowledge to play the bigger more historical games.

I thought...hmmm....couldn't a point system help us out here? As other's have said FOW has one as do many other games including MANY historical boardgames such as ASL.

I never said it would be completely historically accurate but it would allow for fast put down games to be played with some measure of historical accuracy and balance.

As time goes by such players would have that time and skill with the game and TOE's to start working on more historically accurate games. As it is now there is very little easily available to the beginning player involving smaller quick scenarios to learn the game AND the history. I've contemplated using ASL scenarios but they are often much too small and again the problem of the varied additional equipment comes up.

I don't understand what the fuss is all about regarding point systems in historical wargaming...it's a good way to get small or even large games set up fast and to get new gamers into the rules and or genre. Obviously why FOW is making the bucks. I do notice that they do also play historical battles using those rules so it's not like they are dumming the hobby down. They along with some others like myself want a version of rules that also allow for quick and fun semi probable historical and fairly balanced games. Not all of us have the time, money and resources to accurately research a historical battle to play every other weekend, we just want to get down and dirty and wargame.
I've research two Napoleon's Battles historical scenarios in the last year and it was tiresome...worth the effort but not something I'd want to do every month! I wanna say to John Doe "Hey! Come over this weekend and lets play a quick game of Battlefront WWII"!
Heck, imagine the gaming and advertising opportunities for these rules at conventions if someone like myself could play a few furious pick up games over the course of a convention weekend in front of all those attendees!

I really like these rules! I own FOW but I would really prefer to play BFWWII as I think they feel more real and allow more on the battlefield. I just wish there was some simple point system for easy yet semi historical and balanced pick up games.

Anyhoo...I didn't think i'd write a book back to ya'll but there it is... :P :):):)

Adrian Nelsen

Re: Points System

Author: terry haney ()
Date: 12-08-03 19:40

Excellent response Adrian. As a historical gamer of 30 years, I tend to forget what I went thru starting out. Limited resource, time, table space, etc. My book/figure

collection took years to acquire.

Some suggestions.

1. The scenarios on the 'extras' page can be adapted to whatever theater/period your game.

2. Burma 1944-45 is my theater of choice now. So many actions involving battalions or smaller. Also, as the forgotten war, the units in Burma where always under stength and equipped. Some of my best games have been understrength battalion encounters with only on-board fire support, and few AFVs.

3. Regardless of "points" FoW and Rapid Fire OB's are very useful in providing info on unit organizations. Use them as references for building your armies. I do.

4. 'A Difficult Affair II, West of Botovo' scenario on the extras page is a great company level game, that can be adapted to any period of WWII.

5. Libraries and the internet provide free WWII info. See the BF Links page.

Welcome to BF, I hope this helps.

Terry Haney

Reply To This Message

Re: Points System

Author: Mark.Hayes ()
Date: 12-08-03 20:07

Thanks Adrian. Like Terry said, that was a good response. Those of us that have worked on the rules and supplements tend to design scenarios that we run at conventions, meaning for six players or more. We haven't paid much attention to introductory scenarios since we first published the rules, and perhaps that is something we should consider.

Terry suggested another idea. Take some of the smaller scenarios on the website and simply substitute the forces you do have. For that matter, there is no reason why you couldn't play one of the scenarios even if you are a few units short of what is listed.

Probably the easiest and cheapest way to begin playing BF is to build a standard infantry company of Germans and one of the Allied armies. Add a platoon of Shermans, Panzer IVs, or T-34/76s as appropriate. Then work your way up to a battalion-sized battlegroup.

Just some suggestions.

Mark

Reply To This Message

Re: Points System

Author: R Mark Davies ()
Date: 12-09-03 01:21

Mark,

As it happens, I'm just introducing a whole new bunch of fourteen-year-olds to BF and I've written a stack of company-or-two sized scenarios for NW Europe to get them going with different troop types and styles of play (set-piece attack/recce/bocage defence/tank country defence/etc, etc). I'll try to get them posted up soon. The first one will be 'Easy at Nuenen' - based on Band of Brothers.

Cheers,

Mark

Re: Points System

Author: Dan ()
Date: 12-09-03 02:14

Rhetoric aside. As in any discussion there are differing view points. To disregard "any anti-point system argument" as irrelevant is disingenuous. I have played and enjoyed many game systems based on points. With respect to BF, I don't see the need to include such a system. As RMD and others have proposed, there are other alternatives. I would rather have the designers spend their time expanding the scope of BF instead of on a points system, which tend to take on a life of their own with potenially endless revisions. Case in point FoW just lowered the points value for Tiger Is, to the pleasure of some.
As for armour only combat forces, there is historical evidence for such, like at Pohkarovka. The example I pointed out had more to do with players tending to optimising points for games (especially tournaments), which has been a bane of most points systems.

Dan

P.S. I like BF and I don't hate point systems :)

Re: Points System

Author: R Mark Davies ()
Date: 12-09-03 09:12

How about a page of small, hypothetical set-piece scenarios (much along the lines of the WRG books), with suggested forces given for the 'Big Four' in either attack or defence? It would be a large project, but I've basically already had a go at starting it.

Re: Points System

Author: Matt Laing ()
Date: 12-09-03 09:16

Adrian,

SInce you already own the FoW rule book why not use the FoW point system? WHile the FOW point system is not directly translatable to BF scale, with a little effort it can work for quick pick up games. Just remember the difference in unit scale, in FoW each vehicle and gun is equal to one real vehicle or gun and in BF the same model is equal to two or three real guns or vehicles.

The FoW army lists already provide historical TOs from which to start. For example, an American rifle company in BF using the BF organization charts would cost the same as three full strength rifle platoons and a weapons platoon in FoW. Higher level attachments in the form of other weapons platoons can be purchased to augment the rifle company. Ignore the costs for the HQ platoons as they could be considered as part of the overall cost for the company.

Unit composition is according to the BF unit organizations, and it costs what is listed in the FoW rule book. Use the FoW guidlines for creating your force. In other word

follow the FoW book and start with an infantry company or an armored company as your starting force and add attachments from there.

Matt

Re: Points System

Author: Adrian (140.142.204.---)
Date: 12-09-03 12:23

Again, thanks everyone for their responses!

I appreciate the positive feedback.

I don't expect BFWWII to necessarily put out a point system as I do know it would be a lot of work and effort re-directed from other projects. I was mainly curious as to whether anyone had made their own house point rules. :)

I would find the effort to disseminate more small scenarios very helpful as would other new players i'm sure!

The use of FOW's point system was a good suggestion and just might work. Why the heck that didn't pass my mind I don't know but then I guess that is what forums are for. :):)

I look forward to more BFWII gaming and finding some smaller scenarios up on the website.

Thanks!

Re: Points System

Author: bruce henderson ()
Date: 12-09-03 16:10

As above, good luck in your research. I started fairly late in WWII gaming. What I have done to mitigate the cost is concentrate on one period and two armies. I sold (or converted much of my stuff to AK-47) that did not fit these armies or time periods. It also happens that these match the SkirmishCampaigns Books that I also sometimes use for 28mm Skirmish. (1941-43 Russia).
I try to buy Quality Casting vehicles and guns as well as Old Glory Command Decision as they are much cheaper than Battlefront -especially for bulk things like trucks.
Infantry I prefer PP and their well thought out packs.

What I have found is the Flames of War 1500pt armies that I am building for sale are very expensive compared to my endeavors with Battlefront WWII. Instead of one or two inf. AT guns at Company level - I now need four plus prime movers and command - double the price. I now have to buy Artillery pieces, their command and prime movers instead of just an observer in a Universal Carrier -really expensive!. For my BEF infantry (not even using the full platoon supports) I need close to 20 trucks (over $150). I need much less even for a Battlefront motorized Russian Co. and supports.

My best recommendation if using a late War German and US force for Battlefront is to go 10mm, pretty good selection, paint up great and are a reasonable price - tanks about $3. The scaling (represents a platoon of tanks) looks great too and the range of weaponry seems to "feel" better. Won't break your wallet and can use N scale railroad/railway scenery. Had this scale been more readily available when I started out, I would have gone this route. Pendraken, Noble Miniatures(Perrin), are the one's I'm familiar with.

Anyway, look for, or design, small scale scenarios. I have found they provide as much enjoyment, more realistic command and control and manuever and tension as larger ones. if you screw up and the scenario is completely lopsided, so what! Life's not fair - besides you can always recycle units and through them back in as reinforcements - something I do frequently in my 28mm city fights. It's sometimes fairly easy to convert a scenario written for Russians and substitute similar US units and vice versa -just look at the OOB's in the Battlefront book. Possibly a good book for Scenarios for US vs German is McDonald's "Company Commander" and "A Time for Trumpets" mostly covering the Bulge. Inexpensive (definitely at your library) and good reading. Maybe someone has a bunch of Avalon Hill 'Squad Leader' scenarios kicking around. The best way to learn combined arms stuff is to game with what you have -which seems sufficient, and slowly expand -pretty soon you may have Regiment sized units to mess with! But to reiterate: choose a time period and two armies and stick to them, and only then branch out to some other Army -i.e LW British or LW Russian.

Re: Points System

Author: loris ()
Date: 12-09-03 17:02

One thing i can say about this topic it's that it's very, very interesting... I love small games for the reasons just said above and for the fact that they can be played in an evening, two-three hours, the time i can give to my hobby withouth upsetting my Wife and doughters...
RMD's proposal it's a great thing for me, it can be presented like a " newbe introductory tour"...

- A small engagement between two companies in a 24"x24" table
- Like above but with a tank platoon added
- An assault, two companies and a Tank platoon, with small howitzer support against a dug in company & support
- Like above, but with Air support

and so on, increasing...
They can be written like the others on this site, giving the right Feeling to the players...("In their Boots" like RMD said to me)

on the last ones, maybe, we can give some choises to the players, something like this:

" to conquer the hill you can use only three of these ME:

- One company of Infantry
- Another company of infantry
- One Platoon of Medium Tanks
- One Company of Combat Engineers
- One recce Company
- Two platoon of Light Tanks
- One Air Support
- Three battery of 105mm Howitzer
etc...."

Thus you start to give to the players the same choises of the TOE, but much more simplified...., withouth giving a "point" value to each ME...

Loris

Re: Points System

Author: Edward Sturges ()
Date: 12-09-03 17:54

```
Greetings

I think we should try to expand on this idea of small scenarios. How about if, in
addition to RMD's development, some of us try to come up with at least one small
scenario of 1 ME + per side to put on the website? Preferably historically based but
perhaps tweaked a little to fit?

Edward
```

Re: Points System

```
Author: Steven James (144.138.190.---)
Date:   12-09-03 19:04

Adrian wrote: I've research two Napoleon's Battles historical scenarios in the last
year and it was tiresome...worth the effort but not something I'd want to do every
month! I wanna say to John Doe "Hey! Come over this weekend and lets play a quick game
of Battlefront WWII"!

Adrian this has become a problem in our group. Only a small number are motivated to put
a scenario on. Like you after researching a historical scenario I was exhausted and no
matter how many books I have on the subject, I also seem to be missing some information
that requires more research or book buying so now I'm all in favour of a point system.

I've bought FOW and will use their point system. This way we can make a phone call
indicating the number of points and see you next week at the club. The other
alternative is if no one has come up with a scenario, and if they have but we don't
have all the models then theirs no BF game next meeting.

I truly cannot see how a point system will hurt the game.

Cordially

Steven
```

Re: Points System

```
Author: Steven James (144.138.162.---)
Date:   12-09-03 19:32


Bruce wrote: My best recommendation if using a late War German and US force for
Battlefront is to go 10mm, pretty good selection, paint up great and are a reasonable
price - tanks about $3.

Adrian if you really want to get up and running fast and have the best looking 10mm
tanks have a look at Dragon Model's 1/144 resin scale German armour. They are the same
size as Minifigs range but the difference is the Dragon tanks are computer laser
painted and come in seven camouflage schemes, including weathering (engine soot etc).
The detail is on a par with Tamiya's 1/48th scale kits.

Turrets turn but do not fall off when upside down.

They have now released the Stuka and Elephant. Soon will be Mark III's and IV's.

Now another company has released Americans (laser painted) with infantry. The
distributor claims they can with this new resin they are using put eyelash detail on a
10mm figure.
```

Cheers

Steven

Re: Points System

Author: Edward Sturges ()
Date: 12-09-03 19:33

Steven

I think so long as one uses a point system as an indicator to build a scenario and one can live with the likely resulting anomalies that is fine.

I think the potential problems arise when one tries to do an exact points matching assuming that because there are equal points it will a 'fair' fight. So long as it's reasonably close it should be a good game.

Edward

Re: Points System

Author: Steven James (144.138.190.---)
Date: 12-10-03 02:16

Edward wrote: I think the potential problems arise when one tries to do an exact points matching assuming that because there are equal points it will a 'fair' fight. So long as it's reasonably close it should be a good game.

The real basic item that makes a makes a good game for me whether it be points driven or scenario, is the ability of my opponent. There are some I know who provide a very stimulating and challenging game and others offer no mental stimulation whatsoever.

Cheers

Steven

Re: Points System

Author: Bob hart ()
Date: 12-10-03 06:10

As someone who was trying to devise one last year, let me state that my intention was as Edward has stated. It was intended to allow a scenario designer, or a pickup player, the opportunity to carry out what we call a gross error check. Using what was a simplistic point system, the player could hopefully see if the two sides were roughly equal. IIRC, I suggested some sort of modification if one side was dugin or in prepared positions.
I totally agree that a well balanced historical scenario should beat a point system driven game for interest hands down. However, I was looking at those who are moving our way from the dark side , and who have little reference material or who have been indoctrinated to believe that a point system will give a well balanced game.
I fully acknowledge that any point system driven game is at the mercy of a skilled player. I confess a tendency for the underdog, (eg French in 1940), mea culpa, and I have spent many long hours explaining to she who must be obeyed that my historical library costs far less than if I was out boozing and wenching. (yeah, right!)
But I still believe that for the neophyte, a basic point system can be very useful. I totally agree that we who have been gaming for decades can put together a very challenging historical scenario. But please take pity on those just starting out, whose

priority will always be buying and painting figures over purchasing the expensive
historys out there. Who remembers seeing Chandlers Campaigns of Napoleon and saving up
their allowances to buy it? Who would have spent that money on figures first and
Chandler later? I know which way I went!

Bob

Re: Points System

Author: Steve G (128.172.192.---)
Date: 12-10-03 11:06

Gentlemen,

I've been playing wargames for a few years and am trying to get started in Battlefront
as well.

Clearly with any point system there needs to be checks and balances within that system
to prevent abuse. While many may dislike, disagree, or not care for GW games, they do
provide an excellent example of point system evolution and alternate point system
attempts.

Warhammer 40k, Rogue Trader era - Open point system with essentially no checks and
balances. People could play a giant seething mass of troops or a single nearly god-like
presence. I think the only way they actually got past this stage was with the army
lists they published in their company mag (back when it was a mag and not glossy
advertising). In retrospect, this was truely a painful system to work in. I know I'd
never play it again.

Warhammer 40k, first box set - Army lists were standardized and point values were
smoothed up a bit. Point spending restrictions were put in place: minimum percent on
troops and a maximum percent on heros, vehicles, and extras. Did well to clean up some
of the mess, but it still too easy to minimize troop points while maximizing everything
else.

Warhammer 40k, second box set - This version switched from points percentages to
detachment choices with points limiting how much could be chosen in total. It has
mandatory choices, but then your free to choose within the structure of the detachment.
This system works decently as forces could be assembled quickly for a pickup fight
without having to really nitpick points to a great degree.

Warhammer Fantasy Battle - Haven't followed this one as close, but in general it
parallels 40k and has essentially the same flaws and issues.

Space Marine - 6mm scale 40k. This game had a card system setup where there was a main
company card to which the player added three to five detachment cards. Point values
were set for each card and was flexible only as to which detachments cards you added to
the company. Forces were very quick to assemble in this game. This game ultimately
suffered on the miniture side (models needed were scattered amongst spures in different
sets). Other gripes included that every company and detachment was at full strength
everytime and a couple flawed rules that made some troops far more valuable than they
were priced.

Epic 40k - Replaced Space Marine. While the rules were improved the army selection
slipped back into a nitpicky point system where the company cards had point choices for
units and the detachment adds were simply point options within the card.

Battlefleet Gothic - Capital ship combat in 40k universe. Simple point system. People
found what ships worked best and just took lots of those.

In my opinion, the best GW ever did in a force creation method was how they did Space

Marine. While it still had its flaws, its a blunt and fast method and great for pickup games. In fact, when Battlefront was first described to me, the parallel was drawn between the method that Space Marine forces were assembled and how information on Battlefront units was stored, i.e., card format, which became a big draw for me.

I agree that a method to allow two people to field two equivalent forces on the spur of the moment one evening would be very helpful. My personal take on 'Historical' is that the units themselves are historically accurate. Take mideval gaming (not sure if that is the correct term) where people seem to be fine playing games of Celtic vs. Samurai or Egyptian vs. Mogols. Even though these armies never historically fought a battle against each other, the armies themselves are historically accurate and equivalent within the ruleset.

If you think about it, in a historical recreation once the models start moving and dice start rolling, the historical accuracy of the situation is off. It is then up to the historical accuracy of the units to maintain the plausibility of events within the game.

Now ... if I were to design a 'Pick-up System', I would make someting as follows:

- Take the OOBs available on the website (as they are formatted for BF) and disect them down into formations that would remain relatively close on the battlefield. IMO, they more or less are and it might be the scale (6, 10, 15, etc ..) that decides how finely they get chopped down.

- Assign each formation a color code (since a number might be misconstrued as a point system) as to which formations are roughly equivalent in strength.

- Have the players grab/decide on forces such that the colors are matched (e.g., a red, a couple blues, and a green).

- Determine who is attacker and defender. Decide on a simple scenario so objectives can be decided on.

- Roll on some 'Fog of War' table that would be different for the attacker and defender. As not all forces were full strength, sometimes ill-positioned, coming in as reserve, requisition not filled, or just plain lost (I knew I should of made a left turn at Bastogne). This would then allow players to figure out how to accomplish their objectives with less than ideal forces.

- Play the game.

I've rambled enough. I've been enjoying reading this thread and hope that something to aid in the pick-up game area and quick scenario aspects comes out of it, as I would find it to be a much valued resource.

Steve G

Reply To This Message

Re: Points System

Author: Arrigo Velicogna ()
Date: 12-10-03 12:56

Steve,

you can also use a letter based code. But the idea sounds good.

Defining historical gaming having ancient egyptians vs Mongols is a bit off based. any system that allow that is fully unihistorical (and the two armies will perform in a manner markedly different from their historical counterpats); it's the same thing to put an M1A2 and a Tiger II on the same table and consider both heavy tanks.

This is one of the biggest weak point of points systems. They allow mixing
unihistorical opponents just because they are equal on point.

A matching sytem for BF could be:

1) Decide the games size (Company, Battalion, Regiment)

2) Decide the situation (meeting engagement, assault/defense, advance/delay)

3) the attaccker get a primary unit based on the size of the game and then add
attacchements according to his primary force size and type

4) The defender make his choiches in the same manner, only his size will be based on
the game size and situation (roughly 1:1 for meeting engagement, 2.:1 for
assault/defense and 3:1 for advance/dela).

Just some toughts.

Arrigo

<div align="right"><u>Reply To This Message</u></div>

Re: Points System

Author: Steve Burt (61.48.216.---)
Date: 12-10-03 18:51

A couple more options:
Squad Leader (and ASL, I believe) has points values for vehicles and infantry which
could be used for Battlefront.
Another option for those who would like pick-up games, but don't want to use points, is
to get hold of any or all of:
'Wargames Scenarios', 'Programmed Wargames Scenarios', 'Scenarios for all ages' (all by
C.S Grant).
These contain about 50 scenarios each, of all types (rearguard, coup de main, set piece
attack, reinforcing a position, and so on), along with generic forces for each side -
so for WW2 it will say 'defender gets 2 companies of infantry, attacker gets 1
battalion plus a tank company'. You can then use the TOEs on the bF page to construct
your forces.

<div align="right"><u>Reply To This Message</u></div>

Re: Points System

Author: Steve Burt (61.48.216.---)
Date: 12-10-03 18:53

A couple more options:
Squad Leader (and ASL, I believe) has points values for vehicles and infantry which
could be used for Battlefront.
Another option for those who would like pick-up games, but don't want to use points, is
to get hold of any or all of:
'Wargames Scenarios', 'Programmed Wargames Scenarios', 'Scenarios for all ages' (all by
C.S Grant).
These contain about 50 scenarios each, of all types (rearguard, coup de main, set piece
attack, reinforcing a position, and so on), along with generic forces for each side -
so for WW2 it will say 'defender gets 2 companies of infantry, attacker gets 1
battalion plus a tank company'. You can then use the TOEs on the bF page to construct
your forces.

By the way, for those who want small BF scenarios playable in 2-3 hours by 2 players,
Squad Leader is a comes with 12 you can use, half of which are Germans v USA. Just
remember to halve the numbers of the vehicles (SL is 1:1 for vehicles)

BF points' system needed!

Author: <u>Pierrick</u> ()
Date: 01-09-06 11:26

Hello everybody,

First of all, bloavez mad deoc'h all (happy new year to all, in celtic breton, isn't it exotic?!)
I would like to know if someone in this room tried to create a points' system to make easier engagements between two forces, without the need of a scenario, and also to make possible games in tournament.
Maybe the BF staff did olready work on this point?

Pierrick

Reply To This Message

Re: BF points' system needed!

Author: <u>Andy P</u> ()
Date: 01-09-06 14:50

No dont ruin a perfectly good set of rules with a points system. If you want points play FOW this a fantastic set of historical rules, and the fun is in the scenarios.

Andy

Reply To This Message

Re: BF points' system needed!

Author: <u>Billy</u> (208.170.31.---)
Date: 01-09-06 15:48

I am of the opinion that if you want to play a game right away just each have a battalion handy. If one player has a stronger unit the other just balances it with supporting elements and/or higher discipline rating.

Reply To This Message

Re: BF points' system needed!

Author: <u>Ken Natt</u> ()
Date: 01-09-06 15:51

Hi Pierrick

No, no points around here. I understand why some folk ask, but the rules don't work on a points basis. In fact this is a problem with most rules - take FoW, the points value of units keeps changing with each new addition - a battery of Su76s just almost halved in price, even though their stats stayed the same.

Points are just a figment to allow easy balancing of forces for unplanned games, but to be honest a scenario can be agreed in about 1 minite - I'll defend with 2 MEs against your attack with three - job done. The game may not be "perfectly balanced" but as long as it is fun, it will do me.

ken

Reply To This Message

Re: BF points' system needed!

Author: Dave Savage ()

Date: 01-09-06 17:14

Pierrick,

I know exactly why you ask the question. Indeed I even wet as far and drafting out my
own points system in the early days because I too thought it was needed. I've probably
got a copy of it somewhere but I found that in constructing it all I discovered that
and infantry ME is pretty similar to any other infantry ME but it is the discipline
rating and support that makes the difference. I also found that Panzer IVs are roughly
equivalent or a little better than Shermans, and than Panthers and Tigers are a whole
lot better still! In short points systems don't really aid understanding of the game.
Also I found that points systems don't necessarily provide balanced forces - all they
do is provide numerically similar forces based on a highly subjective assessment of
what force elements are worth. Points systems therefore don't guarentee a balanced game
because terrain, situation and victory conditions are equally important factors.

Therefore my advice to you is to start playing in the manner Ken suggests - "you have 3
MEs to attack and I'll defend with 2." Alternatively take a scenario off this website
and play that. I've played through most of them and they are all well balanced. Within
a few games you'll instinctively be able to select balanced and realistic forces for
well thought out and interesting scenarios. In my opinion that is far better than
relying on someone elses subjective opinion.

Dave

Reply To This Message

Re: BF points' system needed!

Author: James Baker ()
Date: 01-09-06 17:42

Do some searches on the forum (see search link at the top). This has been extensively
discussed. There is no general points system that will work for all situations, but the
campaign game used one for a short duration campaign.

Reply To This Message

Re: BF points' system needed!

Author: Nigel Perry ()
Date: 01-10-06 15:19

As Ken says, there are other quick and better ways of determining forces for quick
unplanned battles. Take a look at:

http://home.vicnet.net.au/~wswa/PickUp.htm

Nigel Perry.

Reply To This Message

Re: BF points' system needed!

Author: Pierrick ()
Date: 01-11-06 03:37

Thanks for yours answers!

Hopala! Andy, I do not want to ruin this game! Nor play with warhammer-like WWII rules,
this game is "the one".
For something like 8 mounths ago, I don't play to any wargame else. That's why it seems
to me interresting to have a points system, to make easier quick-prepared battles, and
also to make more well balanced the scenarios and campaigns I built for others.
But, for those purposes, your answers help me, especially Nigel's one.

So... many thanks to you

Diolch
('cause I read there is -at list- one welsh player in this room.)
Trugarez
('cause there is now a breton one!)

Re: BF points' system needed!

Author: eddie pennington ()
Date: 01-11-06 06:13

For added interest in pick up games we developed a system based on the campaign rules
in Peter Pig's ' Regiment of Foote' ECW rules. Alittle twiddling to bring the ideas
into line with WW2 has produced some interesting games.
One led to a Russian force attacking with just its T34s having had its infantry
component shot up in a German air attack pre game and a second led to a very depleted
German infantry company grimly hanging on waiting for reserves to arrive. Couple these
with a defender diced for count down and some FOW style objectives and you can get some
really tight games.

Points System for Battlefront

Author: [Mitchell O'Callaghan](#) (167.130.93.---)
Date: 05-31-06 06:54

Hello all,
This is my first post on this forum, although I have been lurking here for some time.
My wargames group have recently got back into ww2 games after many years of mainly
Napoleonic's. After trying a few free & commercially available rule sets I purchased
Battlefront. We have found this to be far superior to the others, giving a great
balance of simplicity, detail & completeness.
After a few games I thought that a point system could be fun & allow the sides to pick
their forces secretly without the need of an umpire. As well as being useful in
balancing scenarios.
Has anyone else developed a points rating system for units in Battlefront?

My wargaming group have worked out a system that gives units a value based on their
stat's.
Basically it assigns a point value to all the numbers that make up a units card. This
is an semi-exponential scale where every increase of one increases the value by 50% or
so.
Some stats are further weighted by multiplying their value by another factor.
The value of things like movement allowance & size are worked out slightly differently.
All these factors & multipliers are controlled by a spread sheet, so its just a matter
of entering the units stats to get the total points value.

Here is an example of how it works:
Take Pv IV F2
Stat game value base Point value Multiple Final value
Size* L - - 0.95x overall cost
Move off Rd* 8 32* - 32
Move Road * 12 12* - 12
Armour F 4 50 4 200
Armour R 3 28 2 56
Veh Att:
To 5 6 250 0.7 175
10 5 100 1.0 100
20 4 50 1.5 75
40 2 16 1.5 24
60 0 5 1.3 6.5
Soft Att:
To 5 3 28 1.0 28
10 1 9 1.1 9.9
20 0 5 1.2 6
40 -1 3 1.2 3.6
60 -2 2 1.1 2.2
Anti air (nothing)
CA Veh 4 50 0.5 25
CA Tr 3 28 0.5 14
* = values not based on 'point value scale'.

This gives a point value of 732.
For units of different experience ratings we multiply this value by: Raw 0.65, trained
0.8, veteran 1.4, Elite 1.8.

That is how it works for tanks, we have a simular system for calculating the values of
the other units in the game as well Artillery etc.
We also restrict the number of rare or experienced units that may be selected.

To give some other unit values to form a comparison:

```
Panther 1351
Tiger I 1751
Sherman (75) 391
M36 ('44) 1047
Cromwell IV 565
Sherman FF(late) 1997
T34 (76) 677
T34 (85) 1111
JS 2 1500


We have been trailing the values for about 3 months & they no doubt need more work.
Has anyone an opinion on the merits of a points system?
Is anyone interested in helping us balance the system we have developed?


Regards
Mitchell O'Callaghan
```

Reply To This Message

Re: Points System for Battlefront

```
Author: Mitchell O'Callaghan (167.130.93.---)
Date:    05-31-06 07:00

I've just looked at my post & the layout of the values I gave has become very unclear.
They all relate back to what should of been the heading to the little 'table' I tried
to post, the headings were:
Stat, game value, base Point value, Multiple, Final value.
I hope those that are interested can make some sense of it.

Regards
Mitchell O'Callaghan
```

Reply To This Message

Re: Points System for Battlefront

```
Author: Glen Williams ()
Date:    05-31-06 10:34

Why not just use point values already generated by a number of existing games rather
than go thru such a complicated process? Squad Leader/Advanced squad leader, Steel
Panthers WW2 pc game, and quite a few other games already have such and you adjust
those accordingly (-25% to +25%) for troop quality
```

Reply To This Message

Re: Points System for Battlefront

```
Author: Andy P ()
Date:    05-31-06 13:14

Why a points system at all, the whole idea fo the game and derived scenarios are based
on historical events. If you use a historical ORBAT just field whta is there in the
lists, point systems tend to result in unreal situations and a few odd choices, that
were actually used.

But this is just my view

Andy
```

Reply To This Message

Re: Points System for Battlefront

Author: Carlos Sanz Ramírez ()
Date: 05-31-06 14:16

Dear Mitchell,

Funny you bring out this subject: we've been discussing in my Battlefront group about using a point sistem. My original position was to use the TOE to gain authenticity instead of points to gain balance between opposing armies (in history, most of the time opposing forces are not balanced and yet the weaker sometimes wins...).

So, here is our "El Laberinto Official (yet still under work) Point Sistem for Battlefront":

The system is a mixture of points and TOE. First of all we must calculate the value for every of the smaller "elements" we are going to use, from infantry to armour and artillery, based on the game cards. Then, using the structure of a battlegroup and it's different maneuver elements we will calculate the value of our structure of an "army".

Stands, cards and values.

For each different type of unit we are going to use, take it's card. We will add the higher combat value against each type of enemy:

- V (Vehicles)
- TGsV (Troops, Guns, soft Vehicles)
- A (Aircraft)

Exceptions are:

- If any of these values is 0 or negative (-1,-2, etc.), we will add +0,5 instead, to simulate the capacity of the unit to perform the attack.
- If the card shows no value for the attack, add nothing to simulate the inability of the unit to perform the attack..
- If there is more than one value against the same type of enemy (p.e. when you've got the normal attack plus PIAT or Flame, etc.) in the card, create a total value for each attack as if there were different cards, and use the appropriate one when calculating the ME value.
- If the Close Combat value is the highest of all attack values, use it instead of the "distance value".
- For aircraft, add the max. values for bombing, tank busting, strafing and armour if it has, with the rules applied to the other types of units.

Add also:

- Half the off-road speed.
- Front armour value.
- Rear armour value.

Off board artillery and indirect fire on board

For off board artillery and on board elements that perform indirect fire (25 pounders, mortards, etc.) we use another method to calculate their value.

For each "cannon", check the size of the fire template it uses, big ("A" template as we play 20mm) or small ("B" template). Under the "B" template we could hit up to 4 infantry "standar" stand, and under "A" stand, double the size of the "B" template, 8. WE will add the max. indirect fire value against V and TGsV and multiply by 4 or 8 wether it uses the small or big template. Add too half the off-road speed and armour value if it has it. [Most of the big artillery pieces need a tractor to move, but smaller ones and mortars do have it's own movement value].

Morale and Quality

Depending on the quality of the troops, it's effectivenes vary greatly. To replicate this add or substract to each stand these values:

- Elite -> +8
- Veteran -> +4
- Expert -> 0
- Trained -> -2
- Raw -> -4

Maneuver Elements and Battlegroups

With our values for each type of troop and vehicle, we now refer to the TOE and choose our favourite Battlegroup or higher order structure we want to represent (German Panzergrenadiers, a British Armoured Division, Russian Opolchenie...) and the Maneuver Elements that built them. In the ME description we will find a list of different types of troops, etc. that make it in number of stands (p.e. for a British Infantry SQ, 1 command, 8 infantry + 1 PIAT, 3 x 2" mortars, etc.). We add, then, the value of the different types of units as many times as contained in the ME (p.e. the same example: 1xBR50 + 8xBR57 + 1xBR57PIAT + 3xBR55).

We also add all the odd units contained in the Battlegroup that don't correspond to no ME (HQ elements, other transports, etc.)

So, our structure will be made of:

- A HQ element with a commander, the troops tha accompany him, it's transports plus the attached HQ elements (FO, AA guns, etc.)
- One or more ME that define the Battlegroup (Those with a straigh continous lines linking them).
- One or more attached ME of the same type of the Battlegroup (enginers, reccon., artillery, etc.). Linked with a dotted line.
- One or more attached ME of different type than that of the Battlegroup (armour, SP guns, FSE, etc.), namely, divisional attachements. Linked with a dotted line.
- One or more attached ME of different type than that of the Battlegroup (air support, more tanks, etc.), namely, non-divisional attachements. Not listed as part of the Battlegroup..

You don't have to include all the attached or optional ME in the Battlegroup, just those that conform the spine of the structure. For every divisional attached ME, add 20 points, for every non divisional attachement, 30. Also, you could include half ME at half it's cost (p.e. in the case of huge armour elements) or squads or flights at it's cost.

To the value allowed to the Allied / Russian side, add a 20% in 1943, 30% in 1944 and 40% for 1945 to replicate the increasing troops number in one side (and decreasing in the other)

This is more or less all, subject to changes as we have not fully agreed ourselves in every aspect and detail of the system, mostly in the attack points (choosing close combat or the highest distance attack, etc.)

I hope it's useful to you. Also, please tell me waht do you think of it.

Un saludo,

Carlos.

Re: Points System for Battlefront

Author: Carlos Sanz Ramírez ()

```
Date:    05-31-06 14:28

Sorry, I forgot to give you an example of the system:

Comand / HQ - BR-50
Max. Damage against V 1
Max. Damage against T, G, sV 1
Max. Damage against A 0,5
½ off road Speed 2
Front Armour 0
Rear Armour 0
TOTAL 4,5


Para PIAT -BR-57
Max. Damage against V 3
Max. Damage against T, G, sV 3
Max. Damage against A 0,5
½ off road Speed 2
Front Armour 0
Rear Armour 0
TOTAL 8,5


M4A3 Sherman 75mm - BR-03
Max. Damage against V 5
Max. Damage against T, G, sV 4
Max. Damage against A 1
½ off road Speed 4
Front Armour 4
Rear Armour 3
TOTAL 21

If you are interested, I can send you the Excel files withj our points for the British,
German and Russian

Carlos.
```

<u>Reply To This Message</u>

Re: Points System for Battlefront

```
Author: Richard de Ferrars ()
Date:    05-31-06 18:47

Points systems seem to be one of those things that you either love or hate. I must
confess to having flirted with them when I first picked up the rules but now I sit in
Andy's camp - prefer to try and pin down a historical battle that looks interesting and
dig out who was there.

I'm not going to knock your systems as they look like a lot of thought and effort has
gone into making them - perhaps leave the thread as an opportunity to allow those who
like points to exchange ideas rather than as opportunity for those who do not like them
to say why not!!

But then that misses the opportunity for a good argument........

Richard
```

<u>Reply To This Message</u>

Re: Points System for Battlefront

```
Author: Carlos Sanz Ramírez ()
```

Date: 06-01-06 03:56

Richard,

I too prefer the historical approach, but as you say this argument over the points system has given us many days of great headaches...

Carlos.

Re: Points System for Battlefront

Author: Lucas Willen ()
Date: 06-01-06 05:30

Carlos and Mitchell

I have to agree with Andy and Richard on this one. The danger with a points system is that you can get too involved in a competition type of game where you select your armies based on a pre selected points value.

A commander does not select his force based on how many points he has. He is given a force to perform a certain mission by his political or military superiors. Maybe, if he is really lucky he might have some say in this.

Having said that, if your groups like a points system there is no reason why you cannot develop one for yourselves. I suspect every group has their own houserules. Mine is certainly no exception.

There is already a victory points system of sorts in Battlefront (see page 12) which I have found more than adequate for most games. You calculate victory based on the percentage of casualties each ME has suffered or the number of armoured vehicles knocked out. To this you add a points value for any objectives each side is tasked with achieving.

I am very suspicious of point systems as wargamers will tend to select the best option.Having said that, a points system coould still be useful as a scenario design tool in that it can indicate whether a game is going to be seriously unbalanced or not. If this is the case the scenario designer can take measures to ensure greater balance. for example, in a historical refight the points system in use reveals that the Allies are heavily favoured to win. The scenario designer could rebalance the game by adjusting the German victory conditions, for example increasing the value of German objectives.

Regards
Luke

Re: Points System for Battlefront

Author: mitchell O'Callaghan (167.130.93.---)
Date: 06-01-06 06:03

Its good to see my post has stirred up some interest.
I can understand the 'historical scenarios only' attitude, but its always nice to have some extra options, especially if you don't have an extra player to umpire & don't want both sides to know the enemies forces.
Glen:
I imagine the point systems for those games would give a reasonable result, but every system has it's own slant on the relative qualities of forces involved.
Carlos:
I like the simplicity (relatively) of your system but I feel just using the numbers on

the cards as is will give unbalanced results.
For example a Tiger I comes out to have a value of:

Max. Damage against V 8
Max. Damage against T, G, sV 5
Max. Damage against A .5
½ off road Speed 3
Front Armour 5
Rear Armour 4
TOTAL 25.5

This is only a little more than a Sherman and as we all know a tiger was worth 5
Shermans.
But I think your system would work fine if u used a graduated conversion of the game
values, here is the scale we are using:
Game Value : Point Value
-3 : 1
-2 : 2
-1 : 3
0 : 5
1 : 9
2 : 16
3 : 28
4 : 50
5 : 100
6 : 250
7 : 500
8 : 900
9 : 1500
10 : 2000

Using this scale your Sherman would be worth
M4A3 Sherman 75mm – BR-03
Max. Damage against V 5 = 100
Max. Damage against T, G, sV 4 = 50
Max. Damage against A 1 = 9
½ off road Speed 4 = say 32 (4x off road)
Front Armour 4 = 50
Rear Armour 3 = 28
TOTAL 269

Tiger I
Max. Damage against V 8 = 900
Max. Damage against T, G, sV 5 = 100
Max. Damage against A 0 = 5
½ off road Speed 3 = say 24
Front Armour 5 = 100
Rear Armour 4 = 50
TOTAL 1179
This is much closer to the 5:1 'value ratio' between the 2 tanks.

Other than this your system appears fine.
The detail you have added for the higher organisation shows that you have given the
whole idea some thought.
With us it has been a matter of using the ME's in the rules to create your forces, with
a few variations in overall numbers in the MEs. We also had a system of 'prestige
points' that were used up if you bought rare or veteran units (Tiger tanks, heavy
artillery, air support for the Germans in '44 etc)

Luke:
What you say is true, but a point system can still have a value with such a method of
play for balancing the forces. But I suppose that is something that an experienced

gamer would have a good feel for anyway. Still it could still be useful for the less
knowledgeable & for small groups that want to set up a battle where both sides have a
good chance of winning

Regards

Mitch...

Re: Points System for Battlefront

Author: Carlos Sanz Ramírez ()
Date: 06-01-06 07:36

Mitch,

You share doubts on our system with part of my group (Victor, that is), but you must
think it's just an average points system mixed with TOEs (plus the values on the cards
are also an average of different elements), in which the Sherman is worst armoured and
fire-powered than the Tiger I, but better suited for AA and much faster. Still, the
Tiger is 20% more expensive than the Sherman. I don't agree on the value of the Tiger I
of five Shermans, although it is true that German armour was outnumbered (on both
fronts) about five to one.

As well, we intended to make an important gap between different units, infantry and
armour p.e.

Also, if you cross check the ME for the Germans and British (my part, sorry), you will
see that you have 3-4 Tiger I to a company against almost 10 Shermans to a company...
This will make up for the difference in value.

Carlos.

Re: Points System for Battlefront

Author: Ken Natt ()
Date: 06-01-06 09:02

Here's my "points system", based on Company sized MEs

Leg infantry ME 1
Armoured Inf or tank ME 2
Arty 1 per btty
Bttn \ Brigade \Regt attachments free as long as in proportion to historical orbat
other attachment, or higher attachment 1 per attached platoon

ok I just made it up in the spot but it is as valid as any other artificial system.

Ken

Re: Points System for Battlefront

Author: Peter Wort ()
Date: 06-01-06 09:03

Off-topic a moment: The Tiger was more mobile off-road than the Sherman, thanks to its
wider track footprint, and correspondingly low ground pressure.

I am not in favor of points systems either. Even for pick-up games, I balance things

simply: I use units that were (historically), roughly equivalent in combat power and
after I set up the scenario, I let my opponents choose the side to play.

Re: Points System for Battlefront

Author: Bill Slavin ()
Date: 06-01-06 09:44

I've never played point sytems, so I can't really knock them. But in my limited
experience, there are ways to set up fairly balanced fictional games using historical
formations (I rarely have an opportunity to try out the excellent historical scenarios
posted on this site, because they generaly involve elements I don't own, or are just
too large to game with 20mm). And when my scenarios turn out not to be balanced because
of design flaws, it becomes an interesting exercise in extricating yourself from a bad
situation. You do this a few times and you get a pretty good idea of what works.
The rule of thumb traditionally was that you needed a ratio of four to one to insure a
successful attack against dug in forces. Make that three or two to one and you have a
fight. Use the victory points to balance the equation, requiring a 3:2 kill ratio, (or
more) for the defender, or specific goals that need to be achieved. As Peter has said,
set up the opposing sides and then let your opponenet choose his side (keeps you
honest).
Throw in a lot of intersting terrain, BUA's, areas wih lots of cover for attacks, muddy
fields, other areas with wide open spaces for grazing fire and tank movement, and you
have an intersting scenario. You can balance almost any encounter throught the creative
use of terrain, and improved defensive positions.
It takes a couple of tries to get a sense of what works and what doesn't,(one scenario
I designed, in hedgerow country, had six Shermans and two Wolverine tank destroyers
still not enough to oust two Tigers using fire and retreat) but I can't imagine any
point sytem that would be able to accurately refelct all of the above elements that, in
my opinion, create the most iinteresting scenarios.

Bill

Re: Points System for Battlefront

Author: Andy P ()
Date: 06-01-06 09:59

Bill,

Off topic slightly, you said the scenarios are too large, at what level would you like
to see scenarios so you can try out games, and what units do you have. I might have
something for you or even put something together for you.

Andy

Re: Points System for Battlefront

Author: Lucas Willen ()
Date: 06-01-06 12:44

Andy

Reading Bill's post he says that the scnearios were too large for playing in 20mm. To
be fair there have been times when I have been guilty of setting up a 5mm scnenario
that was simply too big to play in the availble time. Sometimes it can be difficult to
resist temptation or fewer players than you expected actually turn up.

Another option to balance a scenario would be to provide more artillery or air support

if that is appropriate to the situation. In cases such as Normandy and other NW European scenarios strong Allied artillery and air support should be provided in any case. The German defenders (and they will usually be defending except in the Ardennes) can be dug in and their positions drawn on the map. Not knowing precise enemy locations makes it more difficult to use the artillery under these circumstances. When the Allies defend you do need to be careful not to give them too much artillery as this can prove quite crushing. Yes,, I know that there were quite a few German attacks that were crushed by artillery alone but these are probably not sufficiently play balanced to give a good game.

Usually, for an evening's game an infantry battalion (or armoured regiment with supporting arms is quite sufficent. For a full day's gaming involving several players per side a regimental/brigade sized action is quite sufficeint. If you want to play anything larger you should look towards another set of rules such as Spearhead or Command Decision.

So far as terrain is concerned I prefer to use something similar to the geography of the area in which the battle is being fought. Having said that even Steppe or Desert terrain can be cut up by ravines, low rises and the occaional village.

Sometimes, as Bill suggests, it can be interesting to set up an unbalanced scenario and there have been times when I have done so deliberately. Scenario victory conditions should of course be adjusted accordingly.

Another interesting scenario could revolve around a technological imbalance, for example the 1991 Gulf War. In a case like this the points system as given in the rules would need to be changed so that the side with technogical superiority is more heavily penalised for casualties. This could mean that the victory points losses table could have double or triple points values for that side while the opposing side retains the original points values. The points total required for victory would be something similar to the rules as they stand.

None of the above would require any kind of new points system.

By and large I do not think we need a competition style points system along the lines some people have suggested. However, if some people want to go ahead with a points system then they are at liberty to develop one. Anyone not interested can simply choose to ignore it.

Regards
Luke

Re: Points System for Battlefront

Author: Bill Slavin ()
Date: 06-01-06 19:46

Andy,
Thanks for the offer. As Lucas has pointed out, some of the problem is just space, because I'm playing 20mm, and a lot of the historical scenarios are just too big for my 4X8 board. Others have a lot of specialised vehicles that I just don't have and am not likely to get in the near future.
So to continue off topic, what I do have is late war European. A battalion of British infantry, a battallion of American, and a couple battalions of Germans, along with support weapons. I can field a reduced company of Mk IV's, a company of Shermans, and troop sized ME's of some of the other tank destroyers and heavy tanks, as well as a company of armoured troops for the British, Americans and Germans. Oh, and some Funnies once I get them built.
As for size of engagement, anything up to batallion level seems to work well with my set up, with up to a company of supporting armour.
Any suggestions? I'd enjoy doing more historical engagements, especially infantry heavy

scenarios. I'm working on a few now loosely based around the Moro River crossings in Italy, but would be interested in doing some post D-Day scenarios.

Bill

Re: Points System for Battlefront

Author: Andy P ()
Date: 06-02-06 04:17

Bill,

I am working on a few airborne scenarios which involve a couple of companies of infantry and nothing else. If you evev look at going airborne let me know. the Mini Maltot scenario me and Ken are working on, fights on a 2KM square board in 15mm and involves 1x BN British Infantry and several reduced comapnies og German panzer grenadiers plus some tigers to balance it all out.

Andy

Re: Points System for Battlefront

Author: Richard de Ferrars ()
Date: 06-02-06 04:54

Dear Bill,

Quick change of thread direction (again) - but I won't start talking about Private Eye as no-one across the pond will understand.

Have you looked at the "Bretteville Vignette" - a cut-down version of Paddy's "Norrey & Bretteville" scenario - this plays on a small board and works well because it's dark - big distances not needed. It's on the same download as the main scenario.

The Putot scenario is mapped to 6x5, but I am pretty sure that you could take a foot off each dimension and still get a good battle. Again, big distances not needed (no armour)

Parker's Crossroads also needs a pretty small table area

Richard

Re: Points System for Battlefront

Author: Lucas Willen ()
Date: 06-02-06 05:25

Bill

Have you ever considered the option of 5mm? As you are probably aware the group I am with use various scales between 5 and 20mm and usually use a 6 x 8 table.

Although your table is a little smaller than the on you use, 5mm will allow you to use more armour and maybe you could consider fielding a few more armies from different countries/phases of the war. Perhaps you could also consider other options such as WW1 or modern given the low cost and ready availability of 5mm figures and terrain.

Of course, as I found out some time ago the danger can be that you end up with a game that is a little too large for BF.

I would be very interested in more Italian scenarios such as your Moro River crossings.

Regards
Luke

Re: Points System for Battlefront

Author: Lucas Willen ()
Date: 06-02-06 05:27

Richard

While we are slightly "off thread" at the moment, I emailed you an Orbat for Putot a couple of week ago. Hopefully you got it and found it useful.

Luke

Re: Points System for Battlefront

Author: Bill Slavin ()
Date: 06-02-06 09:33

Guys,
Thanks. I'll check out all of those. Andy, I'm in the process of painting up my paras, but only have a company so far. I look forward to trying out what you're designing.

Bill

Re: Points System for Battlefront

Author: James Baker ()
Date: 06-02-06 17:53

To put it mildly, points systems have been discussed before (do a search using the options at the top of the page). We have nothing against developing a points system for your own use, but we are NOT going to have an official one.

For small (and extremely hard-fought) scenarios, look at the "A difficult Affair" Kursk scenarios (both of which are about a company on a side), and most of the Kokoda track scenarios. I am going to be running the two Kursk scenarios at a local wargame store this weekend as demos.

Re: Points System for Battlefront

Author: Paddy Green ()
Date: 06-04-06 20:05

I'm with Richard, Luke and most of the other guys on this one. In the early days of BFWWII I dabbled with a points system and thought one should be applied to the game. I've probably still got a copy of it somewhere - but I won't introduce it here as it just captures my prejudices about WWII combat. However, in the nick of time I was saved by finding historical scenarios and then starting to write them myself.

Basically I consider that all points systems reinforce prejudices rather than adding to the gameplay. If you don't believe me then try these statements: "I think that a Tiger 1 is only worth 2.75 Shermans rather than 5!" or "My PzIV may be worth 20 times more

than a 2" mortar but can still be killed by one in close combat!"

Also – the whole point of warfare is to achieve localized superiority at a point and exploit it. Most combat situations are therefore inherently unbalanced and I actually enjoy the challenge these situations provide. Scenarios balanced by points on the hand tend to become staid, dull and repetitive (can I cite some 15 years of playing WRG to support this claim.) They seldom produce interesting situations and besides the terrain is usually as important as the forces in – and no one is suggesting a points system for a cleared wood on the right flank.

That said I can sympathize with the problem of being unable to play the larger scenarios in 20mm. However I think that most scenarios I have seen on the web could be reduced down to the salient 3 ft x 2 ft area of combat in 15mm and then scaled up for 20mm combat on a 6ft x 4ft table. If this fails then the more radical solutions are to try playing in a smaller scale or to remove the car form the garage and set up a 8ft x 12 ft (or larger) board.

Paddy

P.S. The best points system I know is 1 point for winning a game, 0 points for loosing - all points may be exchanged for pints (of beer!)

Re: Points System for Battlefront

Author: Lucas Willen ()
Date: 06-05-06 05:46

Paddy

Somehow I suspect that going for a smaller scale such as 5mm would be the best (cheapest) solution for the larger scenarios. :-)

Designing historical scenarios, scenarios based on actual or possible events is actually far more interesting than any points based game. If they happen to be unbalanced then this can be catered for in the defender's victory conditions. For example, the defender can be awarded victory points for holding key terrain for a set period of time as well as the normal victory points awarded for casualties inflicted.

For example, you could have a scenario where a heavily outnumbered defender is tasked with delaying a superior force which will arrive gradually. The defender has orders to delay the enemy advance for two hours durring which a key cross roads and ridge must be held. Each of these objectives will be worth 10 points. After two hours the defender must withdraw his force from the table in a specified direction while minimising his losses.

Regards
Luke

Re: Points System for Battlefront

Author: Bill Slavin ()
Date: 06-05-06 09:45

Ah, for a garage. And that maneouverable, suspended harness contraption Tom Cruise had for moving stuff around in the middle of an 8" X 12" board!
Sorry Luke, not changing scale. I've got too much invested in this one!

Bill

Re: Points System for Battlefront

```
Author: Lucas Willen ()
Date:    06-05-06 12:16


Bill

I understand you not wanting to change scale. I have a lot invested in 5mm myself
(largely from my earlier wargaming years) However, I do also have quite a few 15mm
figures for WW1 and WW2 and 20mm for Vietnam which I mainly use for skirmishes but can
also use for BFWW2 games. On top of that the group I am with do a lot of 20mm WW2 so I
guess I have the best of both worlds there.

Having said that, have you looked at how the price of 5mm compares to 15 or 20mm? If
you ever were to purchase a 5mm army, not that I sm suggeting that you would, you might
find it cheaper than you think and it would make the larger armoured battlegroup
actions a viable possibility without making the table look too overcrowded or having to
use an 8 x 12 table unless you really wanted to :-)

Of course, you may have the issue f no being able to store any more figures :-)


Regards
Luke
```

Re: Points System for Battlefront

```
Author: Andy P ()
Date:    06-05-06 12:40


Lucas,

For the larger scenarios get fellow gamers together and field whole brigades, whos for
a Divisional game then??

Saves pennies overall. Or befriend RMD and have him bring over the whole of 21st army
group including aircraft..

Al Gasper has a destroyer in his army at 15mm..... mmmmm Midway in 15mm??

The whole of the Orne bridgehead can nearly be fought on a 12' x 8' table. Just need a
bucket full of gliders.
Andy
```

Re: Points System for Battlefront

```
Author: Dave Savage ()
Date:    06-06-06 03:52


Andy,

How can Al Gaspar have a destroyer in his Army? In his Navy maybe - but not his Army ;-
)

That said - a 15mm destroyer! "Enough respect Al!"

Dave
```

Re: Points System for Battlefront

Author: Lucas Willen ()
Date: 06-06-06 04:55

Andy

I could just about do a brigade sized action with some of my larger 1:300th armies
althhough I am not convinced BF has the capacity for anything larger than this,
certainly not for the average group. For a divisional action, and perhaps for some
brigade level games as well, I would be inclined to use something like Command Decision

Dave

"How can Al Gaspar have a destroyer in his Army? In his Navy maybe - but not his Army"

I could mention the PLAN (Chinese People's Liberation Army Navy for anyone who does not
know the meaning of this acronym) :-)

I am curious about how Al gets that destroyer close enough insure to fire while on
table without it running aground though. :-)

However, maybe it would be useful for a St Nazaire scenario.

Funny where these threads can lead.

Luke

Reply To This Message

Re: Points System for Battlefront

Author: Andy P ()
Date: 06-06-06 08:02

Dave,

Check out his pic for his Omaha game its in the background, and stop being picky..

Reply To This Message

Re: Points System for Battlefront

Author: Dave Savage ()
Date: 06-06-06 08:38

Andy,

Salivating already - but can't find it on this site. Do you have the url?

Dave

Reply To This Message

Re: Points System for Battlefront

Author: Chris Ginn ()
Date: 06-16-06 12:48

Some kind of points system would be useful in designing scenarios.

Incidently, does everybody use such limited forces. I was amazed by the recent
correspondance in Wargames Illustrated. We typicaly play with 15mm on an 8ftx6ft table.

A typical game would hav 2xbattalions of German infantry defending, usually 2 co's up,
1 in the second line,(you need that much to hold the front), a company of StugIV 75L70,
an understrength co of Stug III, assorted a/t guns, battallion of artillery plus some

Flak. All Dug in.
Attacking British were a battalion of Shermans, about 8 assorted M10/M10Achilles,
2Battalions of Infantry, wth a squadron of Churchill in support., co of motorised
Infantry, plus elements of a recce and A/c regt. Artillery was 2x25pdr batteries and a
5.5"battery. We also had the odd airstrike from Typhoons, but the single aircraft are
not very effective. Because of the forces on the table, the flak suppresses them. You
need 2 or 4 a/c appearing on the table simultaneously.

Result in about 4-5 hours, including socialising, was a British victory, just! The
morale of the Stugs went and they withdrew having lost not quite 2/3. About 2 companies
of German Infantry overrun/destroyed, 1 badly mauled, but position unsustainable without
armour or A/t support. The British infantry losses were not too bad, but although only
one Sherman squadron withdrew, the remainder had wellover 60% losses. A typical
'Goodwood' with burning Shermans everywhere!

This was based on guesswork, for a balanced scenario. But to fight the Russians in
similar strength with T34/85 and a company of Heavy tanks plus tank destroyers, the
Germans would need some heavy armour or double the strength of SP's.

We have found that you do not need the full 4:1 ratio as the attacker can pick where to
attack on such a large table. However an attack up the centre is not likly to be
successful, it must be on one flank, with pinning forces on the other, plus supports to
take out any armour that trys to redeploy from flank to flank. Attacking Heavy armour
with Mediums tends to be a profitless exercise, although overwelming numbers does help.
Heavy tanks are much less fomidable in attack than in defence.

Overall a pretty historical conclusion.

Re: Points System for Battlefront

Author: Lucas Willen ()
Date: 06-16-06 14:32

Chris

It depends on how the points system is to be used. There are two alternatives I can
see.

Firstly the traditional equal points army. Wargamers, particularly competition gamers
will spend points on whatever is best in the army they are using whether or not it is
historical. This for me, and I suspect many other people on this site is a definate no
no.

The second alternative is as a check on play balance once the scenario has actually
been designed. This would have the benefit of revealing whether the scenario has a
significant imbalance or not. If this is the case then corrective action can be taken
for example varying objective points or adding fortifications for the weaker side.
Alternatively the weaker side could be tasked with figthing a reargaurd action or
conducting a probing attack. Such scenario would have very different objectives from
the traditional encounter or attack/defence situation.

The advantage of the second type of point system is that it would numerically reveal
whether or not a significant difference between the two sides existed.

Points could be calculated by ME with points deducted for any casualties previously
incurred.

Luke

Re: Points System for Battlefront

Author: Billy Etheredge ()
Date: 06-16-06 14:54

About the first type:

Another problem with this buisness is that some people can take a long time with
indecision on what to use because they didn't have a list written beforehand. This
obviously goes against one of BFWWII's great advantages; speed.

About the second type:

I suspect it would be easier (and more fun) to just play the game a few times and see
if there is any obvious imbalance.

Re: Points System for Battlefront

Author: Lucas Willen ()
Date: 06-17-06 04:10

Billy

Yes, it could be fun to play test game a few times to identify an imbalance unless you
have the type of person in your group who is a constant "moaner" and always complains
that the scenario is "so unfair" particularly when he happens to have the weaker side.
The use of the type of point sysem used in Napoleons Battles (alomg the lines of my
second alternative could help in silencing such a "moaner")

However, any points system that may be developed should be for optional use only.

Luke

Re: Points System for Battlefront

Author: Chris Ginn ()
Date: 06-19-06 06:54

I agree with all your points. But I do not accept the argument that just because you
have a points system, players will pick the most effective units. A recent game we had
involved Panzer Grenadiers attacking dug in Russians fielding a couple of A/t gun
batteries with SP guns and a few T34/85 in support.

The Grenadiers were supported by 7xTiger 1s and a Pz IV co. The unengaged flank was
held by a pair of jagTigers and a volks grenedier co. The German attack failed
completely as due to the A/t guns the SdKfz251 were totaly negated. The Russian
Artillery also caught the Grenadiers debussing, which did not help. On any points
system I would guess the Russians were heavily outpointed. But the point is that the
units were not very suited to the task. For the same points I guess you could have had
2 Battalions of infantry/Grenadiers(unarmoured) plus 4Cos PzIV plus some assault guns.
These would have been far more effective.

We used the above units because we wanted to, and we had them. We learnt that they
weren't ideal for the circumstances, and that JagTigers are phenomenal. The wretched
things were shooting across from one flank to the other, hammering the Russian SP's.
Russsian air strikes against them acheived 'zip', although the concentration of flak
around them did have something to do with that.

I am not after a complete points system, just sort of 10pts for an infantry battalion,
30pts for a medium tank battalion, 50pts for a heavy tank battalion (although I realise
this would have to be nation specific, and is probably better on a company basis for
armour) (30 pts/pair of JagTigers!). This would also solve the 'add the points up for

two hours before we start' problem.

Re: Points System for Battlefront

Author: Lucas Willen ()
Date: 06-19-06 13:33

Chris

Simply going on the basis of my own personal wargaming experince.

I also strongly prefer the option of a points system for play balance checking purposes
only whicb is the way I personally would use it. Of course, other people may wish to
use a points system in other ways.

Luke

'Historical' Points System

Author: Luke ()
Date: 12-20-06 01:13

Was browsing old posts and noticed several arguments and a lot of hard work done developing a points system.

For those of you deeply interested, you can't do much better than the one built in to the Combat Mission computer games by Battlefront! They convert to BF:WW2 quite nicely and do about as good of job as you can of remaining historically accurate (OOBs and availability) with a points system.

And you get a great computer game to boot!

Re: 'Historical' Points System

Author: Keith Lowman ()
Date: 12-20-06 07:03

Hi Luke

As with all points systems there are always areas that they fall down in. In Combat Mission the points for artillery suck and the way the game uses it is equally bad, but this is just my opinion. Though Luke I do agree with you that it is a great game excluding the artillery. Playing Battlefront WWII (plus some extra reading) has really changed opinion about Artillery in war games and shows up the weakness in Combat Mission.

Keith

Re: 'Historical' Points System

Author: Luke Willen ()
Date: 12-20-06 09:28

Combat Mission is still a pretty good simulation though it does of course have some weaknesses. It is however better than anything else I have seen in terms of realism.

So far as points systems are concerned though I personaly do not believe in them and prefer to ignore them altogether.

However, if someone else wants a points system for their group that is a matter for them

Re: 'Historical' Points System

Author: Craig Simms ()
Date: 12-20-06 20:59

Combat Mission has some very funny voice clips I always thought :)

"oooo, I could fry my sauages on that!"

For Battlefront I have worked out a very simple points system - each 'side' costs 1pt and each player is given '1pt' at the start of each game.... :P

Re: 'Historical' Points System

```
Author: Luke Willen ()
Date:   12-21-06 07:52
```

Many of the Combat Mission scenarios would convert quite well to Battlefront.

The other thing about points systems is that they tend to get used by those who wan a "fair" or "even" battle. Real war is of course not like that and sometimes you are faced with a situation where you cannot win in the traditional sense. The current victory point system is as much as we really need.

Luke

Re: 'Historical' Points System

```
Author: Craig Simms ()
Date:   12-21-06 19:50
```

Does anyone actually use the victory point system?

I have to keep being reminded it actually exists and have a vague idea it is somewhere at the front of the rule book.

Re: 'Historical' Points System

```
Author: Bill Slavin ()
Date:   12-21-06 20:39
```

Craig,

"Does anyone actually use the victory point system?"

Less and less. It always seems so evident who won and who loss, and even not so very importatnt after awhile. I'm becoming more interested in the narrative of the game itself, which is what makes BF such a good set of rules, I expect.

(Damn! I was trying to avoid getting sucked into this discussion!)

Re: 'Historical' Points System

```
Author: Luke Willen ()
Date:   12-22-06 04:31
```

Yes, though only if it is not obvious who won or if it is neccessary to know by what margin a victory was achieved.

However, as Bill says, it is often pretty clear that one side did achieve a clear victory in which case it is not neccessary to calculate points.

Luke

Re: 'Historical' Points System

```
Author: James Baker ()
Date:   12-22-06 07:15
```

As point systems have been discussed at GREAT length in this forum (please not again!!!), I just want to point out that their purpose is to produce balanced games. However, equal sized forces do not necessarily lead to good games. The best scenarios are those where both sides have an equal chance to win, rather than those with equal forces. When developing scenarios, you can choose almost any force mix if you are willing to adjust the victory conditions accordingly.

One of the best games we played (in the early stages of development of B.F. back in 1988) was a Warsaw Pact game where the U.S. side was horribly outnumbered, but the W.P. forces had very difficult victory conditions. The game was decided when the last remaining U.S. unit suppressed the final W.P. unit needed to fulfill the W.P. victory conditions as it was attempting to exit the board, leading to the W.P. losing by one unit. We looked up, and found that we had been playing for 14 hours straight and hadn't noticed it.