

Second Front

Errata, Q&A

March 3, 1998

The Europa community has expressed confusion over the rules for amphibious landings and naval transport to beaches. GR/D apologizes for this inconvenience; the following errata and clarifications should set things straight.

Rules Errata and Clarifications

Rule 27B6 is rephrased for better clarity:

"6. Amphibious Ability. Any unit with the amphibious or marine symbol as part of its unit type is intrinsically amphibious. The following units are also amphibious:

- Any unit carried by an LVT per Rule 14J2, so long as it is using the LVT.
- Any non-motorized unit without heavy equipment that is embarking, disembarking, or being transported by an LC."

Rule 31B claims "Non-amphibious units with heavy equipment may not embark/disembark at beaches." This is WRONG: such units can land at beaches if they use landing craft (LCs), as explained in the rewrite of Rule 31B below:

"B. Beaches

Any amphibious unit (as defined in Rule 27B6) may land at a beach. A non-amphibious unit may also land at a beach, if it is solely on board LCs at the time of its landing. (Note: A non-amphibious unit on board NTs or NTs in combination with LCs may not land at a beach.)

A naval unit may not embark or disembark cargo at a beach during stormy sea conditions."

Delete the following sentence from Rule 30B:

"However, cargo that has heavy equipment may not embark/disembark at a beach unless it is amphibious (per Rule 27B6)."

The last bullet point in the first paragraph of Rule 32 is incorrect and must be deleted:

"Only LCs may disembark the cargo making an amphibious landing."

The first two bullet points in Rule 32B are correct as written, but some players have complained they are difficult to understand. Another way to put them is:

- An intrinsically amphibious unit has its attack strength halved.
- Any other unit making an amphibious landing has its attack strength quartered.

An Amphibious Recap

For "beach operations," the rules distinguish between regular naval transport (Rule 30B), which is transport to/from a friendly-owned beach, and amphibious landings (Rule 32), which is transport to an enemy-owned beach.

As corrected above, Rules 14J2, 27B6, 30B, and 31B completely define beach operations for naval transport, while Rules 14J2, 27B6, 30B, 32 intro, and 32A completely define beach operations for amphibious landings.

Intrinsically amphibious units such as marine commandos or amphibious armor can land without using LCs, they can "go ashore" directly from NTs. (These intrinsically amphibious units either are amphibious

by their very natures, such as DD tanks, or have factored into them the small landing craft capable of taking them from ship to shore, such as for marine commandos.) The game was designed this way: if the intrinsically amphibious units that landed on D-Day required LCs in the game, then the amphibious armor alone would soak up so many LCs that not all the forces which historically landed could land in the game.

LVT counters are also intrinsically amphibious. They are not, however, landing craft, and must be transported to their landing sites by naval transport. (LVTs were not capable of long distance sea voyages and historically were not classified or used the same as real landing craft, despite the similarity of names and abbreviations between LVTs and landing craft.) Note that any unit carried by an LVT is also amphibious, per Rule 14J2.

LCs bestow amphibious capability to non-motorized units without heavy equipment (Rule 27B6), allowing them to make amphibious landings (see the second bullet of 32B for more detail on how this works).

If you like, you can also allow special c/m units (the British 1x 3-2-10 Aslt Gun X RMAS, and the 1x 5-3-6 Aslt Eng Tank X 1 RE) to make amphibious landings using LCs. This was only excluded from the game for simplicity (to avoid a special rule for a few units). However, these units didn't fare very well when making amphibious landings, so if you adopt this rule, halve the combat strengths of these units when they make an amphibious landing, in addition to any other modifications. (Actually, only two of the three AVRE battalions of 1x 5-3-6 Aslt Eng Tank X 1 RE landed in the assault forces, but a battalion of Crabs from 30th Armoured Brigade also landed. Since we don't have battalion breakdowns, using the '1 RE' for these forces is convenient.)

LCs in the game include LSTs, LSMs, LCIs, etc., and can carry any type of equipment. Assuming that the Allied player makes amphibious landings at enemy-owned beach hexes and gains control of some of these hexes during his movement and combat phases, he can use naval transport to land other units at those now-friendly beach hexes during the exploitation phase. Generally, any units (including those with heavy equipment, such as HQs, armor and artillery units, and even full divisions) can land at a friendly beach, however, unless they are intrinsically amphibious, they must use only LCs to do so (per Rule 31B).

Note that the vast majority of divisions cannot directly make amphibious landings, since they run afoul of Rule 27B6. By breaking a non-motorized division down into a divisional headquarters and unsupported components that do not have heavy equipment (such as infantry regiments), the unsupported components can make amphibious landings using LCs, and the division HQ can use LCs to land in the exploitation phase in a beach hex captured by its side. Note that Rule 15 allows you to assemble divisions in the exploitation phase, even non-motorized divisions. Of course, everything has to work right to do this (all unsupported components land in the same beach hex, they capture the hex without taking losses, the division HQ lands there in the exploitation phase, and you remember to assemble the division), but if all goes well you've increased your beachhead's ability to resist Axis counterattacks. Note: The only division that can make an amphibious landing without breaking down is the USMC 1 Exp Marine Division, since it is intrinsically amphibious.

As mentioned earlier, NTs may carry intrinsically amphibious units to beaches. NTs can also transfer cargo (such as armor units) to LCs for transport to a beach per Rule 31D. NTs may carry resource points or supplies to a friendly beach, but not to an enemy-owned beach.

Second Front Q&A

Q. If LCs can transport units with heavy equipment to friendly beaches, for purposes of invasions this implies that the heavy equipment is being landed in the second wave. However, a lot of heavy equipment did land as part of the first wave. Why doesn't Second Front allow units with heavy equipment to make amphibious landings?

A. The fact that various landing craft could unload heavy equipment on beaches does not mean that units with heavy equipment can make assault landings on enemy-held shores. There are several reasons for this. One is time versus capacity. Time is a critical factor: infantry and the like takes a very few minutes or even just seconds to disembark on a beach and go into combat. Heavy equipment is more difficult to unload. Small landing craft designed for heavy equipment (such as an LCM, Landing Craft Mechanized) could land and unload fairly quickly, but they couldn't carry that much—you needed huge numbers of them (impractical) or many round trips (takes time) to land a large volume of heavy equipment. Larger landing craft (such as an LST, Landing Ship Tank) solved the capacity problem but took a longer time to disembark its cargo, which rendered its landing operations more vulnerable when the enemy was capable of direct fire

on the beaches.

Another reason is that it is difficult to unload heavy equipment in bulk without assistance. Sure, the landing craft can get it to the beaches, but help is needed in getting the equipment out of the landing craft. Beach obstacles and mines must be removed, exit routes must be delineated and in some cases built up so that you don't get stuck in the sand. Having labor on hand to unload the landing craft is extremely helpful, having people in place simply to direct traffic and make sure everything doesn't grind to a confused, milling halt is important. All this means that if you are going to unload lots of heavy equipment, you had better have some control over the beach before the equipment lands.

A third reason is that the landing craft with high capacities for heavy equipment are restricted in their operations. An LST, for example, could land in 3.5 feet of water—you could not unload it directly on very flat beaches unless you were willing to beach it (which opens up another can of worms). Similarly, the LCT (Landing Craft Tank) Mark 3 could carry significantly more than the earlier marks, but its deep draft precluded it from being used in Normandy.

Sure, some heavy equipment landed early on in amphibious operations. At Europa scale, however, the net effect of all this is that the critical, early stages of the battle for the beach would be decided before enough heavy equipment could land and effectively join the action. The game builds these overall considerations into the amphibious landing system.

Q. If you can land/unload units during the naval part of exploitation, and units must spend MPs to disembark, how do non-c/m units do this? No exploitation is allowed for them?

A. Rule 31A states "During the exploitation phase, a non-c/m unit may disembark... during this phase."

Q. Can intrinsically amphibious units transport themselves from port to a beach, or must they use NTs?

A. They must use naval transport, either NTs or LCs (although in most cases you probably would want to use LCs to carry non-intrinsically amphibious units instead).

Q. Can an LVT carry a marine commando?

A. Sure, but this seems a very inefficient use of assets. Since an LVT automatically makes the unit it carries amphibious, you seem to gain little by carrying a unit that is already amphibious.

Q. Can LCs carry LVTs (and their passengers)?

A. Sure, but using NTs instead frees up LCs to carry other cargo.

Q. You say any units can be landed at a friendly-owned beach hex using LCs. What about rail-only units?

A. Although this isn't likely to come up in actual play we should exclude them. Add the following sentence to Rule 27B3: "Exception: LCs cannot carry rail-only units."

Q. (Rule 32C) If intrinsically amphibious units don't need LCs to make an amphibious landing, then are they exempt from the LC limit on planning invasions?

A. Yes, and let's rewrite 32C as follows:

"C. Planning and Preparation

An amphibious landing must be planned in advance, similar to an airborne landing (Rule 24C). Use Rule 24C for planning an amphibious landing with these modifications:

- A player may plan an amphibious landing for each of his intrinsically amphibious units (that is, any unit with the amphibious or marine symbol as part of its unit type).
- For all other units, a player has a maximum RE planning limit equal to the cargo capacity of LCs currently in play (not sunk). For example, if a player has in play LCs with a total cargo capacity of 20, he may plan amphibious landings for an additional 20 REs of units in that initial phase.

The player may not plan amphibious landings for any other units."

Second Front Rules Court

Allied OB

Q. Allied Apr I 44 Initial Forces: How is the Polish 13-10 armor upgrade accomplished with no Polish ETO inf RPs available?

A. Hmm . . . interesting point, looks like the Poles should have a 0.5 inf RP rate for Jul-Dec 43 in the ETO; with 1 Polish inf RP accumulated in the ETO for the Apr I 44 initial conditions.

Maps.

Q. Is Caen really a bigger port than Cherbourg?

A. Surprisingly, Caen is a more important port than Cherbourg. Cherbourg was a premier port for ocean liners in the pre-war period, but Caen was the heavy-duty cargo port of the area. This explains part of the Allies planning on capturing Caen early in the Normandy campaign, as they hoped to capture the port. In the event, the Germans blocked the British back from taking the port in the early days of the campaign, and then they wrecked the locks system that gave access to the port, so extensively that the port was rendered of little use for the remainder of the war.

Chart Errata.

Note #2 in the optional antiaircraft fire table notes is incorrect. The last sentence should read: "Treat shifts that would go past the "A" column of the table as positive dice roll modifiers on the "A" column; treat shifts that would go past the "F" column of the table as negative dice roll modifiers on the "F" column."

Also, the stacking summary is incorrect in one instance: regular stacking should be 3, not 6, units.

Questions and Answers.

Q. (Rules 10H and 14A2) May a player voluntarily reduce his AECA/AECD/ATEC or combat engineer proportion in order to avoid "Required Losses?"

A. No.

Q. (Rule 12) Are ground units on ships in supply?

A. The regular supply rules govern the supply of ground units, even when they are embarked on board ships. Note that in some cases units will become unsupplied when on board ships. For example, a unit embarks upon a NT and ends its turn at sea. In the next player turn, the unit becomes out of supply, since there is no way it can trace a supply line to a supply source. If the NT is in port, however, then an embarked unit on board may be able to trace supply, per Rule 12.

If this seems a bit odd, it works this way to prevent game abuses, such as embarking units on ships to establish a permanently-in-supply "floating reserve" or other silly things.

Q. (Rule 12C2) The final sentence of this rule seems to contradict the previous one. If in order to function as a limited supply source a standard or minor port must trace a naval element supply line to a major or great port, what does the last sentence of this rule mean when it states, "...supply line may be traced from a minor or standard port."?

A. The last sentence allows you to trace a naval supply line from a standard/minor port; it has nothing to do with tracing the line to a major/great port. Instead, see Rule 12B4, which governs naval supply lines and says you have to trace from a major/great port. 12B4/12C1 is the general case, allowing both sides to get full regular supply via naval supply lines. 12C2 is the special case for the Allies, allowing them to get limited regular supply by using ports that don't make the cut for 12B4/12C1.

Q. (Rules 14B1 and 14B2) If a long-range siege artillery unit fires from two hexes in such a way that the "line of sight" crosses the vertex between two hexsides, one of which is an improved fortified hexside and the other of which is not, then is the artillery's strength doubled?

A. Yes.

Q. (Rule 14J) If a movement counter is not carrying a unit is it treated as a 0-strength unit for combat purposes (e.g., not included in AEC/ATEC computations)?

A. Yes.

Q. What is the RE size of transport counters for purposes of naval and rail transport?

A. Its basic size is doubled for being c/m. A 1 RE-capacity counter that moves by rail or sea counts as 1 RE for transport purposes, and a 3 RE-capacity counter counts as 2 REs.

Q. (Rule 14J1) Can transport counters carry units during the combat phase?

A. No.

Q. (Rule 14J2) May LVTs and the units they carry treat narrow straits hexsides as river hexsides, as per Rule 14J2? [Such a crossing was part of the historical battle of Walcheren Island.]

A. The rules as written don't grant any special ability to LVTs for narrow straits hexsides. This was done for simplicity. Unlike LVTs' ability on lake and major river hexsides, in the case of narrow straits hexsides, sea conditions come into play.

You can use the following option for LVTs: Under calm and rough sea conditions, an LVT may treat narrow straits hexsides as river hexsides. Under stormy sea conditions, it cannot do so.

Q. (Rules 14J2 and 14J3) If a unit being carried by an LVT or APC counter is eliminated in the combat phase, is the carrying LVT/APC eliminated as well?

A. Yes, as they are treated as a single unit.

Q. (Rule 14J3) Do units carried by an APC have their total combat strength increased by 1 when determining losses, or is the APC treated as a separate unit with a strength of 1?

A. Neither, actually. The 1-strength point increase is a strength modifier (similar to the way siege artillery is doubled against fortresses), but losses are determined using printed strengths only, and the LVT/APC counters do not have a printed strength. Example: A 3-8 Inf X carried by an APC would attack with a strength of 4. If eliminated, both the 3-8 Inf X and the APC would be removed from play and would count as a loss of 3 attack strength points.

Q. Suppose two 3-8 infantry brigades, each carried by an APC counter, participate in an attack. Would their attack strength be 7 or 8?

A. The bonus applies for each and every APC counter, regardless of the presence or absence of other APCs in the hex/attack. Thus, their attack strength would be 4 each, for a total of 8.

Q. Can a unit be carried by several APC counters, and thus receive more than a +1 bonus?

A. No. Note the phrase "carried by an APC counter" in the rule.

Q. Do units carried by an APC have their total combat strength increased by 1 for purposes of overrun?

A. Rule 13 says "Overrun odds are computed in the same way that combat odds are..." Hence, the +1 attack bonus does apply for overruns.

Q. If units carried by an APC are attacked, is their total combat strength increased by 1?

A. The rule specifically covers attack, not defense, and so the bonus does not apply for defense.

Q. (Rule 15E) If a panzer division with an attached Panther (or Panzer IV) battalion suffers losses in combat, is the battalion considered to be a separate unit from the division for loss purposes?

A. Here's how it works: if a 15-10 panzer division with a 4-2-10 Panther battalion attached is reduced to cadre, the division would count as 19 for loss purposes and you would be left with an 11-8 panzer cadre (a 7-8 panzer cadre with a 4-2-10 Panther battalion attached).

If a 7-8 panzer cadre with a 4-2-10 Panther battalion attached suffers losses in combat, the cadre would count as 11 for loss purposes, and both the 7-8 cadre and the 4-2-10 Panther battalion would enter the replacement pool.

Q. If you attach a Panzer IV battalion does it add 4 or 2 to the strength of the panzer division?

A. "While attached, the battalion is considered to be part of the division: it contributes its strength to the

division but neither counts against stacking nor increases the RE size of the division." Since the strength of the Panzer IV battalion is 2, it would add 2 to the strength of the panzer division.

Q. Can a detached Panther battalion be attached to a plain old Panzergrenadier XX, thus making it a Panzer XX?

A. Rule 15E allows a detached panzer battalion only to be attached to a panzer division, and not to a panzergrenadier division.

This covers all the historical cases I can think of off-hand, although I would not be surprised to hear about exceptions to this. I note that a panzer division had a panzer regiment headquarters, capable of controlling several panzer battalions. A panzergrenadier division, having only one panzer battalion, did not have a panzer regiment headquarters and thus on paper was less able to handle multiple panzer battalions. In reality, however, the German's practice of cross-attaching units and forming battle groups (Kampfgruppen) probably meant that a panzergrenadier division could competently manage a second panzer battalion. So, if you want to add this to the game as a house rule (and your opponent agrees), go ahead.

Q. (Rule 16D) I can imagine situations where both sides will want to initiate an air mission at the same time (e.g., one side wants to bomb a port to prevent a landing, the other wants to bomb the bombers which want to bomb the port before they can leave base). Who gets priority?

A. If both sides simultaneously want to initiate an air operation, then choose at random which side gets to initiate the air op. The easiest way is to roll one die: 1–3 means the Allied player initiates; 4–6 the Axis player. (Use this in cases only when both sides truly wanted to initiate an air op. For example, if one player announces an air op and the other player lets him start moving air units unchallenged, then the second player can't decide later that he really wanted to start an air op, too.) At the end of the air op, the other player may now initiate an air op, if he still wishes to do so. Continuing alternating air ops between the two sides until at least one of the players no longer wants to initiate an air op.

It's also been reported that both players want to fly air ops at the same time, but they want the other side to go first (for example, so that they can see where enemy CAP is going). Follow the same procedure as above: randomly select one player to initiate an air op, and then alternate air ops between the two sides until at least one player is done.

Q. (Rule 17D) Suppose there is a 6-capacity permanent airfield in a major city, for a total airbase capacity of 12. This airbase takes 6 hits of damage. May the owning player assign all six hits to the permanent airfield, and then abandon it?

A. Yes.

Q. (Rule 20F2 and 24) Page 26, Rule 20F2 says ground units may air drop in any hex except prohibited, mountain, wooded-swamp, or forest. Page 35, Rule 24 says units and supplies may air drop in any land hexes. Which is correct?

A. Rule 20F2 is correct; Rule 24's "may air drop in any land hexes, including hexes occupied by enemy units" is intended to let you know that you can drop in enemy occupied hexes, but I see how you misinterpreted the rule the way you did. Perhaps the rule should remove the "any" or even add a rules back-reference: "may air drop in land hexes (per Rule 20F2), including hexes occupied by enemy units."

Q. (Rules 20F3, 22B, and 34E) The minelaying rules seem to make mines excessively effective; in particular, the lack of breakdowns for the big Allied TFs seems to make sweeping mines ridiculously expensive. The rules seem to prohibit naval units firing AA at mine-laying aircraft in their hex—is this correct?

A. [One slick trick would be to wait for the invasion armada to end a movement step, then do a night mine-laying air operation in the hex (the rules do not seem to prohibit this, even if the Allies are not sailing at night). There would be no AA, and only night fighters to contend with. If successful, even one mine point could inflict very heavy losses, far more than seem to have occurred historically.

Naval units don't fire AA at air units on aerial minelaying missions, as the air units do not lay the mines in the part of the hex where the ships currently are. (The hexes represent a huge expanse of area, with it being impractical to impossible for ships to cover the whole extent.)

Air units dropping mines in a hex containing enemy naval units at sea, thereby doing all sorts of harm to the ships at the start of their next naval movement step, can be abusive. However, it requires numerous sorties over the course of a turn to lay enough mines to qualify for a mine point, so the enemy can't catch the ships by surprise through a single overnight mine laying. The game's sequencing of activities attempted to show this:

- A player may aurally lay mines by flying a transport mission, which can be done only in the movement and exploitation phases of his own player turn (Rule 20F).
- Enemy naval units in the hex are unaffected at this time, since per Rule 34E1 they check for mine damage if they enter or put to sea in the hex (they are already in the hex, so this doesn't count) or if they start a friendly naval movement step in the hex (since it is not their player turn, this can't occur at this time).
- After the mine-laying player is finished his turn, the enemy player turn begins. The enemy naval units now can be affected by the mines, but before they do check for damage, automatic mine clearing occurs if the mines are in various coastal hexes or beyond the range of certain ports (Rule 34E3).

I had thought the above sequencing would take care of things in most typical cases. However, reexamining the point leads me to believe that when automatic mine clearing does not occur, the naval units in the hex have a big problem in the game, whereas in reality this would not occur in such a fashion.

The best way to handle this situation is: When a player aurally lays mines in a hex containing enemy naval units at sea, then during the immediately following player turn those naval units (only) ignore the presence of those mines (only) during the naval unit's first naval movement step (only) of the turn.

(Rules 20G2c) There is a problem involving firing AA at DAS due to the new sequencing. The rules specify that AA is fired during the AA fire step of the air operation (including DAS air operations), and not (as used to be the case with DAS) just prior to ground combat resolution against the hex. This forces the phasing player to decide immediately upon the first DAS mission arriving in the hex if he is going to attack the hex (and with which units), so that he can fire his AA at the enemy air units. If such fire binds the phasing player to attack the DAS hex (and presumably it does), the enemy could theoretically continue to pile many other DAS missions into the hex to the point where the impending attack would become suicidal. I see your point. I do not want to delay the AA fire, but until I can figure out a way to make this work, use the old sequencing. Modify the appropriate section of Rule 20G2c as follows:

"Each DAS operation follows the standard air sequence, until the AA fire step is reached. At this point the mission is suspended until the players are to resolve the ground combat in the hex.

When the players are to resolve ground combat in a hex containing a DAS operation, the remainder of the air operation occurs in conjunction with the ground combat, in this sequence:

1. When ready to resolve the combat, the attacking player declares the attack, indicating the attacking units.
2. The AA fire step occurs, per Rule 22B1.
3. The DAS mission resolution step occurs."

Q. (Rules 20G2g and 20G2h) Losses to Naval Units: Are these allocated after each air attack, or after all air attacks in a player turn?

A. Rule 20G2g defines how this happens for both 20G2g & h: "For each air operation, resolve all bombing attacks of air units flying this mission before applying any hits achieved. (Keep track of the total number of hits achieved.) Apply the hits after all air units on this mission [naval units in port bombing] have finished bombing." This means you do it on a per-air-operation basis, applying all hits (losses) to the naval units once all bombing attacks in the operation are over.

Q. (Rule 23A2) It seems almost impossible to take out enemy fighters if they don't want to fight, since even inoperative ones can scramble. This seems too generous; fighters certainly did get caught on the ground from time to time; it is actually easier to overrun them with tanks! Perhaps they should have to make some

kind of escape die roll in order to scramble?

A. Inoperative fighters must be able to scramble. Otherwise, players would resort to the ahistorical tactic of waiting for enemy fighters to become inoperative and then immediately flying to bomb their airbases.

Q. (Rule 23G) Why are there NA air units if no tactical bombing missions can be flown at night?

A. Obviously, type NA air units can fly transfer missions at night without fear of crash landing! Actually, if we ever allow (some) tactical bombing missions at night, then these air units are already rated and will automatically retrofit. Don't hold your breath waiting for night tac bombing, however. The case for this having any appreciable effect at Europa scale is rather tenuous. Still, someone someday may marshal enough data to convince me otherwise.

Q. (Rule 23H10) If I understand this rule correctly, then a code X air unit which suffers an "A" result in combat is considered aborted and not eliminated. Is that correct?

A. The unit would suffer a "double abort" (once in combat and once per Rule 23H10), but in SF this still equates to an "abort" and not an "eliminated" as in some other Europa games.

Q. (Rule 24B1) An Allied airborne unit lands in an unoccupied Axis-owned hex that contains an airbase and becomes disrupted when dropping in the hex. Therefore, the Allied player is unable to use the airbase there. May Axis air units continue to operate from the airbase?

A. Yes.

Q. Suppose the hex in the example above is also a port. May Axis naval units continue to use the port? If so, may Axis naval transports land ground units at the port? If so, may they then conduct the same sort of in-hex combat in the combat phase that airborne and amphibious units conduct?

A. They may use the port there, but ground units may not be disembarked at the port. Rule 6 lists "In general, a unit may not enter a hex occupied by an enemy unit. Exceptions to this are covered in the appropriate rules." Note that the naval transport rules do not list this as an exception.

Q. Suppose the hex in the example above is also a city. May Axis reinforcements/replacements appear in the city in the Axis initial phase? If so, may they then conduct the same sort of in-hex combat in the combat phase that airborne and amphibious units conduct?

A. Yes.

Q. (Rule 26) When a strategic wing flies a mission in poor weather, is the bombing strength halved before or after AA fire?

A. Halve it at the moment of bombing, which comes after AA fire.

Q. (Rule 26C2) Is there any limit to the number of bombing points a strategic wing can allocate to GS or DAS?

A. For 26C2b, note that the wing flies any tactical mission that heavy bombers may fly; and per 23E2 heavy bombers may not fly GS or DAS.

For 26C2c, every 3 bombing strength points (or fraction thereof; calculated before any halving due to weather or terrain) delivered by a strategic wing counts as 1 air unit for the GS/DAS limit.

Q. (Rules 27A3 and 31) Can you deliberately allocate excess naval transport to a unit in order to avoid losses at sea?

A. No. Several naval transports can combine to carry a unit. But, assigning "excess" naval transports to a unit doesn't ensure it will avoid losses at sea, since if any of the naval transports carrying the unit is sunk, the unit is eliminated. (I suppose you could make a case that if 20 NTs were assigned to carry a brigade and only one was sunk, the unit has lost only 5% of its strength and should remain in play. I believe, however, that this is getting into the silly zone and would encourage players to adopt ahistorical tactics.)

However, there is a way to get a result similar to the one you're looking for. Don't assign "excess" NTs to carry a unit, but include NTs that are not carrying anything as part of the naval group with the NTs that

are carrying the unit. If naval units in the group take damage from air units, it may turn out that empty NTs get hit rather than laden ones.

Q. (Rules 28 and 28A) These rules state a naval group may split at any point during movement/reaction. Does this just mean that two TFs may move independently, or does it allow you to split a single TF into two TF units?

A. Rule 27B2 governs the general concept of naval groups, and the seventh paragraph of Rule 28 specifically governs how you split up a naval group. Note that both rules define naval groups in terms of naval units: you can break one group up into several groups, each of which can have one or more naval units. A TF, however, is a single naval unit: it can be part of a naval group (or even the only unit in a naval group) but it cannot be split into two units.

Q. (Rule 28A) Is it correct that non-phasing naval units cannot move at all, except by reaction?

A. That is correct.

Q. Is a naval unit considered moving any time it expends movement points, or only when it enters a new hex?

A. If only the latter, this means that NTs and LCs in the process of disembarking at a beach hex could not be intercepted (i.e., do not trigger reaction) once they reach the beach.

For the purposes of reaction, a naval group is considered moving if it is spending MPs (for any purpose).

Q. (Rule 29B2) This rule states that combat between naval units and CDs is resolved in a single round. Exactly what does this mean?

A. Naval combat between naval units and an enemy CD is initiated as per Rule 28C. Once initiated, the combat is resolved (per Rule 29B2) in a single firing round (unlike combat between naval units and enemy naval units, which can last for several rounds). When the round is over, naval combat between the naval units and the CD is over, and the naval units can resume movement or whatever else they were doing.

Q. If the naval units still have MPs remaining, can they conduct other naval activities in the hex, such as sweeping mines?

A. Yes.

Q. If the naval units still have MPs remaining, can they leave the hex in which they engaged the CD? For example, can they move further down the coast and engage another enemy CD?

A. Yes.

Q. If the naval units still have MPs remaining, can they engage the same CD in another round of naval combat?

A. Yes—but only if the naval units do something that meets the requirements for initiating naval combat again with the CD per Rule 28C, such as entering another hex in the combat zone of the enemy CD.

Q. (Rule 31) If an NT unit is bombed and hit while embarking ground units, does anything happen to the units (i.e., are they considered cargo or not)?

A. Nothing happens to such ground units. They are not embarked until the naval unit has spent all necessary MPs to embark them. Once embarked, they're cargo and are affected by what happens to the naval unit. (Similarly, a unit is considered cargo if it is embarked on a naval unit which is spending MPs to disembark it and is subject to adverse effects on the naval unit until the naval unit has spent all necessary MPs to disembark it.)

Q. Is naval transport of air units allowed?

A. No.

Q. Does the non-phasing player get to know what cargo is in a convoy before he launches an air attack on it?

A. Yes. This is the same as asking if the phasing player gets to know what ground units are in a stack before he attacks it. In Europa, players may freely inspect enemy stacks at any time.

As a house rule, however, you can prohibit the enemy player from examining the cargo of any naval unit or air unit that is transporting cargo. This adds more excitement to play without upsetting any game system. If you want to do this, simply stack the cargo underneath the transporting naval or air unit and do not allow the enemy player to peek underneath. (If you have a stack of several air or naval units in a hex, the other side can demand that you show all the air or naval units in the hex.) Use status markers as usual to denote supply points being carried as cargo.

This system still lets the enemy player distinguish between empty and cargo-laden air or naval units. Of course, in most cases you can fill up an otherwise empty air or naval unit with supply points. I also see no problem with adding another house rule allowing such units to carry dummy cargo; use a hit marker or the like for the dummy cargo.

Q. (Rule 31A) Can a naval unit expend naval MPs for embarkation in an empty beach hex, in anticipation of friendly ground units entering the hex and embarking during the upcoming ground movement sub-phase?

A. No. The prospective cargo must be present for the naval unit to spend MPs to embark it. You can't embark something that's not there yet!

Q. (Rule 32B and 32D) Do divisions making amphibious landings have ZOCs (which might affect enemy reaction)?

A. Divisions are not amphibious units and therefore cannot make amphibious landings. Divisions must be broken down unsupported and transported by LCs and LVTs to make amphibious landings. The divisional headquarters can subsequently be landed in the exploitation phase and the division re-formed at that time. (Exception: The optional U.S. Marine XX Exp is intrinsically amphibious; its ZOC would be considered when determining enemy reaction.)

Q. (Rule 34A4 and 34F) A naval unit starts several consecutive naval movement steps (not moving) in a danger zone. May the contact die roll be modified in each step by having the unit start the step at night?

A. Yes.

Q. (Rule 34E) Does a TF sweeping for mines have to roll for mine damage twice (once when it enters the hex, and again when it starts the following step at sea in the hex)?

A. Twice.

Q. (Rule 34F) It seems a little strange that there would be a danger zone around some of (but not all of) the ports in Sardinia and Corsica. Is this supposed to be the way it is?

A. This is correct. There is, however, an important omission in the danger zone rule (Rule 34F): All hexes within 5 hexes of an Allied-owned port are automatically both an Axis danger zone and not an Allied danger zone, regardless of the standard danger zone definitions. (Note that this allows the Allies to overcome danger zones as they advance. This accounts for Allied local naval superiority.)

Q. (Rule 34G) Do you check LCs for damage when they EMBARK cargo at a beach?

A. No, only when disembarking cargo.

Q. (Rule 34J) Do LCs acting as ferries have to be at sea? If so, is this throughout the turn?

A. Yes, an LC must be at sea to operate as a ferry; it cannot be in port. It must remain at sea throughout the player turn it operates as a ferry.

Q. (Rule 37A4) Does massive flooding destroy a fort marker in the hex?

A. No. A fort marker is removed only when it is captured by enemy units. However, given the sequence of events in Rule 37A4, the Allied player will have the first opportunity to re-enter the flooded hex, and if he opts to do so, the fort will be destroyed at that time.

Q. (Rule 37E) This rule allows half of a garrison's REs to be placed "immediately whenever any enemy unit enters any hex of the district." Does this include enemy units entering the district via airborne drops and amphibious landings?

A. Yes.

Q. If yes, the garrison of France is quite large. Consider the case of an airborne assault on two or three undefended French ports, hundreds of miles apart, undertaken after most German units have moved south in August 1943. Do several 5-defense strength security brigades appear immediately the paras leap out of their transports in time to affect the disruption die rolls?

A. The garrison activation is triggered "immediately whenever any enemy unit enters any hex of the district." In the case of an airborne landing (and similarly for an amphibious landing) triggering a garrison, the garrison is triggered immediately when a unit (the first one, if several are dropping in the same air operation) lands in a hex in the district. Note that the disruption die roll is part of the procedure to land the unit, so it occurs before activated garrison units are placed. After the landing of the (first) airborne unit, the enemy player may place up to half the REs of ground units in the garrison, in any hexes where it is legal to do so (any friendly owned cities in the district, including the hex the first airborne unit landed in, if the unit became disrupted when dropping in the hex). The regular course of play resumes when this is done. Note that the newly placed garrison units may now affect the landing of subsequent airborne units.

Note that an airborne assault on two or three widely-separated French ports cannot occur as part of a single air operation, since the air drop missions will have different target hexes. Such assaults must be performed in separate airborne operations. Thus, when the first drop comes in, the Axis player will only know for sure that one particular port is the target of a drop and will have to guess if and where any other drops may occur.

Q. If Allied units make an amphibious landing in the Axis-owned coastal hex of Catania in Sicily (26:4025), thereby entering the province of Sicily for the first time, may the Axis player immediately place Sicily off-map garrison unit(s) in Catania?

A. Whether or not garrison units may appear in Catania depends upon Catania's status. If the first Allied unit landing in Catania gains control of the hex, then garrison units cannot appear there. Otherwise (such as an Allied unit landing at Catania, but Catania is Axis occupied and not immediately overrun upon the unit's landing), garrison units may appear there. If Allied and Axis units are now in the hex together, the standard rules for both sides being in the same hex apply.

Q. (Rules 37E and 3E2) There is no city on Malta and therefore nowhere to place a unit of the garrison if it is activated. Is Valletta the activation hex for the Malta garrison?

A. Oops! Valletta has indeed been scaled down from a reference city to a point city. Nevertheless, use it as the activation hex for the Malta garrison.

Q. (Rule 38B3) May the Allied player gain production from Italian provinces liberated after the Italian surrender, and if yes, does it work the same as for French MRs, per Rule 38D?

A. Yes.

Q. (Rule 40) Are Axis transfers between theaters handled like withdrawals?

A. A transfer that is required is handled the same as a withdrawal. (Note that not all transfers are required: you ignore transfers between theaters you control.)

Q. (Rule 40A1) In the definition of "Convert" this rule states, "If it is not possible to convert the unit on the turn specified, it must be converted in the first friendly initial phase in which it can be converted." Does this mean the first turn the converting unit happens to be in a supplied, non-isolated city hex, not in a ZOC, etc., or is the converting player obligated to withdraw the unit from the line and move it as quickly as possible to such a hex?

A. The former: the first turn the converting unit happens to be in a supplied, non-isolated city hex, not in a ZOC, etc. This method is guaranteed to work for all game purposes. Yes, this can get a bit silly—you can avoid a particular conversion by trying to ensure the unit never ends up in a city. If you'd like to know how the rule would work in an ideal world, read on.

If you and your opponent are reasonable players, then the conversion is mandatory. (The intention of Rule 40A1 is that reorganizations are voluntary and conversions are mandatory if possible. Conversions are mandatory because not every conversion "makes sense" in the confines of the game: sometimes you incur a net loss of strength or a net loss of special abilities such as AEC/ATEC. These rare "net loss" conversions are usually due to factors outside the scope of the particular game, such as a unit hiving off a cadre of veterans to form a new unit in a theater not in play.) Once a conversion is specified in the OB, you are required to make a reasonable effort to fulfill it as soon as possible. (This does not require you to replace the unit if it happens to be eliminated. If it is eliminated and you do replace it, however, then you must also convert it ASAP.) If you and your opponent are reasonable, go ahead and use this interpretation of the rule.

Mandatory conversions, however, fall prey to gamesmanship if any of the players in the game are unreasonable. For example, suppose your only unit that can be converted is in an isolated pocket. An unreasonable opponent would argue that you must now move your forces and conduct attacks so as to give every possible chance (regardless of all other consequences) for the isolated unit to get back into a situation in which it can be converted as soon as possible. So, if your opponent is unreasonable, then don't use this interpretation of the rule—better still, find a more reasonable opponent!

Q. On Nov I 43 can the Axis player convert 9-8 Para-Inf XX 2 (LW) [instead of 4-8* Para-Inf Cadre 2 (LW)] and 1-8 Para-Inf II I/1 St (LW) to 7-8* Para-Inf XX 2 (LW), and receive 5 inf RPs?*

A. This is allowable.

Q. When a conversion or upgrade is called for and the unit is in another theater, can it be converted or upgraded, even before coming back to the theater specified in the OB?

A. Yes. Remember (per Rule 3F), the theater rule does not bind you for theaters you control.

Q. When the OB lists a "replaced" unit, can the replacement be deferred and used later if the unit is not present at this time in the replacement pool?

A. Yes.

Q. (Rule 40A1 and 40A2) The Axis Order of Battle booklet specifies several transfers or withdrawals, e.g., "Oct I 43, West, German, Transfer to Southeast: 1x 5-5 Static XX 264." As 5-5 Static XX are eligible for reorganization to 5-7-6 Inf XX as of Jul I 43, I understand that if a specified division has been reorganized, another 5-5 Static XX may be transferred in its stead. However, if ALL 5-5 Static XX have been reorganized as 5-7-6 Inf XX, what should be done to fulfill this requirement? Should a 5-7-6 Inf XX be transferred?

A. No, simply follow the rule for withdrawals. If all 5-5 Static XXs in play have reorganized, yank one from the replacement pool and pay the RP cost, per the withdrawal rule. I note that the withdrawal rule possibly should cover the case where an appropriate unit is neither in play nor in the replacement pool: don't yank any unit, but pay the RP cost.

Q. May the Axis player reorganize divisions (e.g., 5-5 Static XX to 5-7-6 Inf XX) that are in garrisons? In the North? In the Southeast?

A. No for all cases above. You can reorganize (or otherwise do things with) only those forces under your control. Rule 37E defines that garrison forces come under a player's control when the garrison is activated. While in garrison, these units are not under the player's control and thus cannot be reorganized. Rule 3F defines how theaters are handled: if you control a theater, you control its forces. Depending upon scenario, the Axis player may control one or more of the Greater Germany, West, and South theaters. Neither the North nor the Southeast theaters come under the Axis player's control in SF, so the player does not control the forces in these theaters (and hence cannot reorganize them).

Q. (Rule 40B2 and 40B3) If a specialized armor unit is replaced, does its replacement also count against the combat/assault engineer replacement limit?

A. No, specialized armor unit types (flamethrower tank, engineer tank, assault engineer tank, and sturmpanzer) are different unit types than combat and assault engineers. Consult the unit identification chart.

Q. (Rule 40D1) This rule refers to tracing an overland supply line to a "source of replacements." What is that?

A. This rule is misworded. Replace the phrase "source of replacements" with "friendly-owned, unisolated regular source of supply."

Q. (Rules 40D1, 42, and 43F2) Is it really true that disbanded units don't count for losses—if so, it seems to make it almost impossible for the Axis to inflict "excessive losses" on Allied ground units: the Allied player can simply disband a few units in play to generate sufficient accumulated infantry RPs to offset his losses?

A. Disbanded units do not count towards losses. Yes, it is difficult for the Axis to inflict excessive losses on the Allies in most situations (although it is possible in MTO-only scenarios, as happened historically). Think of the excessive losses rule less as a reward the Axis can achieve, but more as a penalty the Allies can incur: if the Allied player burns out his forces trying to knock out the Axis quickly, he incurs the wrath of the citizens back home.

Q. (40D3) The USA is not on map; does this prevent the loan of US armor RPs to other forces?

A. In Rule 40D3, the words "city" and "nation" were mistakenly used; the correct phrases are "regular supply source" and "force." Thus, a player may give foreign aid "as long as he can trace a supply line from any friendly-owned, unisolated city regular supply source of the donating nation force to any friendly-owned, unisolated city regular supply source of the nation force."

Also, this rule suggests that the United States and Commonwealth countries may not provide foreign aid to the various exile forces: Free France, Poland, etc. Is this correct?

With the above correction the U.S. and Commonwealth countries will always be able to provide foreign aid to all of the various exile forces, since they share the same regular supply sources.

Q. (Rule 41A) When redeploying the 7 units per theatre after Allied setup are there any restrictions on which units can do so, and are units redeploying still subject to geographic limits listed in the Axis OB (e.g., can an Axis unit which has to deploy in Northern Italy redeploy to the Anzio Front)?

A. There is no restriction on which 7 units may be chosen to redeploy. A unit may redeploy anywhere its initial deployment instructions allow it. Thus, an Axis unit deployed in the Northern Italy area may redeploy anywhere within that area, but nowhere else (such as to the Anzio Front).

Q. Since cargo may not be transported by sea or air in the pre-game Allied movement phase, aren't the units in the Anzio Beachhead out of supply at the start of play on Apr I 44?

A. The units in the Anzio Beachhead are considered to be in supply on the Allied Apr I 44 turn.

Q. Can Allied units be deployed pre-embarked on NTs and LCs during the initial deployment?

A. Yes.

Q. In the Crusade in Europe and Victory in Europe scenarios, can air units be deployed in either theater?

A. Yes, use the combined air orders of battle.

Q. May Allied LCs and NTs in the MTO initially deploy at Gibraltar? Oran?

A. Gibraltar: No, as it is not part of the MTO. Oran: Yes, as it is a North African port and North Africa is part of the MTO.

Q. (Rule 43C2) Under certain conditions, the only units in a hex may be overstacked. If an enemy unit enters the hex, are the overstacked units automatically eliminated, or must they be overrun at 0-strength?

A. If an overstack is alone in a hex, treat it as a zero-strength unit if attacked or overrun.

Q. (Rule 43E) Allied Cooperation. "Other Allied units" are part of a national contingent, but "may be included with any contingents and switched between contingents freely." Does this occur for all units of a national group at a particular time or for individual units? For example, can one French unit (before the return of the French government from exile) attack with a British stack, and another French unit attack

with an American stack in the same combat phase with no penalty?

A. Yes, the determination is made for individual units.

Q. (Rule 43F1) Are Reserve, Replacement and Training units functionally identical?

A. Yes. (In reality, reserve, replacement, and training units could have different functions, depending upon nation, time period, and circumstances, but these are not significant enough to worry about at the level we show things in the game.)

Q. (Rule 43F2) In different places in the rules and charts, the definition of "force" seems to be different. For the purposes of this rule I assume that the Allies have five forces (American, British, French, Italian, and Other Allied) and the Axis have three forces (German, (RSI) Italian, and Other Axis). Is this correct?

A. Yes.

Q. (Rule 44B3) Is there anything to prevent the Axis player from running around with their engineers and damaging every port in sight?

A. See Optional Rule 44B3.

Q. Rule 44C3 states that a heavy AA unit does not have its attack strength halved when attacking a fortification if a field artillery unit would not be halved attacking the same fortification (per the fortifications effects chart). Since heavy AA is not halved attacking a swamp hex, it is therefore twice as effective as field artillery when attacking a fortification in a swamp (or partially-flooded) hex. Is this as intended?

A. That's how it works. Both field artillery and heavy AA are not halved against certain types of fortifications, due to the blast and/or penetrative effects their fire can have on the fortifications. For non-fortification terrain, however, field artillery and heavy AA work differently and thus can have different effects. Field artillery is (mainly) an indirect fire weapon, with its effectiveness coming from catching the enemy in its blast. In soggy ground conditions, such as in flooded canal intensive hexes, the blast effects are reduced and thus the artillery is less effective. Heavy AA is (mainly) a direct fire weapon, even when firing HE against unarmored targets. Direct fire usually can hit its target more precisely and with quicker response to changing conditions; hence it is not as affected by soggy ground conditions as is indirect fire. Thus, for an attack on a port fortification in a partially flooded canal intensive hex, the field artillery is effective against the part of the enemy in the fortifications but is less effective against enemy troops holding positions elsewhere in the hex, while heavy AA is effective against both.

Examples: In an attack on a partially flooded canal intensive hex that has a port fortification, such as in the historical battle of Walcheren Island, various attacking units would be affected as follows:

- An attacking armor unit would be halved twice: once for the flooded canal intensive hex and once for the port fortification.
- An attacking infantry unit would be halved once: for the port fortification but not for the flooded canal intensive hex.
- An attacking engineer unit would not be halved: neither for the port fortification nor for the flooded canal intensive hex.
- An attacking field artillery unit would be halved once: for the flooded canal intensive hex but not for the port fortification.
- An attacking heavy AA unit would not be halved: neither for the port fortification nor for the flooded canal intensive hex