

## Danny

a.k.a. Daniel Giddings

Cambridge, England • 30 Years Old • 2E • 4+ Year Player

Daniel participated in *Make it So 2010*, but was eliminated after Challenge #11.

### Affiliation Ratings

For each category, applicants were asked to rate each affiliation from weak (1) to strong (5).

Affiliation	Competitiveness	Complexity	Diversity
Bajoran	3	3	3
Borg	4	4	2
Cardassian	2	3	2
Dominion	4	3	4
Deep Space 9	4	3	4
Fed – Earth DS9	5	3	3
Fed – TNG	5	2	3
Fed – TOS	5	3	1
Fed – Voyager	4	3	3
Ferengi	2	5	3
Klingon	5	3	3
Maquis	4	5	3
Non-Aligned	3	3	3
Romulan <sup>^</sup>	3	5	3
Starfleet <sup>+*</sup>	5	4	5
Terok Nor <sup>-</sup>	3	2	3
+: Most Favorite    -: Least Favorite    *: Best Understood    ^: Least Understood			

#### Which affiliations did you rate as a one (1) in Competitiveness? Why?

*I didn't rate any affiliation as "Very Weak" as I think the introduction of new cards in the recent virtual sets has raised the game (or the potential to raise the game) of all the affiliations, paying particular attention to their weaknesses, but without losing the sense of culture that each affiliation brings.*

*My two lowest rated affiliations, the Cardassians and Ferengi, scored 2 out of 5, as I think they still have some weaknesses. Sure, the Ferengi recently received two incredible missions, a great gambling themed event, and the latest battle-theme has yet to be tested, but they still struggle with attributes. And although the Cardassians have Central Command and a new discard-a-ship team to add to their ranks, they still seem to work best when mixing with the Dominion aboard Terok Nor.*

#### Which affiliations did you rate as a five (5) in Competitiveness? Why?

*I gave five affiliations top marks - Federation DS9-Earth, TNG, TOS, Klingon and Starfleet.*

*The Klingons have always been strong, what with having highly attributed personnel (who are, on the whole, cheap), the ability to gain skills and have a fairly strong interactive (combat and engagement) element.*

TOS are similar - cheap, well attributed personnel and ships, a wide selection of support events and interrupts, and several dilemma-dodging abilities. Plus the TMP team gave them 'expensive looking' personnel, which gave them access to some cards and protection from others.

Starfleet scored top marks for having five distinct elements - Regular, Mirror, MACO, Damaged and Future. Although MACO isn't really a competitive element (lacking in Gold Stars doesn't help), the CC's Damaged and Future teams both brought interesting and competitive mechanics to the table. Mirror's strength is a unique one - although it relies on having everything out on the table and having no cards in hand, it still manages to have the element of surprise.

DS9-Earth have only recently really entered the competitive environment thanks to three cards: Promenade School, Jaresh-Inyo and Charles Watley. The ability to get out several heavily costed, highly skilled, highly attributed personnel in two or three turns, all the while being supported by cheap weenies, is just overwhelming.

In my opinion, TNG is the anomaly - it works when it shouldn't. See, it doesn't have access to these recent DS9 tricks, nor does it have access to Energize (thereby making its expensive personnel cheaper) meaning one often pays full-price for personnel, plus, all the tricks it does bring to the table help the opponent (as is the TNG way), yet it still performs well, and performs well consistently. I realize Guinan, Vintner and the Cadets make this a strong affiliation, but they've really been around since the beginning. It makes one wonder why no one's wised up to them.

#### **Which affiliations did you rate as a one (1) in Complexity? Why?**

I didn't rate any affiliation as very casual, as each affiliation has its own intricacies and subtleties that mean that they have to be played in a "specific" way. I think TNG would be the affiliation most likely to be slip into the "Very Casual" rating, as they seem one of the affiliations most likely to be linked with "Speed Solvers", but it's their theme of helping everyone equally that stops them getting a rating of 1; one's got to be sharp and think about how the cards one plays will benefit the opponent before one plays them.

#### **Which affiliations did you rate as a five (5) in Complexity? Why?**

I think the Ferengi, Maquis and Romulans deserve the "Very Technical" rating, as each one has, as a game mechanic, some form of deck, hand and counter manipulation. With other affiliations, one has to concentrate on what they know is on the table, and what they think might be coming - with the three aforementioned affiliations, you can expand that to include what they know to be on the top of the opponent's deck, in the deck, what's been removed from the deck and what is in the opponent's hand. That's a lot more bases to cover.

#### **Which affiliations did you rate as a one (1) in Diversity? Why?**

I rated TNG as TOS as "Very Limited" as, aside from solvers, there appears to be little you can do with them; although the former has heavily-weaponed ships, there seems little encouragement for combat. Similar can be said for the latter. Cardassians would've slipped into the "Vert Limited" category too, were it not for their uses in a Dissident deck, working alongside their Terok-Norian allies or their love of Capture/Punishment.

#### **Which affiliations did you rate as a five (5) in Diversity? Why?**

Starfleet's the only affiliation that, in my mind, can be considered very diverse, and that is mainly in part to help it's received from TCC - the Future and Damaged teams have helped given Starfleet players a choice now over the direction they wish to take; non-Humans, Delphic Expanse, playing at Earth. And even though the other side of the

*looking glass has only just received some CC love (Mirror Archer and Defiant), it is still another direction Starfleet players can travel in.*

### **Design Philosophy and Card Design Submissions**

*All answers are submitted as written by the applicants. Cards are as submitted except for minor formatting changes.*

#### **Why do you want to be an assistant game designer?**

*I've a variety of reasons for wanting to be an assistant game designer. Firstly, I've a fairly comprehensive knowledge of Star Trek where the only outlet at the moment is through trivia games and pub quizzes - linking story elements to gameplay mechanics is something I enjoy doing in the Dream Card forum and episodic/theme contests.*

*Secondly, there are so many people, places, ships and events that haven't made it to card form yet, that it would be great to be able to put forward my case for their inclusion in sets, or to promote them in the event of looking for something to fill a gap.*

*Thirdly, I'm an avid games player - not just Star Trek, but board and card games in general - and would love nothing more than being connected, career-wise, to the gaming industry. Being involved in some bona fide professional (in attitude, rather than a remunerative sense) game development would be something worthy of mention on a CV.*

#### **What is the greatest strength of Second Edition's rules and game mechanics? Why?**

*Tricky question. I don't think there's a single aspect of the rules or mechanics that one can honestly say is the greatest. After weighing them up, I've got it down to two – the first are the mechanics associated with the cultures and affiliations (known to all through the shows), and how they accurately portray those cultures and affiliations by the various means of discarding, drawing and relocating cards and counters. The second is something almost as vague – the rules and mechanics surrounding the dilemma pile. I think being able to change the course of the game through the selection and playing of those cards make 2E what it is. For a lot of 2E games, unless one is playing battle, capture or infiltration, that is where the main interaction comes from. Without it/them, we could easily be playing Trek-solitaire.*

#### **What is the greatest weakness of Second Edition's rules and game mechanics? Why?**

*I'm torn on this issue between a mechanic and a rule. The mechanic I believe to be 2E's greatest weakness is the lack of a retaliatory option during combat and engagement. It doesn't make a great deal of Trek-sense for a vessel or landing party not to try to return fire when they come under attack. The original inclusion of such a rule could've lead to the creation of some awesome battle cards, and may have made interactive battle decks more prominent.*

*The rule I find to be 2E's greatest weakness is the ambiguity and inconsistency regarding the use of the word "instead". I realise that some progress has been made towards sorting this (mainly through the errata of offending cards), but the problem still remains, especially when instead is taken to use its correct and proper definition.*

**Choose an affiliation. Create a personnel for that affiliation that replicates the effect of a bicycle card, but within that affiliation's flavor.**

[SF] 3 •Charles Tucker III (Unwitting Saboteur)

[Cmd] [Pa] [AU] Human

•Engineer •Physics •Programming •Science

At the start of the Execute Orders segment on the turn you play this personnel, draw two cards. While you have no cards in your hand, cards your opponent owns cannot prevent your interrupts.

*"Captain, you've got it all wrong. It wasn't me!"*

[INTEGRITY 5] [CUNNING 5] [STRENGTH 6]

**Create a mission with an ability that does not include alternate requirements.**

[s] •Compete in Trans-Stellar Race

[DQ] [30]

**Astrometrics, 2 Navigation, Cunning>34, and (Engineer or Treachery)**

When you complete this mission, the player who commands the staffed ship with the largest Range at this mission scores 5 points.

**Near Antarian space:** *"For the kind of flying I'm here for, warp is not a factor."*

Any affiliation (except [Bor]) may attempt this mission.

[SPAN 3]

**Create a card that is able to be used in any deck, but not one that would be automatically included in any deck.**

[Evt] 0 Rescue Abductees

Remove any number of non-personnel cards in hand from the game to take an equal number of personnel you own but do not command from your opponent's command and place them on your headquarters mission. Destroy this event.

*"Mission accomplished. We have him."*

**Choose any virtual card created by TCC that is a different card type than any of the previous three card types. Keep the existing story but create new game text for the card.**

[Equ] 2 •Trellium-D

When you begin a mission attempt at a Region: Delphic Expanse mission with no dilemmas beneath it, you may reveal this card to make each dilemma your personnel face during this attempt that doesn't require a skill cost +1.

*"Do you have any idea what a spatial distortion can do to a ship that is not insulated with Trellium-D? What it can do to the people inside the ship?"*

*(See the original card [here](#).) I choose Trellium-D, because I really dislike the card in its current guise; it's a cantrip. It almost does nothing. From a Trek-sense perspective, that seems a little odd, considering the impact it was meant to have on ships by its absence.*

*I kept the connection to Region: Delphic Expanse in its gametext and lore, as I thought that to be incredibly important. Also, I kept the original lore as it tied in nicely with my new gametext (the revealing of the equipment when you begin a mission attempt is showing how well insulated/protected you are. Ships without it don't get the bonus).*

**Create a new card under the assumption that it will be the only one the judges will see. This card should show off your personality, your skill, and your creativity.**

[Evt] 3 •Imperial Advancement

Plays in your core. When you play an [AU] [TOS] personnel, if you paid additional counters to use their ability, you may kill your unique [AU] personnel present. If you do, you may use their ability again without paying additional counters.

*"No one will question the assassination of a captain who has disobeyed prime orders of the Empire."*