

http://www.idealab.com/fan_design/completed/cross_check.html
http://www.idealab.com/fan_design/in_progress/discussions/20111228_fb_talk_menu.html



Cosmic Encounter

Angler is in the Cross Check

Like · Share · Yesterday at 3:10pm ·

Discussion

○



Peter Olotka Message me to get permission for cross checking the new Fan Designed aliens against the existing Cosmic Encounter Aliens

Yesterday at 3:22pm · Like

○



Jefferson Krogh Found a small wording issue with Angler vs. The Claw and other aliens that keep cards outside its hand. We need to figure out if the Angler is restricted to opponent's hands, or what. Currently it doesn't say.

Yesterday at 7:31pm · Like

○



Jack Reda I think it should be

23 hours ago · Like · 3

○



Peter Olotka @ Jefferson Krogh Did you listed it in the cross check? Otherwise we will find a good number of things as we progress. Once its in cross check then we just keep going until all issues are out there..then rewrite

23 hours ago · Like

http://www.ideabout.com/fan_design/completed/cross_check.html

http://www.ideabout.com/fan_design/in_progress/discussions/20111228_fb_talk_menu.html



Jefferson Krogh Yep, I did.

23 hours ago · Like



Peter Olotka Point being, as these issues are discussed along the way, shouldn't we keep the actual wording of the BETA alien stable since it was cross checked on that current text. And keep the proposed corrections over in the "problem" column.

22 hours ago · Like · 2



Sam Connolly The way The Claw is worded, if Angler can go after the claw itself, then it can make The Claw not have a power for the rest of the game, since after game setup, The Claw can only SWAP its current claw for a card in hand, which is impossible if no claw exists. So Angler should absolutely be restricted to cards in hand.

While it's nice to say that we should keep the wording we're using simple, it's ambiguous, and it's difficult to playtest a power effectively if it's not quite clear what the power does. Can Angler go after the Miser's hoard? Can Angler go after the Citadel's citadels? Can Angler un-build the Industrialist? Those are important questions when it comes to determining how powerful the Angler is, so they really do need to be answered, and five short extra words - "in his or her hand" - accomplish that perfectly without increasing the conceptual complexity of the power at all.

21 hours ago · Like



Jefferson Krogh Peter is correct -- I apologize if I inadvertently stirred things up. I mainly wanted to signal people that the cross-checker was being used, and used to do useful things! And then the people would think that they should be doing more of that. Yeah.

21 hours ago · Like



Peter Olotka @ Sam Connolly I think that changing the BETA wording while the cross check is in progress, while tempting, could potentially cause more harm than good. If a certain case is cited multiple times by different cross checkers it will be

http://www.ideabout.com/fan_design/completed/cross_check.html

http://www.ideabout.com/fan_design/in_progress/discussions/20111228_fb_talk_menu.html

more valuable in the end. We can pretty much expect multiple cases based on the same language, but keep in mind, a wording solution for ONE case might not work for other similar cases. SO best to wait till all the reviews are in, then rewrite with a better knowledge base.

21 hours ago · Like · 1



Ales Smrdel I would suggest the following process:

1. Complete cross-check cycle for an alien
2. Review cycle including cross check comments which will produce new alien description or updated FAQ - resolving cross check comments
- 3a. If review created new version of alien then repeat step 1 on new version of the alien
- 3b. If review did not create a new version of alien then current goes to ALPHA status (or whatever status is after BETA)

Play-testing process goes on all the time. If would be wise to create a template (form) which would include required metrics for the play-testing game (no of players, final score, duration, general thoughts, ...)

13 hours ago · Like



Bill Martinson Agree that the wording needs to remain constant while the cross-check is in progress. However, certain high-level questions (such as the one Jefferson asked) have the potential to corrupt the cross-check if different checkers make different assumptions about the intent. In cases like this, where the appropriate resolution is clear (it should have said "If that player has the card IN HIS OR HER HAND") then perhaps we should attach a "rider" to the official text so that the cross-check doesn't get corrupted?

4 hours ago · Like