

- (FP11.0) and (FP14.0): Carronade is a normal firing option. If the torpedo is converted into a Sabot shot, then by (FP11.214) it cannot be converted back to a normal torpedo. It can be bolted (FP11.26), but not fired as a carronade shot.
- (FP11.0): The plasma sabot rules mention proximity photons as an upgrade for photon ships. The mention is simply that there was an improvement to the photons, not that it was done as part of the General War.
- (FP11.11) The (FP11.11) BPV cost of the Sabot, can be paid for with commander's options. It says it is a refit, and Annex #6 and Annex #6A both include the purchase of refits "available but not installed".
- (FP11.315): This rule should have read "If a sabot plasma torpedo is launched on Impulse #3, #7, #11, #15, #19, #23, #27, or #31, it moves only one hex, not two".
- (FP14.0): Carronade was originally developed by the Gorn Military, and first used by the police while the Gorns were trying to develop it for larger torpedoes. When that failed (along with the failure to develop stasis boxes for the larger torpedoes), the Gorns eventually simply installed plasma-Fs on their larger ships.
- (FP14.0): The use of Carronade by Gorn X-Ships is still under review, but right now plasma-Ls are sort of plasma-Gs and cannot use it.
- (FP14.15): (FP14.0) says "It is fired in the same manner and under the same restrictions as a plasma bolt . . ." which means that the (K1.543) restriction "PFs cannot bolt more than one plasma torpedo per turn" does apply. Although I agree the "launch" is a little confusing.
- (FP14.21) Note that a plasma-F can be armed at three points as even a plasma-F can be completed with two points of reserve power added during the third turn of arming (FP1.91). And even a plasma-F can use "contingent allocation" with two points of power allocated on the third turn of arming pending the addition of the third point to complete the torpedo for launch (H7.6).
- (FP14.23): The reference to adding reserve power to an armed torpedo is meant as a note that a plasma-F carronade cannot be reinforced past fully armed, i.e., no more than five points can be used for a carronade shot. Rule reference (FP14.33) should also be to (FP14.36).
- (FP14.23): Reference (GP13.36) should be (FP14.36).
- (FP14.37): Second instance of RP should actually be AP (Aft Plasma).
- (R02.106): Missing the "Ident" label on the shuttle track. The shields on this ship are correct, it does not get the stronger shields of the CLC, these additional shield boxes are lost in the conversion in order to keep other CLC systems not found on other NCAs.
- (R02.107): Missing the "Ident" label on the shuttle track. Attack Carrier - "Movement Cost = 1" is not complete, 360° phasers numbered #11 and #12. Should be #9 and #10.
- (R02.108): Missing the "Ident" label on the shuttle track. We did the countersheet before I did the NCF hull outline and nobody thought of it. We did those counters MONTHS ago so we would not have any problems with the Origins deadline. R-section says first example in Y178, MSC says Y175. MSC should probably say Y178 with Y2 note. SVC decided to go with the first year the ships could have been built on the MSC for some reason that he has forgotten.
- (R02.109): - Missing the "Ident" label on the shuttle track. R-section says first example in Y179, MSC says Y175. MSC should probably say Y179 with Y2 note. SVC decided to go with the first year the ships could have been built on the MSC for some reason that he has forgotten.
- (R02.110): - Missing the "Ident" label on the shuttle track. R-section says first example in Y176, MSC says Y175. MSC should probably say Y176 with Y2 note. SVC decided to go with the first year the ships could have been built on the MSC for some reason that he has forgotten.
- (R02.110A): R-section notes that one was never converted. MSC should probably have UNV note. SVC decided to go with the first year the ships could have been built on the MSC for some reason that he has forgotten.
- (R02.111): Missing the "Ident" label on the shuttle track. Mistakenly has 24xF-18Bs and 6xF-111s in the Ship Description. It should carry 12xF-18Bs and 6xF-111s. R-section says first example in Y180, MSC says Y177. MSC should probably say Y180 with Y2 note. SVC decided to go with the first year the ships could have been built on the MSC for some reason that he has forgotten.
- (R02.112): Missing the "Ident" label on the shuttle track.
- (R02.113): Missing the "Ident" label on the shuttle track. We checked the Table of Contents and Ship Description of the NVH, and both said it was the "New Heavy Fighter Transport", meaning the SSD for the NVH is in error and has been, this ship should probably be changed to NVA for New Attack Carrier. R-section says first example in Y179, MSC says Y177. MSC should probably say Y179 with Y2 note. SVC decided to go with the first year the ships could have been built on the MSC for some reason that he has forgotten.
- (R02.114): Missing the "Ident" label on the shuttle track. R-section says first example in Y176, MSC says Y177. MSC should probably say Y176, although the "one or two may have been built earlier" clause for MSC Year-in-Service dates probably covers this one just fine. SVC decided to go with the first year the ships could have been built on the MSC for some reason that he has forgotten.
- (R02.115): Missing the "Ident" label on the shuttle track.
- (R03.??): Some thought it might be a good idea to state that all of the D5W's use a standard D5 boom. While a more or less factual observation, it is a background point and not entirely correct as D5A and D5J booms are not "standard", and the DWE boom has the phaser-1s downgraded, so it is not an exactly correct statement. Obviously a D5J boom could simply be slotted into a DWJ rear hull, and a D5A boom could be added to a ship to make a DWA, but a DWE boom is a modified boom (or a boom built for a D5I? But there was only one of those).
- (R03.119): In the first paragraph, "Andromeans" should be "Andromedans." The ship description says that a third DWD may or may not have been built before the end of the General War, but scenario (SH225.0) (Y180) lists a fourth DWD. At this point we are stuck and will just go with the ship being a conversion of an existing D5D.
- (R03.121): MSC has Y2 note; probably not needed, since ship is introduced the same year as Klingon PFs. SVC decided to go with the first year the ships could have been built on the MSC for some reason that he has forgotten.
- (R03.121): SSD needs "Repair is destroyed on cargo." note.
- (R03.122): SSD needs "Repair is destroyed on cargo. . ." note.
- (R03.123): R-section says first (and only) example in Y183, MSC says Y175. MSC should probably say Y183 with Y2 note. SVC decided to go with the first year the ships could have been built on the MSC for some reason that he has forgotten.
- (R03.125): This ship has security stations because they also help in boarding party combat (G6.13).
- (R03.128): The marine contingent includes two Commando Squads, Four Heavy Weapons Squads, and four GCVs. The DWG cannot carry battle or carrier pods (it can carry a carrier pod if the pod is loaded with GAS and/or HTS shuttles to support a ground attack), and neither can the D5G (except as noted for the DWG). Neither of them ever could. If we need to update the errata we will (next year!) but you wanted to know and now you do.

- (R03.129): MSC has a YIS of Y175. The YIS of the D7D is Y176. So should the DDW's YIS be after the D7D, since from the description, it sounds like the DDW came after the success of the D7D. SVC decided to go with the first year the ships could have been built on the MSC for some reason that he has forgotten.
- (R04.0): INTRODUCTION: from Module R10 indicates that the Romulan Firehawk ". . . could (previous data being incomplete) carry most of the Sparrowhawk's modules. This allowed quick conversion to some of the more useful variants." This did not make Firehawks modular in the same sense as Sparrowhawks. While Firehawks could use the modules, they still had to be "hard welded" to the hull, a process taking a month or more (including breaking the welds on the previous modules).
- (R04.107) SSD: Lists the G-D and G-III-K fighters prior to their Y183 deployment date. The policy is to print the most up-to-date fighter SSD on the Carrier SSD, then the player can cross out anything that does not apply.
- (R04.109): Add: Note after: U-Scout Carrier module: Possible, but never done.
- (R04.110) SSD: Lists the G-D and G-III-K fighters prior to their Y183 deployment date. The policy is to print the most up-to-date fighter SSD on the Carrier SSD, then the player can cross out anything that does not apply.
- (R04.113): The design began with K-Modules, but these were also modified as part of the conversion process and are not a new type of module. The ship cannot use any other type of module.
- (R04.114): Ship description KWR listed as KRW (. . . convert KD5s into KRWs . . .).
- (R04.116) SSD: Lists the G-D and G-III-K fighters prior to their Y183 deployment date. The policy is to print the most up-to-date fighter SSD on the Carrier SSD, then the player can cross out anything that does not apply.
- (R05.75): R-section says first example in Y183, MSC says Y182. MSC should probably say Y183 with Y2 note. SVC decided to go with the first year the ships could have been built on the MSC for some reason that he has forgotten.
- (R05.84): Missing the "IDENT" label on the ADMIN Shuttle damage track.
- (R05.85): Missing the "IDENT" label on the ADMIN Shuttle damage track.
- (R05.86): Missing the "IDENT" label on the ADMIN Shuttle damage track. R-section says first example in Y177, MSC says Y175. MSC should probably say Y177 with Y2 note. SVC decided to go with the first year the ships could have been built on the MSC for some reason that he has forgotten.
- (R05.87): Missing the "IDENT" label on the ADMIN Shuttle damage track. Has FA arcs described, but no weapon uses this arc. R-section says first example in Y176, MSC says Y175. MSC should probably say Y176 with Y2 note. SVC decided to go with the first year the ships could have been built on the MSC for some reason that he has forgotten.
- (R05.89): NPF: Missing the "IDENT" label on the ADMIN Shuttle damage track. SSD needs "Repair is destroyed on cargo." note. MSC says Y179, but Kzinti PFs introduced in Y181. MSC should probably say Y181. SVC decided to go with the first year the ships could have been built on the MSC for some reason that he has forgotten.
- (R05.90) This ship has the correct shields. In the MSC, (R05.90) is listed as NDC, not NDS, the ship description is where the error is. SSD needs "Repair is destroyed on cargo." note. The use of external bays on Kzinti ships has to do with hulls that are so crowded that there is simply no room to install an internal bay. The hangar decks pretty much use all the space. MSC says Y179, but Kzinti PFs introduced in Y181. Escort/fighter chart in R-section also starts at Y181. MSC should probably say Y181. SVC decided to go with the first year the ships could have been built on the MSC for some reason that he has forgotten.
- (R05.91): Missing the "IDENT" label on the ADMIN Shuttle damage track. R-section says first example in Y179, MSC says Y175. MSC should probably say Y179 with Y2 note. SVC decided to go with the first year the ships could have been built on the MSC for some reason that he has forgotten.
- (R05.92): NSC: Missing the "IDENT" label on the ADMIN Shuttle damage track. The "R-Section" lists that the NSC was a conversion of a "CMS". The Kzinti Medium Scout is the "MSC".
- (R05.93): The marine contingent includes two Commando Squads, four Heavy Weapons Squads, and four GCVs. SSD names the ship the "New Heavy Ground Assault Cruiser." It is the New Commando Cruiser.
- (R06.72): SSD Gorn G-12D fighters for the MSR list a dogfight rating (DFR) of three. The G-12D has a DFR of two according to Module J2. The Master Fighter Chart in Module J2 was in error, see the SSDs for the carrier with G-12Ds in Module J2.
- (R06.72A): MSC is missing UNV note.
- (R06.74): Marine forces includes two Commando Squads, three Heavy Weapons Squads, and three GCVs.
- (R06.75): SSD Gorn G-12D fighters for the MSR list a dogfight rating (DFR) of three. The G-12D has a DFR of two according to Module J2. The Master Fighter Chart in Module J2 was in error, see the SSDs for the carrier with G-12Ds in Module J2.
- (R06.76): Note that SSD (and MSC) is labeled as CMV 'Medium Strike Carrier' while rulebook is MDV 'Medium Carrier'. It should be Medium Strike Carrier. R-section says first example in Y176, MSC says Y175. MSC should probably say Y176 with Y2 note. SVC decided to go with the first year the ships could have been built on the MSC for some reason that he has forgotten. SSD Gorn G-12D fighters for the MSR list a dogfight rating (DFR) of three. The G-12D has a DFR of two according to Module J2. The Master Fighter Chart in Module J2 was in error, see the SSDs for the carrier with G-12Ds in Module J2.
- (R07.50): Ship is not subject to shock. The Tholians cannot weld these packs on any other war cruiser variant due to Mission requirements. These ships are meant to be defensive, so the slow speed was acceptable. The CWH was a "product improvement" (says so in its description), the CAN says that it was not possible to make a HEAVY CRUISER out of a CW, not that it was not possible to improve it.
- (R07.51): The APRs on the actual ship were not converted to AWRs to save money. The APRs can power the disruptors while the ship will still have to divert warp engine power to either fire the photons, or fire the disruptors. So there was no reason to change the APRs. The ship is not subject to shock.
- (R08.45): This SSD has LS and RS arcs described for use by plasma cartel ships that have plasma-D racks instead of drone racks.
- (R08.46): SSD needs "Repair is destroyed on cargo." note. This SSD has LS and RS arcs described for use by plasma cartel ships that have plasma-D racks instead of drone racks.
- (R09.095): Should have N1 note in MSC (true carriers).
- (R09.097A): While obvious, a note mentioning that the Survey fighters replace Admins on the MSR would be consistent with other Survey Carriers.
- (R09.097A): Should have N1 note in MSC (true carriers).
- (R09.098): Hydran MKP: SSD needs "Repair is destroyed on cargo." note.
- (R09.099): DCS: Should have N1 note in MSC (true carriers). SSD needs "Repair is destroyed on cargo." note.

- (R09.100): This ship is qualified to use the FSP.
- (R09.102): Should have N1 note in MSC (true carriers).
- (R11.75): The R-Section for the Lyran NSR has 'Note that this ship could carry stand tug pallets or two (or one) K-type tug pods.' seems to be very clear that the ship is a tug.
- (R11.76): SSD needs "Repair is destroyed on cargo." note.
- (R11.77): SSD needs "Repair is destroyed on cargo." note.
- (R13.67): SSDs of the CL with the plasma-S and CS with PPD pack might be published in the future. In any case, the hull does not suffer shock. Ship is named "New System Cruiser" on the SSD because we were thinking about doing the other variant as well, but wound up with only two ISC pages.
- (R13.68): Ship is named "Strike System Cruiser" on the SSD because we were thinking about doing the other variant as well, but wound up with only two ISC pages. This ship does not suffer from shock.
- (R14.40): The ship description says that the lone NCA was upgraded to an NCC in Y175, but (R14.27) says the lone NCA *Spokesman* was built Y177. The conversion date should have been Y185.
- (R15.30): Was the big "MODULE R10 - SSD BOOK" on the Seltorian NVS. We put that "SSD book" title on the back page so that the warehouse crew could identify the book when it is upside down. We will do that in future to all books.
- (SG75.0): Scenario number was repeated. (SG75.0) was used in the 2000 Edition of Module T.
- (SG77.46): Example Federation Forces have an NSA, which is the NHS..
- (SH222.0): Historical outcome: "Should have read "left AFTER loading."
- (SH222.451): The reference to (SH222.4521) [which does not exist] should be to (SH222.61).
- (SH223.45): lists a Pegasus carrier as a "Hydran scout." The Pegasus CV does not have scout sensors. Use a PFT with Harrier PFs and one Stinger-FM in its place.
- COVER: On the cover, the NCC numbers on the engines of the NCA do not match the NCC number of the saucer. The engines still have the number of the original NCL model Ted must have used as the base of the NCA model. Ted missed it.