

Personally, I'd like to see a game closer to the closed/early open beta version. This leads to the following basic rules:

- minimum 25 cards per deck
- minimum 15 bronze cards (As I've loved the archetype focused and strongly synergistic gameplay the game had earlier, decks should be built around a bronze core, where every card has its purpose and which defines the archetype. Therefore NO provisions for bronze cards)
- 3 bronze copies allowed
- naturally best of three rounds
- three rows (I don't care for card size or mobile portability and think three rows offer more possibilities than two rows)

Now about other more important aspects of my vision:

Gold immunity:

I've liked gold immunity, because I enjoyed the idea of having to play around a card's effects instead of just zapping it, but I can also understand the reasons why it was removed. I've thought about a lot of ways how to tweak it and the idea I like best so far is the following:

- The principle idea: Only the last gold card played has immunity, if you're playing another one, the gold card played before loses its immunity. This prevents the old 'play all your gold cards in the last round and your opponent can't interact with you'-problem and there are more things to consider now in terms of 'when do I want to play my gold cards'.
- No binary removal options like for artifacts now, immune really means immune
- Obviously, you have to be careful in the design process when deciding, which cards can have gold immunity, and which would be too strong
- Gold cards can't be resurrected under any circumstances
- Instead of the old 6 silvers and 4 golds rule there are provision costs for all silver/golds. For some cards there could even be the option if you want to play it as gold card or silver card (note: only immunity is the difference) and therefore two different provision costs. The difference between the higher provision cost cards and the lower ones shouldn't be too big though to limit the variance.

About coinflip and hand size:

- No hand size limit. The current coinflip fix should be good enough to decrease the number of drypasses to a reasonable number. If the first player drypasses, the 2nd player gets the tactical advantage for the 2nd round. If they then drypass as well, no one would get it in round 3.

Carryover:

- One of the most problematic mechanics in old Gwent. Naturally, I'd like to see more of it again 😊, but it needs some tweaks. First of all, carryover should be distributed more or less equally between different factions. No more 60 points carryover dwarves, please. And even more important: carryover only actually carries over when you play at least one card the next round (or alternatively all carryover appears at turn end. Same thing they made with Ronvid during open beta. Naturally there has to be some visual indication how many points carryover). Everyone, who remembers post midwinter wardancer, should know why.

Order/ Timer :

- Order based effects are replaced by timer based effects. This speeds up the gameplay, which is necessary as orders slow down the game too much and offer very little upside compared to timer or event based engine cards (all kind of charges, which have to be triggered manually are replaced by automatic mechanics). Timer based effects can trigger at turn end and turn start and use the priority system introduced in the midwinter update (starting at melee left, ends at siege right), giving unit placement a little bit more importance.

Weather:

The current weather is extremely boring and not very useful. So, I thought about two alternatives:

Option 1:

- it works like the weather system in HC, but all weather types have an additional effect. For example fog could decrease the range of units by one, frost could slow down timers by one and rain decrease the damage units, who are played on a row with rain effect, deal by 1.

Option 2:

- All weather types have the above mentioned effects, but instead of dealing damage over time they spawn a unit token once. Furthermore weather effects are symmetrical again and weather immunity can come back to add a little bit more depth to the game. Problem: The additional effects are probably too weak to convince you to put clear skies (also spawns a token) in your deck.

I'm still not completely satisfied with any of my ideas. I'm searching for a weather concepts, which includes symmetrical weather and weather immunity like during CB, but it shouldn't be as swingy and unbalanced as it used to be.

Meaning of rows and positioning:

One of most interesting aspects of Gwent and one of the hardest ones to find a suitable design for.

Some core points of what I'd probably like to see:

- three rows as said before
- Soft row lock to give the game some structure and add some flavor (trebuchets in the siege row etc). This means cards can be played on any row, but some of them do only stuff on specific rows. Additionally, some cards could do different things on different rows. So basically, this point is already implemented, but the number of cards, which are designed this way, is too low in my opinion.
- ranged based system as there is now, but more cards, which can manipulate range. I also think some additional feature to make range even more intriguing is missing, but I don't really know what it could be.
- more positioning (where on a row do I put my units) related effects + 'extended' positioning

(Updated 8/19):

The concept of extended positioning:

Additionally to the three rows columns are added. Different rules how filling a row works could be considered. It shouldn't be too complicated, but still add more complexity and higher emphasis on positioning to the game. To fulfill the first criterion it should work quite similarly to how it is now.

I'll use this ugly sketch to show my concept:

M	-5	-4	-3	-2	1	2	3	4	5
R	-5	-4	-3	-2	1	2	3	4	5
S	-5	-4	-3	-2	1	2	3	4	5

The first card played obviously appears at the '1' position. Then you have the option to play at the '-2' or '2' position. Let's say you play a card at '-2'. Now you have the option to play a card at '-3' or '2'. So that's quite simple, but it doesn't consider that you may want to play a card between two other cards. So let's say there are cards at '-3' to '3'. Now you want to play another card at '2'. The most intuitive solution is that the card, which was previously at '2' is moved to '3' and the one at '3' moves to '4'. Same thing on the other half of the board. If you want to play a card at '-2', the card previously placed on '-2' moves to '-3', the one on '-3' moves to '-4'. If one half is full you must play your card on the other side.

Another aspect you have to consider is what happens when your opponent destroys a card (or you do it yourself). As said before it should be similar as how it is now. So, let's look again at the previous scenario and assume the unit at '2' is destroyed. Now the card at '3' just moves to the '2' spot. Naturally, the same applies to the other side of the board. Only problem left is what happens if the unit at 1 is destroyed? Well, either we expand the rows by a 10th slot and have '-1' and '1' or the player, who destroys the card, chooses if the left or right side 'collapses' (if there are only cards on one side anyway this problem solves itself). While it may look complicated on paper, it should feel quite intuitively in practice.

This concept allows to expand the current positioning system (basically just adjacent/left/right); introducing new positioning related key words behind/before/surrounding and therefore should open more design space for cards utilizing positioning related effects. This also directly leads to my rework of artifacts (or items how they used to be called, which I think is a more appropriate word for them).

Artifacts/Items:

The current system is very binary as having artifact removal can be extremely powerful or pretty useless depending on whether your opponent plays artifacts or not. Additionally, they are not lorefriendly at all. I mean they can deal damage without any unit on your side of the board. Do they live?

I want to demonstrate my idea how they could be reworked by giving two examples:

[placeholder for card name] : Choose ally: It damages an enemy on the opposite column by its basepower.

[placeholder] : Choose ally: It adds its status effects to two surrounding units.

This solution removes the binary nature of artifacts, is lorefriendly and makes positioning more meaningful! Sure, it would be even more lorefriendly if it would give the unit some sort of permanent modification, but that would lead to all kinds of trouble in terms of balance.