Reply from the Ranking List Manager to Ranking list proposals for IGC 2006 Plenum.

Proposal 1.
Handle the IGC RL rules like SC docs.
Good idea we agree, but the best place to display the rules is on the Ranking List (RL) web pages with the rules also accessible from the IGC documents page.

Proposal. 2.
We agree that the information relating to the calculation of country scores etc should be amended to the rules, see Ranking list report.
There are no different classes within a competition. Either it is a one class competition or each class is displayed as a different contest. The class is clearly displayed on the comps list page.
The GP calculation for the first WGP was an experiment and it has not yet been decided how we handle future GPs if they wish to be included in the Ranking system.

Proposal 3
The RL was started using the excellent database provided by World Pilot Ranking system run by Denis Flament. It was considered the best way to start the system and has proved to have been very successful. There has not been a single complaint from any pilot regarding his Ranking position. The system is now maturing and all pilots results pre 2002 will be disregarded. There is no necessity to rescore the RL from 1999.

Proposal 4
Keith and Theirry have been working for some time on a parallel system which would allow us to run the system under different rules. This is now functioning.
Whilst we have had no complaints form pilots we are aware that some people consider the system biased toward contests entered in the early years. We have now run several tests to check the effect of any changes. Our preferred solution to the apparent benefit gained by these pre 2003 contests is to zero the results of all pre 2003 Cat 2 and 2+ sanctioned contests.
This results in changes to pilots positions but has very little effect on the position of the top pilots whose results are mainly from Cat 1 contests.

The RL was only experimental until 2003 when we considered enough competitions had been entered to produce a relevant list. A competition is only relevant for 4 years therefore all results prior to 2001 are now out of the system. All NAC's were invited to send in their results for inclusion but very few even responded. The system was built on whatever results we could obtain from available results on the Internet.
The proposer underestimates the difficulty in getting replies from NAC's even when they have paid to be in the RL.

Proposal 5
One of the most important aspects of the RL is that it is dynamic and live. To publish pilots rankings on a once a year basis would seriously reduce the interest in the system and inhibit the possibilities for future development.
We are very strongly against this proposal.

Proposal 6
This was carefully considered prior to the initial approval of the rules. The need to have the five ranked pilots in the top 15 prevents having guest appearances when a pilot participates for just one day which would enhance the competitions quality factor and subsequent rating. If they compete seriously and do well they will improve the quality of the contest and it's rating.

Sanction fee proposals.
1, Sanction fee be based on number of pilots.
We also considered this at the outset but decided against it because of admin difficulties.
We would support this when the IGC appoints a professional administrator.

Proposal 2
See reply to proposal 1. It would also cost most countries NAC's more for their Nationals to be included in the system. We would propose an alternative to help out the organizers of multi class contests.
A single sanction fee of 250euro for a multi class contest when all the classes compete at the same venue at the during the same period.
Proposal. 3 IGC Logo
We already encourage this and ask Organisers to display the FAI logo. We thought of having a unique form of the FAI logo for the RL but this was decided against.
Maybe we should ask the organisers to display "IGC Ranking List" text in a certain colour and font. Displayed on competition results/home pages this would increase the IGC Ranking List's visibility and "brand".

Brian Spreckley
10.02. 2006