



WORLD RANKING

PROPOSAL

Presented by

Richard Meredith-Hardy



Why do we need a ranking system?

- ◆ It encourages pilots to travel to championships they may not otherwise have gone to.
- ◆ It could provide some extra income to CIMA (The CIVL one has).
- ◆ It helps to promote our sport.
- ◆ It is useful to pilots in getting and maintaining sponsorship deals.
- ◆ Some sort of selection may well be necessary for future WAG's. A ranking system is the obvious solution.



Current status

- ◆ Sub committee formed at 2003 meeting
 - ◆ Tom Gunnarson [USA Chairman]
 - ◆ Jose Luis Esteban [ESP]
 - ◆ Richard Meredith-Hardy [GBR]
 - ◆ Thierry Monteigneaux [FAI]
- ◆ Prototype ranking system established on the COMPS website.

COMPS

www.flymicro.com/COMPS

- ◆ The sub committee has agreed the COMPS system should be presented to CIMA



What makes a good Ranking system?

Fundamental to the creation of a ranking system are the questions:

1. **What makes a championship good?**

- ◆ A high quality (ranked) group of competitors.
- ◆ A lot of aircraft in class.
- ◆ A lot of tasks.
- ◆ A high international status.

2. **What makes your result in a championship good?**

- ◆ You came high in the positions in a good championship.

3. **What makes a ranking system good?**

- ◆ Is reasonably simple to calculate and understand.
- ◆ Is not impossibly turgid, ie a newcomer can get into the rankings in a reasonable time.
- ◆ It encourages the things which should be encouraged in Microlight Championships.
- ◆ It doesn't introduce undesirable behaviour.

The **COMPS** system attempts to address all these issues



The COMPS System - 1

Establishes a 'Championship value' based on:

- ◆ Quality of competitors
- ◆ Number of aircraft in class
- ◆ Number of tasks in class
- ◆ International status

2003 World Championships						
	Opposition quality value	No. Aircraft value	No tasks value	Total	Status value	Competition value
WL1	126	51	150	300	700	1000
WL2	141	69	150	300	700	1000
AL1	100	30	150	280	700	980
AL2	134	54	150	300	700	1000
PF1	128	150	102	300	700	1000
PL1	130	51	102	283	700	983
PL2	0	21	102	123	700	823



The COMPS System - 2

Assigns each competitor 'Ranking points' according to:

- ◆ Competition value
- ◆ Position in class

The Winner gets the full CV, every other competitor gets RP's equal to 5% less than the position above

For a championship which qualifies for a maximum CV.

Place	Cat 1	Cat 2	Cat 3
1st	1000	800	600
2nd	950	760	570
3rd	903	722	542
4th	858	686	515
5th	815	652	489
6th	774	620	465
7th	736	589	442
Etc...	Etc...	Etc...	Etc...



The COMPS System - 3

A person's rank is determined from an ordered list comprising:

- ◆ The sum of the pilot's four best RP's
- ◆ In the last 2 years and three months.

Issue 8, from 31 Aug 2003

Rank	Name [Nation]	Best 4 RP's				Total
1	Samir ELARI [FRA]	989	903	864	0	2756
2	Cathy AMALRIC [FRA]	989	903	864	0	2756
3	Igor POTAPKIN [RUS]	983	635	479	478	2575
4	Richard RAWES [GBR]	1000	882	669	0	2551
5	Simon BAKER [GBR]	1000	821	729	0	2550
6	Anita HOLMES [GBR]	1000	821	729	0	2550
7	Vadim BUKHTIYAROV [RUS]	888	696	503	456	2543
8	Dani MARTINEZ [ESP]	950	569	519	504	2542
9	Paul DEWHURST [GBR]	1000	871	670	0	2541
10	Endre THUROCZY [HUN]	928	864	702	0	2494

...Etc. There are currently 356 ranked pilots in the COMPS system.



The **COMPS** System

- ◆ All classes are grouped into one complete ranking. This positively encourages people to fly in different classes. Any purely class based system would positively discourage people from moving class.
- ◆ The method in which a competitor's RP's are calculated positively encourages people to enter classes with small numbers of competitors.
- ◆ The 27 month cut-off prevents too much 'turgidity' in the rankings, encourages people to compete more, and in an extreme case could allow a brilliant total newcomer to get from nothing to the top of the ranking in as little as two years.
- ◆ This scheme encourages people to participate in more regional & open National championships.
- ◆ The way the CV is calculated encourages competitors to ensure organizers get lots of entries and have lots of tasks.



PROPOSAL 1

- ◆ CIMA uses the COMPS method of calculation for a CIMA ranking system.

Next question: *Where should it be published?*



PROPOSAL 2

- ◆ The current CIMA ranking is published on the CIMA part of the FAI website

Next question: *How should it work in practice?*



How it could work in practice

- ◆ It would be possible to have a stand-alone ranking system so long as there is an established method of inputting the key data. Essentially there must be a way of reliably identifying individual competitors.

Next question:

- ◆ *How to identify each individual?*



PROPOSAL 3

- ◆ A system of centralized “CIMA Ranking ID's” is established.
 - ◆ This is different to a FAI licence which are issued by NAC's.
 - ◆ It makes membership of the scheme entirely voluntary.
 - ◆ There would be a small fee (€ 25)
 - ◆ Valid for as long as a competitor is still ranked and their nation is still a FAI member.

Next question:

- ◆ *How do championships get into the ranking?*



PROPOSAL 4

- ◆ There be a 'ranking championship sanction fee'
 - ◆ FAI category 1 & 2 championships are automatically included as part of the normal fee.
 - ◆ To be included in the ranking, “Category 3” championships (open National Championships Etc) must pay the equivalent of of “One pilot’s entry fee”.
 - ◆ The ranking can include only one Category 3 championship in any one nation in any one class in any one calendar year and at least 1/3 of the max possible score must be derived from tasks compatible with the task catalogue in S10.

Next question:

- ◆ *How do people know about these championships?*



PROPOSAL 5

- ◆ A calendar of forthcoming ranking events is put on the CIMA FAI website.
 - ◆ Category 1 & 2 events are put on when FAI receives the organizer agreement.
 - ◆ “Category 3” events are put on once the fee is paid.
 - ◆ Deadline of 6 weeks before the event.
- ◆ Next question: *Who is going to maintain it?*



PROPOSAL 6

- ◆ A 'contractor' is hired by FAI / CIMA to provide current CIMA ranking.
 - ◆ It is unlikely FAI has the resources to operate such a system
 - ◆ Contractor builds and maintains a system which can automatically provide all the information to the FAI / CIMA website in a timely manner.
 - ◆ Contractor operates an “e-commerce” site to collect fees.
 - ◆ No cost or risk to FAI /CIMA, instead contractor retains a percentage of the revenue.



PROPOSAL 7

- ◆ A standing sub-committee is established to oversee the implementation and operation of the ranking system.
 - ◆ Establish the exact specification and rules of the scheme.
 - ◆ Establish and oversee implementation timetable.
 - ◆ Makes sure the contractor continues to deliver the goods.



IMPLEMENTATION

- ◆ If CIMA agrees to all 7 proposals then the sub-committee can get on with the work of writing the exact rules and appointing a contractor.
- ◆ CIMA ranking could be established from 1st January 2004.
- ◆ 'Transitional period' between then and the end of EMC 2004 (Aug 2004). In this time nobody should be removed from the published ranking because they don't have a "CIMA Ranking ID", but no new score additions may be made to the ranking without one.
- ◆ At the moment the scores from this 'next' category 1 championship are added to the ranking, all people who do not have a "CIMA Ranking ID" to be completely removed from the ranking.



SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

1. CIMA uses the COMPS method of calculation for a CIMA ranking system.
2. The current CIMA ranking is published on the CIMA part of the FAI website.
3. A system of centralized “CIMA Ranking ID's” is established.
4. There be a 'ranking championship sanction fee'.
5. A calendar of forthcoming ranking events is put on the CIMA FAI website.
6. A 'contractor' is hired by FAI / CIMA to provide current CIMA ranking.
7. A standing sub-committee is established to oversee the operation and implementation of the ranking system.



WORLD RANKING

END