



23 Dec 74

"May I have the envelope, please? ... Ladies and gentlemen, the Sack Award for the worst rating system is

LAPUTA is an occasional publication by and for the postal Diplomacy Rating Commission, a voluntary association of curators of postal Diplomacy rating systems. It is automatically sent to members of the Commission. Interested parties may subscribe (on a delayed basis) @15¢ an issue. A copy will also be deposited with the Postal Diplomacy Archives in Lebanon NH. This issue is Pandemonium Publication #578, edited and published by Rod Walker, 4069 Jackdaw St., San Diego CA 92103.

THIS ISSUE is Constitution Issue #2 (LAPUTA 7 was #1). It contains the initial reactions to Lon's proposals (other than the odd membership proposal, on which see LAPUTA #9, item III). I have my own reactions, those of Jeff Fover, and some comments from Walt Buchanan based on Lon's carbon-copy original.

If you will pull out your copy of LAPUTA 7, we will take comments by the numbers.

I. Membership

A. Power: I am in favor of waiting until a list has been published 2 or 3 times before asking its curator to participate in the PDRC. I am also in favor of requiring a certain amount of updating of each list; 6 months is fine so long as there is new data with which to update.

Buchanan: I don't believe a member should have to maintain a rating system 6 months before being allowed to join... (and)... once a year should be often enough to update a rating system.

Walker: If somebody goes to the work of compiling a system, which is more work than updating it, he should immediately be a member. If he doesn't continue to update it, then he'll cease to be a member. There's such a thing as being too exclusive. Updating twice a year is a good requirement--assuming, as Jeff says, that EVERYTHING comes out in the interim.

B. Power: I don't see what purpose it serves to have the EHC participate. He has nothing to recommend himself over scores of other players who similarly do not publish or edit rating systems. The EHC should be kept current on our activities, of course, since he may want to reflect a judgement as to a game's regularity in assigning numbers and would presumably be interested in the criteria we decide upon. With that exception the EHC has nothing more to do with ratings systems than scores of other people. This is likely to be a moot point, however, since the EHC will probably be a ratingsmaster in any case.

Walker: This is actually a reply to Jeff. The EHC presumably scans the original publications more than any of us, so he can provide valuable expertise on a given game. Having a few knowledgeable outsiders might be good for our group, since they could provide detached judgement. Certainly the EHC is a logical choice there, and the most obvious. The current EHC is a ratingsmaster, and I was, but von Notake, Koning, Wells, and Boardman weren't.

C. Power: Any prior member who no longer qualifies should not be a member. The plea that someone has invaluable knowledge of the game and so should be included even though not an active ratingsmaster is hogwash. We have ample knowledge of the game and hobby available with those qualifying under (A). The work we have to do is in large part merely a matter of forming opinions. Since ratingsmasters are the people most concerned by far with the results of our deliberations, it does not seem reasonable to include others. We have a wide enough spectrum of opinion as is without also consulting interested bystanders. I suspect the accomplishment of the PDRC will, like that of most committees, be inversely proportional to the size of its membership.

D. Power: My feeling on the Chairmanship is that anyone who wants it can have it. Like most of the important positions in the hobby it is largely thankless and one hell of a lot of work. My only opinion here is that unless the Chairman is also

a ratingsmaster he should not vote. Otherwise we should just try to get the best man willing to assume the responsibility. I do not feel it would be right or fair to reward his sacrifice of time and resources with a vote, unless he is a ratingsmaster.

Walker: It seems to me that the Chairman should be any voting member of the Commission, not excluding the IBC. I suppose the Chairman could be a non-voting member--i.e., an outsider volunteering to do the work--but I would prefer that we be forced to depend on our own resources.

C. Power: No. If anyone wants to subscribe to our "journal" that should be possible, e.g. the IDA rep. There is no place on the PDRC for them though.

Walker: We have to be careful that in bringing in more members, we don't make the group too large to be workable. If there is someone who is so interested in ratings, with such invaluable advice, that 2/3 of us would want him as a member, let him put together a rating system; he probably will, anyway. Besides, if we need advice, I'm sure we'll accept reputable expertise without increasing the membership.

II. Expulsion

Power: It is not a question of expelling someone. Once it is determined that he ceases to qualify, his membership should automatically lapse without any sort of vote necessary.

III. Votes

Power: Just ratingsmasters. IBC, Advisors, or Chairman, even if they become members in some other capacity than being a ratingsmaster, should not vote.

Walker: Jeff, I assume, however, you agree that if ultimately the IBC (e.g.) is a voting member, and he is also a ratingsmaster, that he does not cast one vote in each capacity, but one vote altogether.

IV. Duties

A. & B. Power: Fine.

C. Power: If these people don't do anything, what would their purpose be in sitting on the commission anyway? I don't want to waste my time on some spectator's ego trip. Do we intend to let the membership of people who do nothing lapse merely because they do nothing? How unfair.

Walker: Jeff, if there were some such category of membership, then we would need some standard of performance to maintain an "active" status.

V. Business / Functions

A. & B. Power: I believe the SRB is the main function of the PDRC. Games should be added and subtracted from the SRB by a vote of one less than there are voting members at any time on the PDRC, e.g., 4 out of 5 as I believe the commission should be presently constituted. This allows for one person's idiosyncrasy or personal vendetta but not for any more widespread disagreement.

Walker: I like Jeff's proposal. He notes 5 members, since (I hazard a guess) Jeff Key is not a ratingsmaster. My counter-proposal would be this: a vote of all-but-1 would apply until the Commission reaches 8 members, and then would become an all-but-2 vote.

C. Power: This sort of abbreviated notation will be much easier to understand when comparing lists. I believe it is a great idea.

D. Power: He will not achieve this goal as long as there are more than two ratingsmasters.

VI. Business

A. Power: Fine (but, under A.3: Any zero base ratings system, such as BROB at

least, cannot partially exclude games. As such I will have no opinion nor will I vote one way or another on this matter.)

Walker: As I understand BROB, Jeff, the countries are rank-ordered in order of finish and each receives points (positive or negative). Then the player collects (or loses) the points involved. But isn't it possible simply not to assign the points in question to a player? For example, if a game winner played less than 3 game-years, and it is agreed such wins don't count, say, then isn't it possible that no actual person collects the +6 normally assigned for the win? Or under BROB does some actual person always have to be assigned the points?

B. Power: Fine.

C. Power: What??

Walker: I wrote Jeff separately. I'm talking about a situation in which different questions are settled by different majorities. If we use a standard all-but-one vote, this isn't necessary. -- But what I meant was that deciding that such-and-such a type of game isn't rateable requires a given majority (2/3, for example); then deciding that game 1973XX fits in that type, and therefore can't be rated, would perhaps require a lesser majority (51%, for example). Jeff is proposing, however, and as I said it looks good, that we use a standard majority for all such determinations.

VI. OOOOOOPS

I forgot something last time. Majorities needed for adopting a Constitution and for amending it. We have a lot of choices, as you will see.

ABOUT THE ENCLOSED BALLOT

It seems to me that I need some concrete figures to work with. I have therefore concocted a sort of ballot. The various choices indicated on it are taken from the discussion thus far.

Each choice on the ballot has a line by it. If you agree with the choice, put an X on the line. If you disagree with the choice, leave it blank. If you agree with more than one choice, number them (1-2-3-...) in the order of your preference.

Some choices are connected. For instance, the vote required for new members who are not ratingsmasters (advisors, for instance) would be used only if we actually allowed such types of members.

I have provided blank spaces for other choices, of course.

When I get the ballot back, I will try to construct from it some sense of the majority and write up a constitution, or a partial constitution, on that basis. It might not work this time, but let's see what happens.

PDRG Ballot #1 -- 23 December 1974
Please return to Rod Walker, 4069 Jackdaw St., San Diego CA 92103,
NOT LATER THAN 31 January 1974.

The PDRG Constitution

I. Membership. Membership in PDRG should include:

- _____ Ratingsmasters:
 - _____ After publishing a rating list once
 - _____ After publishing a rating list twice
 - _____ After publishing a rating list _____ times (insert number).
 - _____ Who update at least twice a year
 - _____ Who update at least once a year
 - _____ Who update at least _____ times a year (insert number).
- _____ The current NHC
- _____ Former members continued in membership
 - _____ majority vote _____ 2/3 majority _____ unanimous vote
- _____ The Chairman, who
 - _____ Must be an active member
 - _____ May be any person elected for the job
 - _____ Must be elected and be an active, regular publisher
 - _____ Serves for 1 year
 - _____ Serves for _____ years (insert number)
 - _____ Serves until resignation or removal
- _____ Advisors
 - _____ Representatives of recognized Diplomacy groups (e.g., IDA, TDA).

II. Loss of Membership should be accomplished by

- _____ Vote of the members to expel
 - _____ unanimous _____ all-but-one _____ majority _____ ()
- _____ By declaration of the Chairman after failure to continue meeting the qualifications of membership or duties of members

III. Each individual person who is a member has one vote and one vote only. _____

IV. Duties

- _____ Chairman must publish Commission journal, at least every _____ month _____ 8 weeks _____ ()--insert period
- _____ Continued members, advisors, group reps must participate
 - _____ On every vote
 - _____ In every discussion
 - _____ On every other vote
 - _____ Every other issue
 - _____ (insert:)

V. Business / Functions. Vote on categories and games excluded from SRB:

<u>Categories</u>	<u>Games</u>
_____ Unanimous	_____ Unanimous
_____ all-but-one	_____ all-but-one
_____ all-but-one to 8 members, then	_____ all-but-one to 8 members,
_____ all-but-two	_____ then all-but-two
_____ 2/3	_____ 2/3
_____ 51%	_____ 51%
_____ (insert:)	_____ (insert:)

VI. Partial Exclusion

Determining cases where an individual player's performance is not rateable

(e.g., played less than X years, player was III, etc., etc.) should be done by a vote of:

- all
- all-but-one
- all-but-one until 8 members, then all-but-two
- 2/3
- 51%
- (insert:)

VII. The Odd Membership Rule

- Membership should be restricted to an odd number of members
- Members should always be admitted where eligible, without regard to the total number
- Membership should be restricted to an even number of members
- (insert:)

VIII. Adoption. The Constitution, or constitutional provisions, are adopted by:

- unanimous vote
- all-but-one
- simple majority
- 2/3
- (insert:)

IX. Amendment. The Constitution should be amended by a vote of:

- all members
- same majority required to exclude a category of games
- all-but-one
- all-but-one until 8 members, then all-but-two
- 2/3
- (insert:)

X. Votes. Required majority of votes includes:

- All members eligible to vote
- All members voting at the time
- (insert:)

XI. Standard Rating Base Concept

- Approve
- Disapprove
- (other:)

XII. Other items Constitution should include:

(Signature)

(Date)