

# Ranking Determination Rules

『The Complete Method©』

SGR LLC  
CopyRights Administrator  
IP Manager

# About Rules of Golf

The official Rules of Golf are jointly established and interpreted worldwide by The R&A (St Andrews, Scotland) and the USGA (Liberty Corner, New Jersey).

# Current Ranking Determination Rules

- Ranking based on the total number of strokes over 18 holes.
- Provisions regarding tie-breaking procedures for tied ranks are not defined.
- For determining winners in domestic and international tour tournaments, conducting a playoff is the standard practice.

# Our Suggestion of Ranking Determination Rules

In the event of a tie in the total number of strokes over 18 holes, rankings will be determined by comparing the following 15 factors

## [The "Complete Method©" Ranking Determination Rules]

Comparison of **18-hole total strokes (Gross score)**

1. Number of **putts on the green**
2. Number of **OB (Out of Bounds)**
3. Number of **RPA (Red Penalty Area)**
4. Number of **Holes-in-One**
5. Number of **Albatrosses**
6. Number of **Eagles**
7. Number of **Birdies**
8. Number of **Pars**
9. Number of **Bogeys**
10. Number of **Double Bogeys**
11. Number of **Triple Bogeys**
12. Number of **hole-outs with a score of +4 or worse** (Compared in ascending order)
13. Number of **bunker shots**
14. **Countback** (Comparing scores hole-by-hole from the final hole back to the starting hole)
15. **[Additional Provisions]**

✂Rankings are determined based on the performance-based order listed above. If a winner cannot be decided under these rules, a **playoff** will be conducted.

✂The above rules will also apply to determine the winner within the **playoff**.

✂From the playoff onwards, the process will be repeated until a final ranking is determined.

✂By adopting this method, ties are effectively eliminated, making it possible to determine the ranking of **all players**.

✂**(Created: Feb 12, 2026 / Revised: Feb 19–25, 2026)** *All intellectual property rights for the above rules, including copyrights, belong to our company. Legal action may be taken if any infringement of copyrights or moral rights is identified, including partial modification of the rules.*

# Implementation in tours

## [1-Day Tournament]

Rankings are determined by The Complete Method©.

## [2-Day Tournament]

### Qualifying Round (Day1)

Rankings will be determined by The Complete Method©, and qualifying players will be decided based on the cut line.

### Final Round (Day2)

The Complete Method© will also be used to determine the rankings in the Final Round.

## [3-Day Tournament]

Rankings for the two-day Qualifying Rounds will be determined by the total score using The Complete Method©. Qualifying players will be decided based on the cut line. The Complete Method© will be used to determine the rankings in the Final Round.

## [4-Day Tournament]

Rankings for the two-day Qualifying Rounds will be determined by the total score using The Complete Method©. Qualifying players will be decided based on the cut line. For the Final Rounds (2 days), the rankings will be determined by the total score using The Complete Method©. When a count-back is required, scores will be compared starting from the 18th hole of the final round, moving backward through all 72 holes to the 1st hole of the first round, until the tie is broken. If a tie still remains after the above process, a playoff will be held. Rankings in the playoff will also be determined by The Complete Method©.

# Assumption Q&A

**Q: Why do you compare the "number of bunker shots" rather than the "number of times a ball enters a bunker"?**

**A:** This is to accurately reflect the effect of relief procedures. For instance, if a water hazard forms within a bunker, a player may take relief outside the bunker by incurring a two-stroke penalty. Simply counting "entries" into a bunker fails to account for this select. A player who takes such relief and plays from outside the bunker is compared against those who actually played from the sand. Without this distinction, the player taking relief would effectively gain an advantage in the stroke count equivalent to those penalty strokes compared to if the hazard had not existed. To neutralize this discrepancy and ensure fairness, we use the actual "number of bunker shots" as a comparative factor. Note that if a player takes a one-stroke penalty to play from a different spot within the same bunker, that shot is included in the count.

**Q: Why are bunker shots ranked after the score comparisons (such as birdies/bogeys) rather than immediately after penalties?**

**A:** This is because a bunker shot itself is not a penalty. Our logic prioritizes performance-based metrics—such as the number of under-par holes or holes with scores of bogey or worse—before evaluating specific situational statistics like bunker usage.

**Q: Why isn't the "Countback" method applied immediately after the total stroke count?**

**A:** While applying a countback significantly increases the possibility of reaching an immediate decision, our method is designed to allow a broader range of performance factors—including the number of penalties, birdies, and eagles—to influence the final ranking first. The countback comparison and sudden-death playoffs remain the final definitive steps in the determination process.

**Q: Why aren't penalties for playing a "Wrong Ball" included in the comparison?**

**A:** The penalties currently adopted as comparative elements are limited to **OB (Out of Bounds)** and **RPA (Red Penalty Areas)**. The list of other possible penalties is too numerous to list. Furthermore, even if every conceivable penalty were compared, the possibility of proceeding to a playoff can never be entirely eliminated. If two player shots ball to every same place constantly, entirely play off in this instance. As a result, the possibility of proceeding to a playoff can never be entirely eliminated in spite of additional all penalties.

# Instance-1

Application of “The Complete Method©”

Scenario: Total Strokes: 74 (Both players)

Number of times the ball entered a bunker: 1 (Both players)

Bunker Relief/Procedures:

Player A: Used a relief procedure due to a water hazard within the bunker. Took a 2-stroke penalty and played a shot from a relief area outside the bunker.

Player B: Played a standard bunker shot with no penalty. Result under the "Complete Method©": Player A is ranked higher than Player B.

Comparative Analysis: Player A vs. Player B

Note on Comparison Factors:

If the "Number of times the ball entered a bunker" were used as the comparative factor, both players would remain tied. However, by using the "Number of Bunker Shots" as the factor, Player A wins the tie-break. Evaluation of Performance:

There is a high probability that Player A would have finished at Even Par (72) if the water hazard had not existed within the bunker (accounting for the 2-stroke penalty taken for relief). In contrast, Player B finished with a total of 74 strokes under standard conditions, playing from a normal bunker without a water hazard.

## Instance-2

Following the these case, under present rules, the participants would end in a tie; however, by using The Complete Method©, it is possible to determine a definitive ranking.

### CASE1

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	FRONT	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	BACK	TOTAL
Gross A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	○	36	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	△	36	72
PT A	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	17	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	18	35
Gross B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	36	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	36	72
PT B	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	18	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	18	36

1. Stroke Count: Tied (Same number of strokes)

2. Putts: (A = 35) < (B = 36). Player A ranks higher due to a better putting score.

\*(Number of OBs and RPAs are the same)

### CASE2

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	FRONT	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	BACK	TOTAL
Gross A	-	-	○	△	-	○	-	-	○	34	-	-	-	-	○	-	-	-	△	36	70
PT A	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	1	15	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	19	34
OB A	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
Gross B	-	-	-	-	○	-	-	-	-	35	○	-	-	-	△	-	-	-	○	35	70
PT B	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	17	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	17	34
OB B	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1

1. Stroke Count: Tied

2. Putting Count: Tied

3. Number of OBs: (A = 2) > (B = 1). Player B ranks higher due to a better score (fewer OBs).

# Instance-3

## CASE3

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	FRONT	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	BACK	TOTAL
Gross A	-	-	○	-	-	△	-	-	○	35	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	△	37	72
PT A	2	2	1	2	1	2	2	2	1	15	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	19	34
OB A	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
RPA A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
Gross B	-	-	△	-	○	-	-	-	-	36	-	-	-	-	△	-	-	-	○	36	72
PT B	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	17	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	17	34
OB B	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
RPA B	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2

1. Stroke Count: Tied

2. Putting Count: Tied

3. OB Count: Tied

4. RPA Count: (A = 1) < (B = 2). Player A ranks higher due to a better score (fewer RPAs).

## CASE4

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	FRONT	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	BACK	TOTAL
Gross A	-	-	○	△	-	○	-	-	○	34	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	△	37	71
PT A	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	1	15	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	19	34
OB A	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
RPA A	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
Gross B	-	-	-	-	○	△	-	-	-	36	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	○	35	71
PT B	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	17	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	17	34
OB B	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
RPA B	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2

1. Stroke Count: Tied

2. Putting Count: Tied

3. OB Count: Tied

4. RPA Count: Tied 5. Number of Birdies: (A = 3) > (B = 2). Player A ranks higher.

# Related Associations

JGA (JAPAN GOLF ASSOCIATION)

JPGA (THE PROFESSIONAL GOLFERS' ASSOCIATION of JAPAN)

JGTO (JAPAN GOLF TOUR ORGANIZATION)

JLPGA (Japan Ladies Professional Golfers' Association)

USGA (United States of Golf Association)

Recommendation

Timeline

[in 2026]

Feb.19

JGA, JPGA

Feb.21

JLPGA

Feb.25

JLPGA, JPGA, JGTO, USGA

Feb.20

JLPGA

Feb.24

JLPGA, JPGA, JGTO

Feb.28

JLPGA, JGTO

# Roadmap-1

## Schedule & Milestones

### ■ Early April – Late June

**1. Preparations for the establishment of legal entities aimed at organizing and operating league-format golf tournaments adopting “The Complete Method©.”**

**Japan Golf League Association (JGLA)**

**Japan Ladies Professional Golf League Association (JLPGLA)**

**Japan Professional Golf League Association (JPGLA)**

**2. Initiatives for competitive rule adoption.** Promotion and advocacy activities directed toward regional golf federations and prefectural golf associations, including:  
**Tohoku / Kanto / Chubu / Kansai / Chugoku / Shikoku / Kyushu Golf Federations**

**3. Initiatives for golf course implementation.**

Updating the calculation logic for **cart navigation** systems and managing score data aggregation.

Displaying real-time rankings on the official **Golf League Association website.**

### ■ Early July – Late September

**Production and filming of golf television programs utilizing “The Complete Method©.”**

**League-Format Golf Tournaments:** Showcasing the new ranking system in action.

**Validation Matches:** "JLPGA Pros vs. Declared Pros" (A competitive demonstration to verify the method's effectiveness).

### ■ Around October

**Scheduled broadcasting of the golf programs adopting “The Complete Method©” .**

# Roadmap-2

## Schedule & Milestones

- Around November

### Progress Report

Submit a domestic status report to the United States Golf Association (USGA).

- Around December

### Reporting to The R&A

Report the outcomes of the discussions held with the USGA.

Suggestion: Formally propose the international adoption of the "Complete Method©" into the Rules of Golf.

in 2027

- Mid-April – Late June

Global Outreach: Conduct promotional activities for “The Complete Method©” across major countries.

- Early July – Late September

JOC Consultations: Initiate formal discussions with the Japanese Olympic Committee (JOC).

IOC Suggestion: Submit a proposal to the International Olympic Committee (IOC) for the adoption of the method in Olympic competition.