

### Final Rankings of GTOC1:

Ranking	Team name	flyby sequence	J
1	<a href="#">JPL (Team 11)</a>	EVVEEJSJA	1,850,000
2	<a href="#">Deimos Space (Team 17)</a>	EVVEEVVEVEJSJA	1,820,000
3	<a href="#">GMV (Team 2)</a>	EEVEEJSA	1,455,000
4	<a href="#">Moscow Aviation Institute &amp; Krunishev Space Center (Team 12)</a>	EVEVEEA	1,364,000
5	<a href="#">Politecnico di Torino (Team 4)</a>	EVVJA	1,290,000
6	<a href="#">CNES/CS (Team 7)</a>	EEVEEJSJA	1,194,000
7	<a href="#">Glasgow University (Team 13)</a>	EEVVA	385,000
8	<a href="#">Moscow University (Team 9)</a>	EA	351,152
9	<a href="#">Alcatel (Team 14)</a>	EA	330,385
10	<a href="#">DLR (Team 1)</a>	EA	330,000
11	<a href="#">Tsinghua University (Team 8)</a>	EA	89,000

Other teams returned trajectories that could not be inserted in the above ranking. This was either because the final distance with the asteroid was greater than 0.01 AU or because the format of the submitted file did not comply with the example.txt file provided making it impossible for us to perform a fast preliminary evaluation.

Team Name and number	flyby sequence	J
<a href="#">Politecnico di Milano (Team 5)</a>	EVEA	184,000

*....it was a proof of the scientific level of the participants to be willing to "play" with us testing different methods and techniques with this difficult problem. The ranking reported should by no way be mistaken as absolute: many factors should be considered when evaluating an optimisation method. Its scientific value cannot be judged on the basis of the sole value of the objective function reached in the problem given. Nevertheless this was born as a competition and we had to form a ranking.*

*We hope you enjoyed as much as we did and that the participation to the workshop in February 2006 will be the largest possible.*

*Dario Izzo*