

# Ranking System Consultation

Presentation to National Council  
14 March 2020

Simon Griew

# Outline



- Background
- Overview of the consultation
  - scope
  - process
  - document
- Summary and next steps
- Discussion

# Background



- Board considering whether changes are required to the national ranking system
  - could be major overhaul or tweaks
- Catalysts for change:
  - new ITTF World Ranking System from 2018
  - common issues/concerns
- Work taken forward by the Ranking Policy Group (RPG)
  - a “task and finish group” established by the Board
- Paper from MAG in June 2019 commented on principles and concerns
- Now seeking feedback from wider membership

# Overview of the consultation

## Scope

- National ranking system only
  - this is not about TT Leagues
- Big picture
  - acknowledging but looking beyond day-to-day concerns
  - what are our members' priorities?
  - what ranking system can best meet our needs, and why?
  - strategic issues related to the operation of the system
- Broad audience
  - c. 3000 players
  - people who support player development
  - other interested parties (e.g. tournament organisers)



# Overview of the consultation Process



Table Tennis England's  
National Ranking System

Consultation Guidance  
Document

January 2020

Consultation  
guidance  
document



Online survey

Responses by  
20th March



Drop-ins at 5 events:  
January - March



Presentations to MAG  
and National Council

# Overview of the consultation

## Summary of the document

Consultation is structured in three parts

### Part A

Objectives and principles

### Part B

Pros and cons of main alternatives

### Part C

Additional considerations

Information

Analysis

Discussion

# Overview of the consultation

## Summary of the document – part A

Objectives: why have a ranking system?

### Members

- Motivate players to play and improve
- Enable understanding of progress and relative level

### NGB

- Inform seedings and invitations
- Inform national selections
- Support talent ID and tracking

**We are asking for comments on these objectives and, in particular, whether this is a complete list**

# Overview of the consultation

## Summary of the document – part A



### Principles: what do we want from our ranking system?

- Be transparent and easily understood
- Be seen to be reasonably accurate
- Fairly reflect recent results
- Not disincentivise participation in competition
- Enable effective transition between age-groups
- Not be overly labour-intensive
- Work in harmony with domestic competition formats
- Reflect the performance of our top players on the international stage

**We are asking for comments on these principles and, in particular, for respondents to rate their importance**



# Overview of the consultation

## Summary of the document – part A



Examples of trade-offs between principles

Transparency v  
accuracy

Reflect international  
performances v  
labour-intensity

Accuracy/fairness  
v incentives

# Overview of the consultation

## Summary of the document – part B



Pros and cons of the main alternatives:  
Which type of ranking system best meets our needs?

### Relative systems

- Along the lines of our current system (also known as ELO system)
- Awards/deducts points based on who you beat/lose to

### Absolute systems

- Along the lines of the ITTF system
- Awards points based on how far you get through a tournament or how many wins you get in a team event

**We are asking for comments on our assessment of the pros and cons (next slide), and on which of the two types of ranking system would best meet our needs**

# Overview of the consultation

## Summary of the document – part B



Type	Pros	Cons
Relative (ELO-style)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More fairly rewards results</li> <li>• Normally provides an incentive to compete.....</li> <li>• Supports broad range of players, not all of whom can compete frequently</li> <li>• Compatible with any competition structure and format</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More complex, less predictable and transparent</li> <li>• ....but threat of losing points can act as a disincentive to compete</li> <li>• Needs over-ride at top end of the rankings for international results</li> <li>• Greater administrative burden and IT complexity</li> <li>• Greater complexity leads to a greater risk of data entry errors, delays or ranking re-runs</li> </ul>
Absolute (ITTF-style)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simple, predictable and transparent</li> <li>• Will never disincentivise competition....</li> <li>• Easier to reflect recent results</li> <li>• Low resource intensity</li> <li>• Straightforward to reflect international results</li> <li>• Less complex to cater fairly for new players</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Doesn't reward 'good wins' or penalize 'bad losses' ...but can reduce the incentive to compete in specific circumstances</li> <li>• Not as easily compatible with current competition structures and the number of team events</li> <li>• Could lead to loss of flexibility for organisers to develop innovate competition structures</li> </ul>

# Overview of the consultation

## Summary of the document – part C



### Additional considerations: How a future system should operate

#### Points for consultation

- Scope of national rankings
- Integrated v non-integrated lists
- Dealing with inactivity
- Transition between age-groups
- New players
- Returning to play

#### Additional points

- Bonus points
- Integration with ITTF results
- Non-TTE players in TTE competitions
- Events weightings
- Consequences of withdrawal/no-show
- Mixed events

# Overview of the consultation

## Summary of the document – part C



### Example: dealing with inactivity

	VM	VW	SM	SW	JB	JG
Percentage reductions in #30s over 5 years	28%	29%	34%	44%	19%	-9%
Average percentage reduction in #30s	6.4%	6.7%	7.8%	10.9%	4.2%	-1.7%

Conclusion: compression of lists is unsustainable

Impact on ranking of almost inactive #10 over 5 years	VM	VW	SM	SW	JB	JG
	82	52	14	12	49	35

Conclusion: system not working as intended, particularly on senior lists

#### We are asking :

- how could we better deal with inactivity if we retain a relative system?
- what would an appropriate rolling period be if we had an absolute system?

# Summary and next steps



- Consultation until 20th March
- Drop-ins at 5 events
- Feedback following Board decision in the summer
- Potential for further consultation on specific topics
- Any significant changes implemented in August 2021
- Potential for a period of parallel running

# Discussion