



## THE 2022 USPA RANKINGS Explanation

---

The purpose of the rankings is to create an objective, mathematical-based system that grades players according to their results. To better achieve this purpose, the USPA made three significant changes with the 2022 system relative to the prior one.

### 1. The competition format consists of a wider range of tournament classifications:

- USPA Finals (1)
  - Major Championships (4)
  - USPA 1000's (6)
  - USPA 500's (unspecified)
  - USPA 100's (unspecified)
- 

The new system seeks to funnel the highest competitive and achieving players in each division to the Tier 1 tournaments since that is where the most points are available. This helps to ensure that the highest ranked players are earning a significant number of points by beating other highly ranked players.

*The prior system did not offer much differentiation in its competition format, so every tournament essentially offered the same number of points, regardless of field strength. The #10 team may beat #22, #41 and #63 and earn the same number of points as the #1 team in a different tournament beating #2, #3 and #4. Of course, this can still happen in the new system in a Tier 2 tournament, but the #22, #41 and #63 most likely will not qualify for entry into a Tier 1.*

The tournament classifications also serve other purposes, but this is the main purpose from a ranking perspective.

### 2. The addition of a seven-tournament limit in the calculation.

This concept is consistent with the World Padel Tour (WPT), International Padel Federation (FIP), ATP Tour, United States Tennis Association (USTA), and most other like-minded associations. This rule seeks to create more equitable circumstances for players who are not able to travel to every tournament for financial, personal, or any other reason to gain points. It is not intended to cap participation at seven, and many competitive players may not be able to achieve seven tournaments played, but the USPA feels that seven tournaments are a reasonable compromise for players on both ends of the spectrum.

### 3. The revised points tables and allocations loosely track those from WPT/FIP, ATP and USTA.

First Match Consolation (FMC)										
	USPA Finals		Majors		USPA 1000		USPA 500		USPA 100	
	Points	%	Points	%	Points	%	Points	%	Points	%
Winner	1300	100%	1700	100%	1000	100%	500	100%	100	100%
Finalist	780	60%	1020	60%	600	60%	300	60%	60	60%
SF	470	36%	610	36%	360	36%	180	36%	36	36%
QF			310	18%	180	18%	90	18%	18	18%
R16			150	9%	90	9%	45	9%	9	9%
R32			68	4%			20	4%	4	4%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Place Grp	350	27%								
4 <sup>th</sup> Place Grp	235	18%								
Cons Winner			272	16%	160	16%	80	16%	16	16%
Cons Finalist			221	13%	130	13%	65	13%	13	13%
Cons SF			170	10%	100	10%	50	10%	10	10%
Cons QF			119	7%	70	7%	35	7%	7	7%
Cons R16			68	4%			20	4%	4	4%

- The main draw point allocations of 1300, 1700, 1000 are mimicking the same point allocations used by WPT and FIP.
- The naming tournament classifications of Finals, Majors, 1000, 500, and 100 are loosely mimicking the same classifications used by the ATP.
- The back draw point allocation percentages are loosely derived from similar allocations used by the USTA. Professional organizations do not administer consolations or back draws.

Allocations are based on draw size, which is a similar concept but different application from the previous system. 100% allocation for Tier 2 tournaments, the US Padel Nationals and USPA 1000's will be awarded for the following:

- Men's divisions: 16+ teams
- Women's divisions: 12+ teams

100% allocation for the USPA Finals and Major Championships will be the following:

- USPA Finals: 8 teams
- Major Championships: 12 teams

The percentage allocation for draws with fewer than 16 men's teams and 12 women's teams will be:

- Men:  $x / 16 = \text{allocation percentage}$
- Women:  $x / 12 = \text{allocation percentage}$

*Example: 12 teams sign up for a Men's draw and six teams sign up for a Women's draw in a USPA 1000:*

- *Men's allocation:  $12 / 16 = 75\%$*
- *Women's allocation:  $6 / 12 = 50\%$*
- *Winner of Men's draw:  $75\% \times 1000 \text{ points} = 750 \text{ points}$*
- *Winner of Women's draw:  $50\% \times 1000 \text{ points} = 500 \text{ points}$*

Allocations based on draw sizes are also designed to serve as a fairness and accuracy component in awarding points and ultimately calculating rankings. The allocations between the divisions are as follows:

A team that wins a tournament with a draw of six teams has arguably accomplished less than a team that has won a tournament with a draw of 26 teams, assuming the strength of the draws are similar. Of course, two teams who meet in the finals of a 26-team draw may have encountered much

different paths to reach that point, but the level of complication increase significantly in accounting for strength of opponent. The sophistication of our ranking system is not equipped for that at this point.

### **How do the point allocations work between divisions?**

For the sake of simplicity in the tracking and logging of results process, the point tables are the same for all Divisional rankings. For the sake of accuracy, an allocation between the divisions needed to be established for comparison purposes. The allocation is as follows:

- Open level players receive 100% of their total points toward their Overall ranking.
- First Division players receive 20% of their total points toward their Overall ranking.
- Second Division players receive 4% of their total points toward their Overall ranking.

*Example: Two women apply for selection to the 45+ Team USA Senior World Championship team. Player A is ranked #2 in the Women's First Division and has 5,000 points. Player B is ranked #23 in the Women's Open Division and has 925 points. How do we compare the two sets of results with some accuracy?*

- Player A maintains 5,000 points in her Divisional ranking and  $5,000 * 20\% = 1,000$  points toward her Overall ranking.
- Player B maintains 925 points in her Divisional and Overall ranking.
- In this system, Player A is ranked higher even though she has chosen to play in a lower division.

*Example: Two men play a USPA 1000. Player A wins the Second Division and scores 1,000 points. Player B loses first round in the front draw and first round of the back draw in the First Division and scores 70 points. How do we compare the two results with some accuracy?*

- Player A earns 1,000 points toward his Divisional ranking and  $1,000 * 4\% = 40$  points toward his overall ranking.
- Player B earns 70 points toward his Divisional ranking and  $70 * 20\% = 14$  points toward his overall ranking.
- In this system, Player A earns more points toward his overall ranking even though he has chosen to play in a lower division.

Whether Player A in both scenarios is playing too low in divisions or Player B is playing too high is subjective and difficult to police at this point. What is clear, however, is that there is a points-benefit for players to play in the division that corresponds to their level and not too high or too low.

The old system would motivate players to play higher than their corresponding level would suggest to earn more points. Losing in the first round of Competition was more beneficial than winning the Advanced category and the 2022 system corrects for that.

### **How does the new system affect 2021 results?**

In terms of revising the 2021 results to match the 2022 allocations, the new allocations and point totals were applied to all players results as logged in 2021. Furthermore, all tournaments were deemed to be a USPA 1000 unless classified as a 'double points Master' tournament, in which case it would be classified as a Major Championship.

A male player in 2021 who made the finals of a 12-team *Open* tournament at the Competition level in 2021 would've received 96 points. In the new system they would receive  $(12 / 16) = 75\% * 600$  points = 450 points.

A female player in 2021 who made the semifinals of a 12-team *Master* tournament at the Advanced level in 2021 would've received  $19 * 2 = 38$  points. In the new system they would receive  $(12 / 12) = 100\% * 610 = 610$  points for their ranking in Women's First Division and  $610 * 20\% = 122$  points for their overall ranking amongst all women.

The same standards were applied to all logged results for all players in all divisions in the updating process.

*Further reading and examples are provided in the 'Competition Structure' document online.*