

Rankings Working Group

Update for the Board of British Orienteering, 23 September 2009

This report provides a brief update as to the progress of the review of the Rankings system, and in particular summarises the responses received to the consultation paper published earlier this year.

David May, David Rosen and Mike Hamilton have been working on creating the seed data for the ranking system, and checking its compatibility with other BOF systems. I'm sure David and Mike will be able to provide a more detailed update at the meeting on this aspect of the work.

A total of 30 individuals and 3 BOF committees responded to the Consultation paper. Another response was received well after the deadline (and analysis was completed) and so has not been incorporated into the following findings.

There was a reasonable spread of respondents amongst age groups and by geography (pretty much all areas other than Northern Ireland being represented), but the vast majority of respondents were male. There were no juniors amongst the respondents. Although not a specific question, very few if any of the respondents appeared to be relative newcomers to orienteering.

The prospect of a web-based system with lists being created by the user according to various category filters was widely welcomed. There was some demand for the facility to create bespoke lists and to use rankings data for local competitions, but not overwhelmingly so.

There was broad agreement with the proposed criteria by which an event would qualify as a ranking event, with some disagreement that sprint/urban races should be included, and a split view on Night events. However, it is worth noting that since the consultation paper was published, the guidelines for Level 2 and 3 events were clarified, and it would now appear that the wider definition of Level 2 events would more or less incorporate all events meeting the proposed ranking criteria.

There was a clear majority in favour of NOT weighting Level 1 events, although strong arguments put forward on both sides. The vast majority felt that the rankings system should be based on all eligible events, and that there should not be separate lists for Level 1 and other events. 6 was the popular choice in terms of the number of events to count, although suggestions ranged from 5 to 10. Most people were in agreement that all TD4 and TD5 level courses should be eligible for ranking points.

Coaching Committee re-stated their view that juniors should not be eligible to take part in the rankings. However, this view was clearly out of step with the respondents as all but one other person indicated that juniors, where capable of competing on a ranking course, should be eligible for ranking points. There was a clear majority in favour of certain international performances being included in the scoring.

Various comments and suggestions were made on such things as the specifics relating to the algorithm, presentation of the rankings and links to awards, and others. One or two respondents took the opportunity to re-state their opposition to the demise of the former event structure.

A full breakdown of the results, together with the [anonomised] responses in full, will be incorporated into the final report (see below)

I would request that the Board formally minute it's thanks to those people who took the time and effort to respond to the Rankings consultation.

Next Steps:

Testing of the proposed rankings algorithm and the software will continue, and it is hoped this will include testing a number of the variables on which the Working Group sought views through the consultation process.

Once testing is complete, a final report will be prepared which brings together all the work of the Rankings Working Group, and presents final recommendations for consideration by the Board. It is anticipated that the work will be completed for formal application in 2010.

Martyn Broadest
Chair of the Rankings Working Group, 21 September 2009