

=====

- I. "Executive Summary"
- II. Detailed WeeWeekly Guidelines/Rules
- III. "WeeWeekly FAQ"
- IV. Appendix: DrawSheet
- V. Update History

I. "EXECUTIVE SUMMARY":

-----

This document is a means of formalizing the "WeeWeekly System" for present players, new participants or other interested parties.

1. St. George's[StG's] WeeWeekly[WW] tournaments are meant to provide a FREE "half-day" competitive environment OPEN to players of varying skill levels.
2. As with most aspects of St. George's, WW's are organized & run by VOLUNTEERS. In general, the guiding principle is: "What's best for the GROUP [members in general, as well as WW-players] ??"  
Try to keep things SIMPLE and NOT WASTE court time!
3. Except when weather or other (Provincial/etc.) tournaments prevent it, Singles & Doubles alternate every Saturday at 9:00am, following <http://www.stgeorgetennis.ca/calendar.php>  
To be an "official" WW (with points), there must be a minimum of 6 players for Singles, or 4 teams (8 players) for Doubles, and it must have been "pre-scheduled" on StG's web page. Limited to first 32 Singles players, or 48 Doubles players, PRESENT by 9:00am.
4. Rankings (based upon the past 52 weeks' performance) are used to determine tournament draws as follows:
  - a. Singles: an "even half" of the top-ranked players are NON-randomly seeded; the non-seeded players are RANDOMLY evenly distributed.
  - b. Doubles: the top-ranked HALF of the players are NON-randomly "seeded"; partners are RANDOMLY drawn from the remaining HALF.
5. Matches are "pro-sets" to 7, with a regular tie-break played at 6-6. Players are guaranteed 2 matches: play 1 match (win or lose), then get eliminated upon losing a subsequent match.
6. To facilitate tournament completion by early afternoon, "longer", more competitive, matches are played first, with preference given to "Winners side" matches, then equally "deep" Consolations matches. Since 80 to 100% of StG's courts are used for WW's, WW-players should "reasonably" allow other members use of "open" courts.
7. Points for ranking/seeding purposes are based upon tournament "results" & participation.
8. Disputes/problems/interpretations/etc. should be resolved QUICKLY among the players. In the interest of expediency, the "Tournament Director" shall have final authority in WW-related matters. The "Duty Host" is limited to CLEARLY recording names of players seeking to participate in that morning's WW, unless directed otherwise by the StG's "Board".
9. Please realize that WW's are a human enterprise/undertaking that can never be "perfect". Over the years, WW's have been "tweaked" to result in a GREAT activity. Suggestions for improvement are welcome and given serious consideration.

## II. DETAILED WEE-WEEKLY GUIDELINES/"RULES":

-----  
Some ABBREVIATIONS [in case confusion later/below]:

PD = [Ranking] Points Distributor/Determiner [Gerry V. until 2009; mainly PL in 2010] updates results then posts them online (usually by Wednesday).

PL = Pat Lee [author of most of this document based on his experiences: 2003-10 WW player; 2009-10 WW TD; 2010 WW PD; plus moderate TNS tournament experience]

StG's = St. George's Lawn Tennis Club [StGeorgeTennis.ca]

TD = Tournament Director [mainly PL for 2009-10; NOT person on StG's "Board"] creates draw then decides match ordering.

TNS = TennisNovaScotia.ca [formerly NSTA]

WW = StG's WeeWeekly [tournament system]

WW's = WeeWeeklies (plural)

WWd = WW Doubles

WWs = WW Singles

### 1. a. BRIEF HISTORY:

Krys Dlutek started the WeeWeekly tournaments in 1990. They have been organized and run by WW participants(players) and/or other VOLUNTEERS/staff over the years. Gerry Vrbensky, the "soul" of StG's website, has diligently maintained rankings and other essential WW aspects over the years. Two decades after its "birth", WW's have grown significantly in participation: approx. 50% more players in 2010 than in 2009. This has resulted in many questions/suggestions/etc. which this document hopes to address.

### b. TOURNAMENT:

WW's ARE tennis "tournaments" (as contrasted with "Socials") with specific rules/etc. above, beyond, and sometimes different than those found at TennisCanada.com  
Personal enjoyment of competition will vary...

### c. FREE:

Since there is NO ENTRY FEE for this weekly club tournament, players are expected to provide their own tennis balls. Players SHOULD be able to decide amongst themselves whose/which balls are acceptable for use. One [historical] approach has been that players may each bring/buy a NEW (unopened) can of balls, with the match loser keeping the "just used" match balls, and the winner advancing with the UNOPENED can.

### d. DURATION & WAITING:

WW's are an "elimination tournament" in which MOST participants should be done by around noon, if not earlier. All players are guaranteed two matches. Regardless of what happens in the first match, when a player loses a subsequent match, they are out of the tournament. "Better" players will advance "deeper" into the tournament draw and will play more matches.  
Participants will, out of necessity, have to "take turns" and share the limited number of tennis courts. When there are more participants, the wait time is generally increased, although STEPS [see below] are taken to minimize this for all!

### e. OPEN:

WW's are OPEN to ANY StG's "member" who abides by  
<http://www.stgeorgetennis.ca/rules.php>  
This includes legal users of Visitor/Guest Passes.

### f. SKILL LEVEL:

Player skills will vary from beginner to advanced.

1. f. Competitive/ranked/"promising" juniors are welcome.  
Although it ranges depending upon the year, the skill level of WW-players roughly approximates players in TNS's MEN's "Class A" to "weak Open" (or Masters 45+).  
NTRP Men's ratings of APPROXIMATELY 2.0 to 5.0, mostly 2.5 to 4.5
2. a. VOLUNTEERS:  
Remember that WW's are a StG's activity run by players for other players -- PLEASE feel free to learn/contribute/etc.! The more players who take an interest in learning to keep things running smoothly, the better it will be for ALL!
- b. GUIDING PRINCIPLE:  
When a situation NOT covered by these "rules" arises, handling it in a manner that benefits the "majority", be it WW-players or StG's members in general, seems a wise guideline...  
REMEMBER: "WW-players" \*ARE\* StG's "members"!!  
(In general, "majority rules" should work.)
3. a. SCHEDULE:  
WWs alternate every Saturday morning with WWd, according to <http://www.stgeorgetennis.ca/calendar.php>  
If one week is cancelled (usually "rained out"), the next week does NOT change to replace the missed WW.
- b. START TIME (& RESERVED SPOTS):  
ALL players are expected to be PRESENT by 9:00am which is the WW registration "cutoff time", except when courts are not yet playable. A Duty Host is usually present by 8:30am which is the earliest "sign-up" time to take names by phone as a COURTESY; VoiceMail can be missed. Priority is given to the FIRST 32 players for Singles and 48 players for Doubles present by 9:00am when the Draw is made. Calling in then failing to show up [PL can recall this happening only ONCE!] will result in permanent loss of such "call in" privilege for such an offending player.  
NOTE: calling in does NOT guarantee a "reserved spot", since potentially many players COULD be already PRESENT and waiting.
- c. NUMBER OF PLAYERS:  
Singles = 6 to 32; Doubles = 8 to 48.  
In cases of insufficient players, that WW is officially CANCELLED; but, players may still organize and play amongst themselves!
- d. RAIN/DELAY POLICY:  
CALL the club to check on the status of courts!  
In fairness to all StG's members, if the courts are not playable (i.e., still too wet) by 11:00am, then that week's WW will be considered "rained out". In cases of impending inclement weather, players present may vote to possibly abbreviate matches.  
Tournaments unable to reach the "final four" stage (4 Main draw Singles semi-finalists, or 2 Main draw Doubles final teams) shall be deemed "washed out" and no points awarded. If play is halted with only 4 or less Main draw participants remaining, the players, along with the TD, will decide upon later completion or "splitting the points"...
4. a. RANKINGS:  
The most current WW rankings, generally updated by Wednesday following each Saturday's WW, as well as the "system" of points distribution and rankings calculations can be found at <http://www.stgeorgetennis.ca/weewebly.php>  
Seedings are based upon these rankings which are based upon performance and participation in WW's. The WW tradition of

4. a. seeding based solely on WW-rankings is unbiased. The TD's copy of the rankings should be current and will be used for seeding.

b. SEEDING & DRAWS:

WWs: seed (# of players)/2, rounding 0.5 such that an EVEN number results.

For example:

22 players:  $22/2 = 11.0$  --> seed top 11 players  
 23 players:  $23/2 = 11.5$  --> seed top 12 players  
 24 players:  $24/2 = 12.0$  --> seed top 12 players  
 25 players:  $25/2 = 12.5$  --> seed top 12 players  
 26 players:  $26/2 = 13.0$  --> seed top 13 players  
 27 players:  $27/2 = 13.5$  --> seed top 14 players

Note: the seeding of 50% (as contrasted with the usual 25%) of the players, along with the NON-random placement of the "seeds", is simply a "WW tradition" which facilitates simple quick accurate draws.

Example draw set-up for 9 players (A-I):

Rank	Name	Seed	
1	A	#1	
3	B	#2	
6	C	#3	
10	D	#4	[Note: $9/2 = 4.5$ --> seed top 4 players]
...	...	...	
	E, F, G, H, I		[lower ranks irrelevant since randomized]

R16	QF	SF	F	W	
#1--A--					R16 = "round of 16"
--A--					QF = quarter-finals
-bye-					SF = semi-finals (last 4)
					F = final (last 2)
					W = winner (champion)
#8-----					
#5-bye-					
-----					
-----					
-bye-					
--D--					
#4--D--					
#3--C--					
--C--					
-bye-					
-----					
-----					
#6-bye-					
#7-bye-					
-----					
-----					
-bye-					
--B--					
#2--B--					

4. b. BYE = a temporary advancement in the main ("winner's side") draw [given to "highest seeds"]; but, player moves to consolations side (LEFT) if loses 1st match (a seed is said to have been "upset").  
 Drawsheets size: 16  
 -(# of players): 9  
 ----  
 7 BYEs - 4[to seeds] = 3 BYEs left  
 Remaining BYEs are evenly "spread out" by simply placing them where "seeds" #5 to 7 would be -- this actually serves to INCREASE the competition for "top seeds"! [in this case, 1 QF is NOT "automatic" & the #1 seed must face/play a "warmed up" (& unlikely tired) match winner] THEN randomly place remaining 5 players in 5 positions. For randomizing, there are 16 pre-made "cards" with the "WW Clipboard" [which also has pre-numbered drawsheets]. If over 32 players, then "strips of paper" with numbers on them can be drawn...
- NOTICE PATTERN: if above "outline" were used for 16+ players, and if seeds win as "expected", SF's sum to 5, QF's to 9, [R16 to 17,...]
- Consolation matches are to the LEFT, and will often include many "holes" cause by BYEs and DEFAULTs. Consolation-side players must often "wait" to see if a seed is "upset" before advancing early on the LEFT side...
- WWd: There MUST be an EVEN number of players. Then the above "seeding pattern" is used to spread out the teams. Non-seeded players then get partnered with the seeds. BYEs are "automatic" based upon the resulting draw.  
 ODD # of WWd-players: if waiting until 9:10am for an "extra body" is unsuccessful, then either 1 player sits out (LAST to ARRIVE or a "volunteer"), or perhaps the "Duty Host" can be encouraged to "fill in"...
- "TEAM PRACTICE": in the event that a NON-RANDOM (pre-set) "team" wishes to play a WWd, in order to preserve the integrity of the ranking system, such a team will be "fed" into the Consolation side at the TD's discretion (perhaps to a team benefiting from more byes/defaults?).
- Tied Seeds: simply RANDOMLY order any tied seeds -- do NOT use "other" WW rankings since skill can differ & could also be tied.
- Printed names on the drawsheet are easier to read and make the PD's task easier... Also, drawsheets are posted!
5. a. SCORING:  
 WW matches consist of Pro-sets that are played to 7 games. However if a set gets to a 6-6 tie, a "standard" tie-break to 7-points is played in which the first player to reach 7 points, leading by 2, is the winner.
- b. NO-AD:  
 In cases of more than 24 WWs players or 37 WWd players, No-Ad scoring is used and MUST BE ENFORCED! No-ad scoring means that at "deuce"(40-40), the RECEIVER chooses which side to receive the serve, with the winner of that point winning the game.
- c. TWO MATCHES & WARM-UP:  
 WW's are NOT "double-elimination" where one must LOSE TWO MATCHES

5. c. to be eliminated; 2 matches are "guaranteed", except in the rare case where all subsequent opponents elect to default themselves. Please be courteous to other waiting players/members and limit pre-match warm-ups to 5 minutes. Players are encouraged to arrive well before 9am to "warm-up".
- d. SCORES:  
Although it is generally considered the winner's responsibility to report match results/scores, it is helpful if someone can report results, including tie-break scores, ASAP.
- e. DEFAULTS:  
Players SHOULD arrange to be and stay at the courts until approximately 12 noon if they choose to participate. In fairness and as a courtesy to other waiting players, when unable to play a match on time, it is better to default oneself ASAP rather than hold up the tournament! PLEASE let the TD know ASAP, or ensure that your intentions are clearly indicated on the drawsheet, when intending to default. Defaults in Doubles hurts your partner so please try to avoid them! Substitutions are not allowed. In Singles, defaults are common and acceptable in the consolations, generally from "weaker" players who quickly lose their first match then do not wish to wait around for their next match. For main draw matches, please do not allow the losing player to advance through a default. For consistent points/ranking, it is better to play your match, THEN elect to default upon reporting the score. Allowing a "weaker" player to advance & then get "undeserved points" only serves to reduce the integrity of the rankings. If a player is unable to commit to playing until approx. 12 noon, it is better to not sign-up to play.
6. a. COMPLETION TIME:  
As this is a TOURNAMENT with matches, the precise ending time can NOT be predicted. However, most players are eliminated by "noon", which is also the approx. time that some courts may become "free". Doubles usually ends around 1pm, Singles around 2-3pm.
- b. LONG MATCHES FIRST:  
From experience, proper choice of the first 4-5 matches can DRASTICALLY reduce tournament completion time. Also, hopefully players can reach QF/SF/F approx. "together".
- c. MAIN DRAW PRIORITY:  
The "Main Draw", "winner's side", is more important than the the "Consolations", "loser's side", and as such is reflected in the points awarded. Thus, for equally "deep" matches, when courts are still limited, the "winner's side" matches have priority.  
For example, if there are 28 Singles players [such large draws are when such prioritizations along with "long matches first" & "No-Ad" scoring are essential], then the "longest" 5 matches play 1st (at around 9:15am -- it takes time after 9:00am to create a draw). By 10:15am, the 2nd group of 5 should hopefully start (again, with potentially "long" matches playing earlier). By 11am, most of the FIRST ROUND (1R) matches will be completed. While some 1R matches are finishing, "Winner's side" "Round of 16" matches can commence (again with "longer" matches sooner). Towards the last few Round-of-16 matches (around "noon"), courts will free up for Consolations Round-of-16 to begin. However, many players will have defaulted themselves rather than wait, so there may not be too many such matches to play. As Consolations Round-of-16 completes, Main draw Quarter-finals matches can start (again with priority over Consolations QF's, when courts are still busy). Of course, rather than leave a court "idle",

6. c. ANY available match (even a Consolations match "deeper" than the Main Draw) should go on an unused court.

Towards the end of the tournament, one "half" ("top" or "bottom") often gets "ahead" and must wait for others to "catch up". In such cases, players may elect to "rest"/wait (when such actions will NOT delay overall tournament completion) and "free up" courts for Consolation matches.

d. OPEN COURTS:

Since WW's as a "scheduled priority" utilize all 5 courts (WWs) or Courts #1-4 (WWd) virtually every Saturday morning, and sometimes later into the afternoon depending on participation numbers & weather conditions, DO NOT WASTE COURT TIME! Some courts should become "open" [no longer needed for WW tournament matches] around "noon" and should be "shared" in the following SUGGESTED order:

1. WW tournament matches [by definition, not really "open"]
2. Non WW-players seeking a court [this allows them to possibly see the fun/skill level of WW-players!]
3. Eliminated (that day) WW-players
4. WW-players still in tournament CANNOT book a court while STILL \*IN\* the draw!

Of course if eliminated after 2 doubles matches and you wish to utilize Court #5 and those players have already played an hour, then feel free to "bump" them using normal booking procedures...

7. a. POINTS (for ranking/seeding purposes):

If the PD is NOT present at the WW, then the TD should get the drawsheet (or a scanned copy) to the PD by Monday or ASAP. Points are assigned to WW participants by the PD based upon their accomplishments after each WW tournament -- the further one advances in a tournament draw (generally by successfully winning more "matches"), the more points:

S I N G L E S		TOURNAMENT	D O U B L E S	
Main Consolation		Draw / Round	Main Consolation	
-----		-----	-----	
45	12	Winner	30	12
30	8	Finalist	20	8
20	5	Semi-Finals	14	5
14	3	Quarter-Finals	10	3
10	2	Round-of-16	7	2

Note that points are awarded to players based upon where in the draw they are eliminated (or choose to default themselves).

If no ATTEMPT is made to play a subsequent match, extra points are NOT awarded for defaults/byes. [default = match in which 1 player/team fails to participate; bye = there is NO player/team to play a specific match]

b. RANKING FORMULA:

Players are ranked (with a separate ranking maintained for Singles and Doubles[team play]) in descending order based on the number of "Ranking Points" they have, calculated as follows based on the past 52 weeks (= 1 year = 12 months):

Tm = number of WWs or WWd tournaments played in the past year  
TTL\_Pts = total points based on adding up accumulated WW points  
CD = Current Division Factor = (Tm \* 0.5) + 1.5  
[ \* = multiplication ]  
RnkPts = Ranking Points = TTL\_Pts / CD [ / = division ]

Although rankings are based upon performance during the past 52 weeks, only the CURRENT year's results are used for final year-end "awards" (e.g., names on Clubhouse plaques).

7. b. Note also that from a strict mathematically correct standpoint, "Ranking Points" ONLY equals "Average Points" [= "mean"] for EXACTLY Tm=3.
8. a. DISPUTES/ETC.:  
Since court time is "precious", and WW's are a tournament run BY players FOR players, players should try to QUICKLY resolve problems/etc. among themselves (maybe with TD "guidance"/advice). The TD will handle "unresolved problems" in a decisive & final manner.  
Unsatisfied members may "escalate" complaints [see below].
- b. DUTY HOSTS:  
Unless given addition "duties" by the StG's "Board", Duty Hosts are asked simply to LEGIBLY record the names (first and at least initial of last name) of ALL players seeking to play (either already present at StG's or "called in"). In addition, a Duty Host \*MAY\* sometimes help prevent member disappointment by playing when there is an ODD # of players at a WWd.
9. a. QUESTIONS/SUGGESTIONS/COMPLAINTS/CONCERNS/ETC.:  
If after reading the above "WW Rules" + "FAQ" below, you have ANY complaints, suggestions, questions, or concerns, please send them to:  
Email: WeeWeekly@StGeorgeTennis.ca  
Web: <http://www.StGeorgeTennis.ca/suggestion-poll.php>  
Submissions may be anonymous and hopefully will be directed to the appropriate person(s).  
Responses [possibly edited] will be posted below...
- b. NEW situations/etc. that arise shall be added to this evolving document [usually appended to the end of III. FAQ].



### III. "WEE WEEKLY FAQ":

-----  
Q: What's this FAQ?

A: This is a collection of questions/complaints/comments/suggestions/concerns/musings/etc. that COULD BE "frequently asked", or perhaps just imagined/muttered.

Q: Why has PL gone into so much "nauseating" detail here??

A: Since 2009, PL has been trying to prevent a few complainers from ruining something which the "silent majority" seems to quietly enjoy. This is in response a few "complaints"/etc. made about the WW's... Also, others can take over the running of WW's when PL is unavailable yet maintain consistency (with points/etc.).

NOTE: this document is NOT meant to discourage players or make WW's less enjoyable! It is a response to a "few people" (with limited or no WW experience, who may have either not known about or understood the StG's website) whose questions/complaints/etc. were directed to others without WW experience (&/or maybe also had difficulty understanding/accessing the StG's website), and as a means of formalizing the "WW System" for future players &/or new participants.

Believe it or not, this is PL's idea of SIMPLICITY!

Q: I like to have long breaks (hours to rest/recover/etc.) between matches.

A: Either lose 1st match then long wait until 1st consolations match, or play TNS tournaments (where matches are spread out over DAYS...)

Q: PL wins too often and easily! The draw must be "rigged"!

A: Please feel free to learn & participate in the making of these "half random" draws [since half seeded = "half fixed"].

Q: I keep losing before I get to play anyone "good".

A: Practice to get better...YouTube.com has MANY fine FREE instructional videos!

Q: I only want to play against "hard hitting" players.  
PL wins too easily and makes me play bad!

A: Roger Federer's slice backhand is NOT considered a "power shot"! Andy Murray wins using variety.

Q: I only want to play against "advanced" players.  
I get bored playing "weak players".

A: For 2010, there was only one(1) StG's member who was capable of EASILY winning every WWs. Even this "Open Class" player faced weaker opponents in many TNS tournaments (winning one final 6-0,6-0). There were an additional 2 other StG's members who, based on TNS results, were capable of winning SOME WWs tournaments in 2010. WW's always include players who also have had some (limited) success competing at a provincial level.  
["Elitism" already failed with 2010's attempted "Advanced Doubles"]

Q: PL is a dictator and ignores my suggestions, especially when when trying to quickly create a proper fair draw with integrity while 20+ players are waiting to start!

A: Yes.  
Please feel free to discuss matters with the TD/others during the quiet "waiting for matches to finish" time, and/or email your concerns to WeeWeekly@StGeorgeTennis.ca

Q: I don't have fun at WW's! I don't like the VOLUNTEERS running them!

A: As with most aspects of St. George's, WW's are organized & run by VOLUNTEERS; in this case, WW's are run BY more experienced fellow players FOR other players -- please feel free to learn then help out! As a COMPETITIVE tournament, "fun" can NOT be guaranteed as individual responses to losing can vary unpredictably.

Q: Can I pay some \$ at WW's? The prizes "suck"!

A: Prizes are proportional to entry fees.  
Currently, no fees are taken in, either for purchase of balls or for "prizes"...

Tips for the TD/PD are appreciated, but, will NOT result in favoritism! ;-)

Q: Why can't I call in days/weeks ahead of time and "book" my place?

A: A "first come, first served" system (which is StG's "tradition") simplifies things while maximizing fairness to MOST (maybe not ALL), without allowing "early bookings" (with potential "no shows" common to pre-booked FREE events) RUINing the Majority's "fun"!

Q: What if I PAY a fee/penalty to reserve my spot?

A: If a PRE-PAID \$5-10 "fee" (or "penalty" for "no shows") is collected by the Duty Host, then the \$ could be used for prizes/snacks/etc.  
Hmmm...

Q: Why is there a limit to the number of players who can play?

A: WW's are intended to be a "half-day" QUICK tournament. More players takes longer, unless matches are shortened (which MOST players generally OPPOSE!). The "minimum" number of players is meant to promote validity of the rankings.  
In 2010 (with 85 unique WW-players), the most players was 29 for WWs, 30 for WWd. Doubles is limited to 24 teams due to 20% less courts plus generally longer match times due to coordination of more people and more "parity" (random partners --> closer scores).  
In cases of insufficient players, that WW is officially CANCELLED, but, players may still organize and play amongst themselves!  
If WW's grow further still, serious considerations will be needed to perhaps significantly change some aspects, such as limits, scoring, &/or perhaps having a preliminary "B draw" Saturday morning, that "feeds" into a stronger Sunday morning "A Draw"...  
[a "radical" 2009 idea then impractical due to much smaller draws]

Q: Why wasn't I seeded? I can beat #\_\_ !!

A: Rather than use "judgment" (which frequently differs among players/professionals), "strong" players can "prove" that they "deserve" a high[er] seeding by simply WINNING MORE WW MATCHES to improve their ranking (rather than "complaining about being under-seeded")  
While NO "seeding" system can EVER be perfect (see [http://en.Wikipedia.org/wiki/French\\_Open#Records](http://en.Wikipedia.org/wiki/French_Open#Records) ), the WW's can NOT be accused of "favoritism". (BTW, in 2008, the most competitively skilled club member StG's has had in MANY years simply [easily] won enough WWs tournaments to claim #1...).

Q: What is "seeding"? Why is the #1 seed considered "higher" than #2?

A: This is a terminology/usage convention: although the number "1" is smaller than "2", a "#1" ranking is considered "higher" than "#2"; seeding is a way of separating "highly ranked" players so that they ("seeds") do not play against each other until later in the draw.

Q: Why isn't there a PRECISE ending time for WW's?

A: In contrast to "Social" events that can play for a set time [which can NOT work in a tournament setting due to "stalling"], the precise ending time can NOT be predicted (cf., Wimbledon 2010).

Q: Why are "longer" matches given court priority?

A: The rationale for the TD starting "longer" (more competitive [based upon TD's/others' experience/advice]) matches first is:  
Essentially, if one wanted to "drag out" (lengthen) an activity (tournament/project/etc.) as far as long possible, one can imagine trying to schedule the lengthiest activities (upon which LATER activities are DEPENDENT) as late as possible. So, by doing LONG DEPENDENT activities FIRST, the potential for the "worst case scenario" is minimized! Basically, try to avoid having LONG matches "hold up" the entire tournament...  
[More info at [http://en.Wikipedia.org/wiki/Critical\\_path\\_method](http://en.Wikipedia.org/wiki/Critical_path_method) ]  
From experience, proper choice of the first 4-5 matches (e.g., having 2 "beginners" [who at least know how to keep track of tennis scores] (or 2 "pushers" [defensive players who prefer to patiently wait for an unforced error from their opponent]) play each other ASAP can (along with priority given to Main draw matches) DRASTICALLY (1-2 hrs) reduce tournament completion time. Also, hopefully players can reach QF/SF/F approx. "together".

Q: Why is there sometimes such a long wait between matches?

A: In general, more players than courts results in waiting.  
Higher seeded players usually get 1R byes and often must wait 1-2 hours before playing their first match! Players who play almost immediately after the draw is made but lose their first match, can anticipate waiting 1-2 hrs for their 1st "Consolations" match to begin (assuming relatively large numbers of players, "winner's side" matches are given priority). Also, defaults can sometimes further increase wait time.

Q: Can I change the WW point system?

A: The above points distribution has been successfully used for MANY YEARS and there do NOT seem to be any compelling reasons for change.

Q: Tell me more about the ranking system.

A: Professional tennis seems to use a MORE COMPLEX system that includes some notion of "best n of m results".  
This current WW divisor system yields CD's of (2,2.5,3,3.5,4,...) which has been shown to DRAMATICALLY improve the "realism" of player ranking as compared with the pre-2010 system (similar to old TNS's) with divisors of (3,3,3,4,4.5,...). The old CD's encouraged "sitting on points" [protecting one's point average by only playing 3 WW's, especially in Doubles where LUCK-OF-THE-DRAW often plays a large role!], while the new (2010-) CD system more accurately ranks infrequent strong players yet rewards participation.

Q: Why should the TD help resolve disputes/etc.?

A: Since the TD has enough experience/etc. to be capable of creating a proper draw then setting out match order, the TD SHOULD also be "wise" enough to handle "problems" (with assistance from others if absolutely needed...) in a DECISIVE (quick & final) manner. This should help avoid "gridlock" caused by a single "unhappy" player.

Q: Why are WW's so "awesome"??

A: For any players who have PAID \$\$ to then endure protracted waits (from rain delays, long matches, etc.) at TNS or other tennis tournaments, the experience of WW's \*SHOULD\* be a dramatic improvement!! This may be reflected by the observation that WW's have FAR MORE PARTICIPANTS than most TNS tournaments!  
Any changes to WW's are likely to be incremental/small and must be well thought out so as not to "hurt" something already GREAT!  
I.e, don't "break" something VERY good while trying to "fix" it!  
Thus, ANY changes [suggestions ARE welcome] are UNLIKELY to be a potential improvement, and change is likely to be SLOW!

Q: [paraphrased from FIRST/only(?) Nov. 2010 "feedback" <-- Thank-you!!]  
Is there some [easy & fair] way of preventing "OBVIOUSLY [too] strong" WWd pairings ("stacked teams") who are likely to win easily?

A: [again, from PL -- his "opinions"/etc...]  
Short Answer = NO!  
Longer "Maybe" Answer (to this "good Q") in 4[5] parts below:

1. Why "judgment" of players' "skill" is imperfectly biased & etc.:
  - a. WHY/HOW can such a "stacked team" occur?  
This is INEVITABLE in RANDOM situations -- it WILL happen occasionally! Sometimes called "luck of the draw".  
Conversely, sometimes "painfully weak" teams (which few will notice) are also produced. Obviously, the "WWd System" [see I./II. 4. b. above] is meant to minimize BOTH situations and strive for "as much PARITY as is reasonably possible"!  
[NOTE: although multiple lotto winners are SUSPICIOUS:  
<http://www.cbc.ca/canada/calgary/story/2009/10/26/lottery-dispute-court-super7-ndabene-calgary.html>  
WW draws (since at least 2009) HAVE BEEN [half-]RANDOM!! ]
  - b. Basically, this gets back to issue of "judging" players' "skill" as opposed to using an unbiased evaluation system (like rankings) [see also II. 4. b. above].  
Due to injuries, "upsets", etc., even "elite" players can't always agree amongst themselves how they'd "seed" each other!! This problem of 2 "strong players" being "matched" is similar in WWs & WWd, except the outcomes are opposite! In WWs, 1 of the 2 MUST lose and thus get "abnormally low" points -- thus if the unseeded "strong player" loses, they will likely be a "dangerous (unseeded) floater" AGAIN next WWs! In WWd, the unseeded "strong player" is likely to gain enough points that they will be seeded NEXT WWd! (If not, they might be a "dangerous floater" again next WW...). So, by using a random system (though "imperfect" like ALL OTHER SYSTEMS), "self-corrections" SHOULD occur eventually...  
The above [I./II.] "system" \*IS\* a significant improvement over the pre-2010 set-up where some "decent" ("3.5" [see below]) players were able to finish #1 at year's end by getting lucky with 2 or 3 good partners then "protecting their points"... Getting 2 or 3 good partners could almost "guarantee" #1 in years past, but, this current system encourages PARTICIPATION to "prove" one's [more realistic] ranking!  
The problem of "judging" players (along with trying to "improve" GOOD/GREAT SYSTEMS) was brought to light in 2009 when the WWs were ALMOST "ruined" by an ill-advised IGNORANT "decree" to split WW's into "A" & "B" divisions. Besides disagreements (even among experienced players) regarding who were the "[A]dvanced" players, any actual attempt at implementing a NOT-COMpletely-THOUGHT-OUT-SYSTEM [unlike THIS document which reflects PL's attempt at creating a sufficiently detailed "manual"/guide to running "optimally efficient fair streamlined" WW's based also on valuable EXPERIENCE], would have been simply comically disastrous!  
[BTW, "Doubles proficiency" seems much harder to evaluate since partner "chemistry" can be a significant factor...]  
But, since "judging others" can be "fun"...
  - c. Based on the FINAL 2010 WW rankings, and PL's "estimation"... Of 64 listed WWs players, approx. 7 in Top-10 are "4.0+" [www.USTA.com/Play-Tennis/USTA-League/Information/1237\_NTRP/] MEN'S SINGLES players and there are approx. 6 others (including one woman) who are "under-ranked" [mostly due to infrequent play]; of these 13, PL would consider approx. 10 to also be "4.0+" in DOUBLES, with approx. 2-3 others being 4.0 DOUBLES but 3.5 SINGLES due to limited mobility/etc.  
Of the 69 listed WWd players, approx. 5 in Top-10 are "4.0+"

1. c. DOUBLES, with approx. 5 other "4.0+"s being "under-ranked"...  
Assuming we define a "stacked team" as 2 "4.0+" DOUBLES players teamed together, such occurrences should be fairly rare, and arguably only resulted in approx. 2 such "easy wins" in the 10 2010 WWd played.
- d. SINGLES ranking does NOT guarantee DOUBLES proficiency!  
<http://www.cbc.ca/sports/story/2010/08/09/sp-rogers-cup.html>  
[http://www.rogerscup.com/men/pdf/SMD\\_aug\\_15\\_10\\_revised.pdf](http://www.rogerscup.com/men/pdf/SMD_aug_15_10_revised.pdf)  
[http://www.rogerscup.com/men/pdf/MDD\\_aug\\_15\\_10\\_revised.pdf](http://www.rogerscup.com/men/pdf/MDD_aug_15_10_revised.pdf)  
tells the story of the #1 & #2 RANKED SINGLES players playing DOUBLES together at the 2010 Rogers Cup yet losing to a Canadian "Wild Card" [ranked too low to qualify for the draw without "special help"] team! [RN/ND appeared to have had enough success for "direct entry" into the DOUBLES draw(?)...]
- e. While judgment \*is\* used for scheduling match priorities [see I./II. 6. above], doing so generally has a MINIMAL effect upon the final MATCH results.
- f. Misc. issues:  
If "strongest team" broken up, shouldn't "weakest team" also? Some players \*WANT\* the challenge of playing "good" opponents and may wish to use the opportunity to "prove their skill"!
2. A POSSIBLE [time-consuming?] UNTRIED "system" of MAYBE FAIRLY(?) breaking up a LUCKY random "stacked team" [conceived 2010-11-06]:
  - a. There can be only ONE "overwhelmingly strong" team of "elite"/ "[A]dvanced"/"4.0+" DOUBLES players. (If there are 2, only 1 can "easily(?) win"!)
    - b. The "complainers" (players unhappy with the pairing; CAN include the 2 "elite players") MUST:
      - i. "shame" the "strong pairing" to agree to a possible split,
      - ii. convince the "weaker team(s)" [there could be a BYE involved and some players enjoy "playing up"] to also agree to a possible split,
      - iii. gather enough players for MULTIPLE votes where "clearly" a majority of those present voting can off-set the "I don't care and would rather continue warming up" = "No I do NOT want to waste valuable court time voting" = "NO!" votes who are "voting NO with their feet". The votes ("majority rules") would be (in order):
        - "Is this team TOO STRONG?" [remember: players unwilling to "come in" to vote are essentially saying "NO!"]
        - with input from TD/rankings/players/etc., multiple votes until majority (PRESENT AT VOTING since only their opinion matters at this point...) agrees upon a DOUBLES SKILL RANKING of 4 or 6 [if BYE involved] players. (Note that this requires PUBLICally identifying the "worst player of a [small] group" and COULD be embarrassing. Also, the "seeding #"s of the 2 or 3 players [remember that ALL WWd teams are "seeded"] can serve as an "aid", but, "relying" upon them solely kinda seems silly since that's what \*this\* "process" is trying to "enhance"...).
      - iv. NOTE: failure at ANY point above suggests that the "majority" wish this [unfair?] "process" to end immediately so matches can begin!
      - v. Create 2 or 3 NEW "as equitable as possible" teams by pairing the "strongest" with the "weakest" -- the "middle" team should be most "balanced".
      - vi. If 3 teams, MAYBE decide (more voting) if team with seeded player truly is [still] "deserving" of the 1R BYE...
      - vii. LEGIBLY print names of NEW teams on drawsheet.
    - c. Start 1R matches ASAP!
    - d. If ANYONE can propose a well-thought out & explained "better" system, please do!

3. IF above "system" had been "thought up" (& "accepted") by 2010-08-21 [date of the "unfair" WWd mentioned by original suggestion -- see 4. below]:
  - a. [Note: name abbreviations used to "protect"...]  
#2seeds\_PL/SN DID win the WWd "quite easily" (from their perspective...) [also, strongest WWd team of 2010?]
  - b.
    - i. no "shaming needed" -- would gladly have split up!
    - ii. assume #15seeds\_MD/BS agreed to split also.
    - iii. assume "majority" also wanted PL/SN to be split up.
    - v. new MUCH more "balanced" teams: PL/BS vs. SN/MD (1R)  
[based on BOTH 2010-08-21 WWs + WWd rankings...]
  - c. Even if PL/BS lost 2 straight matches, PL would almost certainly have still finished #1 at year's end...  
If SN lost his first match, he'd most likely still be an unseeded "dangerous floater" AGAIN at his NEXT WWd!
4. SPECIFIC RESPONSES to ORIGINAL SUGGESTION [broken up]:
  - a. "There should be a "rule" in place that does not allow two highly ranked players to be teamed."  
Actually, only PL was ranked high enough to be seeded for the 2010-08-21 WWd in question. The WWd system CLEARLY prevents "two highly ranked players [from being] teamed"!
  - b. "In this case one of the players (SN[edited to initials only]) had been out for the better part of a year and came back. Paired with [PL] who was ranked no 1."  
Actually, on 2010-08-21, PL was ranked #3 in WWd [#1 in WWs] and seeded #2 for that WWd. SN was ranked #11 in WWs & a low #43 in WWd (due to a very poor late-2009 result combined with 2 poor results in the 1st 2 2010 WWd; skipping the next 4). So, SN had a "legitimate" (albeit abnormally low for him) WWd ranking, as contrasted with "NEW" players who ALWAYS start off as "dangerous (unseeded) floaters"; again, it is usually IMPOSSIBLE to "insert" someone into the seedings...even professionals get "upset" [lose earlier that predicted based on rankings/judgment/etc.]!  
Although he played no more in 2010, SN did gain sufficient points to become a "low seed" for subsequent WWd...
  - c. "No competition for the rest of the season."  
Not sure about above meaning, but, the #1 season-ending WWd ranking was NOT YET SECURED at that point since there were 3 more scheduled WWd still to come. However, PL did agree at the time that this "lucky draw" [it \*WAS\* TRULY RANDOM unlike some past StG's draws NOT "overseen" by PL or others with INTEGRITY] was unnecessary since PL believed it was HIGHLY UNLIKELY that ANYONE would be able to "defend"/win enough WWd points to finish ahead of PL for 2010.
  - d. "Seen as NOT FAIR"  
SOME players, who do not understand or believe in lucky draws [understandable given StG's UNFORTUNATE "tradition" of NON-random pairings/draws/etc. (which PL has tried to ELIMINATE COMPLETELY from WW's!)], would understandably have such a misperception. However, it seems clear from the last 3 2010 WWd that PL did NOT need an "elite" partner to win...
  - e. Again, THANK-YOU for your FEEDBACK!!  
BTW, if the above is not a satisfactory answer, PLEASE provide "constructive criticism"!
5. Another Possible Solution to "Stacked Teams":
  - a. This involves "preventing" "stacked teams" from forming in the first place (BEFORE/while the draw is made up).
  - b. "Complainers" must be AWARE of unseeded/underseeded "strong DOUBLES players" ASAP, then identify GROUP of "elite players" who should NOT be paired together.
  - c. "Complainers" must gather "majority" of players to multi-VOTE on who "belongs" in such an "[A]dvanced group".

5. d. If MAJORITY agree on "group too strong to be partners with each other", then draw will be made randomly, except that such "illegal pairings" are "re-drawn". MUST BE CAREFUL TO ENSURE REMAINING DRAW \*STILL\* "RANDOM"!
- e. Sub-Q: Why not simply ask the TD to do all without "votes"?  
Sub-A: PL does NOT consider "Stacked Teams" a problem in the first place [i.e., would ignore BOTH of his solutions], AND asking the TD (who is also playing) to NON-randomly form certain teams would cause even more accusations!

Q: Why is "No-Ad" sometimes used? Are there alternatives/options?

A: No-Ad scoring [details in II.5.b. above] has been used sporadically in the past to "speed up" WW's (either when there were a LOT of players &/or "rain coming soon"). Since the vast majority of players present historically voted to "finish sooner", it was "officially" implemented in 2010. Finishing "sooner" has the following benefits:

1. Less defaults from "I gotta go to do..."
2. Less complaints from other members showing up "around noon"...
3. A good "mental test" & experience for players interested in other (e.g., TNS) competitions. TNS often uses "No-Ad Pro-Sets" for Consolations matches! For those uncomfortable with such "pressure", simply do NOT allow the score to get to Deuce! ; -)

For benefit/fairness of ALL, No-Ad must be used at least until Main Draw SF's and Consolations F[inal]; at such point, at most 3 courts are needed and "regular/full-Ad" can be used IF BOTH PLAYERS AGREE.


Q: "2010 Survey" WW Comments (from "Page 4. ...[Question]8. ...")

A: a. ALL already fully addressed above in this document!

b. Some elaborations to specific comment(s):

- # 1. ANY [well-thought out/through] "improvement" MUST be EASY to understand/implement/maintain/etc. YET still be "FAIR"...
- #2,4. WW's are "open" to ALL members & guests. Individuals will vary with regards to their experience/perception of WW's as being primarily "social" vs. "competitive". However, the WW "format" will NOT become more like the [Sun./Tue./Wed./Fri.] "social events", unless players WANT to bring snacks... ; -)  
BTW, WW's are NOT meant to be "Saturday morning day-care".
- #12. Inevitable waiting explained above.  
Besides necessitating(?) a name change to the "less poetic" "WeeTwiceWeekly" (or even worse "WeeSemiWeekly"), [note that the ambiguous "(Wee)BiWeekly" only works in UK] setting aside additional court time is a "big deal" (see rest of Survey...).
- #16. See Pages 12-15 above for detailed response... Again, ANY [well-thought out/through] "improvement" MUST be EASY to understand/implement/maintain/etc. YET still be "FAIR"...
- #23. "~6hrs"?? You must be a "Top-5" Singles player at StG's! ; -)

IV. APPENDIX:  
-----



INSTRUCTIONS: [Minimum requirements: dry & playable courts by 11am; 6 Singles[WWs] or 8 Doubles[WWd] players (depending upon which is scheduled on online "Calendar")]  
0. Print/get CURRENT WW rankings (from StGeorgeTennis.ca; likely can save ink+paper+time if most recently replaced rankingS printout from glass display case is available for [re-Juse...]).  
1. "Combine" rankings with list of players [usually started by Duty Host by 8:30am]; limited to FIRST 32 Singles or 48 Doubles players PRESENT by 9am (or whenever courts are playable).  
2. Non-randomly (following above #'s) SEED (based on rankings) top (highest ranked) HALF of players. "Advance" names in draw by 1/2/3 rounds when less than 17/9/5 "competitive units".  
3. BYEs ["automatic" for WWd]; distribute (PowerOfTwoDrawSize[32/16/8] - #ofPlayers) WWs byes following above "seeding numbers", starting with #1 on down.  
4. RANDOMLY distribute (with assistance of others & die/NumberedCardsOrPaper/etc.) remaining HALF=unseeded players. [Since this sheet is used for rankings AND is posted, please PRINT legibly!]  
5. MATCH PRIORITY: obviously, matches "earlier" in the draw MUST play ASAP; when equal "depth", Main Draw over Consolations, with "more competitive" (potentially longer) matches earlier.  
6. WARM-UP & SCORING: warm-up limited to 5 minutes; matches are "pro-sets" to 7 with a tie-break at 6-all; No-Ad scoring [must be enforced!] used when more than 24(WWs) or 37(WWd) players.  
7. REPORTING RESULTS: it is match WINNERS' responsibility to ensure correct scores are recorded -- LEGIBLE printing (with scores) helps those maintaining [website]rankings/WW/etc! !  
8. "OPEN COURTS": do NOT waste court time! Please "share" any "free" courts (NOT needed for tournament completion) with other members! Players still "IN" the draw may NOT book courts!  
9. ONLINE POSTING OF RESULTS: please get this drawsheet (or a scanned copy) to whomever is responsible for maintaining online results/rankings/etc. [WeeWeekly@StGeorgeTennis.ca] by Monday.  
10. More information/details/etc. can be found at StGeorgeTennis.ca

Last updated: 2011-02-08



## V. UPDATE HISTORY:

-----

2010-October:

1. Draft ("Version 0.9") of this document posted to StGeorgeTennis.ca for feedback.

2010-11-06:

1. Various "typos" corrected + minor clarifications/etc.
2. "Stacked" WWd teams Q answered in FAQ.

2011-02-08:

0. This "Version 1.0" (with changes [& location] below) posted to StGeorgeTennis.ca
1. Formatting/etc. further "cleaned up" + minor clarifications/etc.
2. [II.4.b.] "Tied Seeds" issue addressed.
3. [III.FAQ]
  - a. "Drawsheet Instructions" updated and moved to Section IV.
  - b. Idea of "PRE-Paid" RESERVED spots mentioned
  - c. "Stacked WWd teams" part "3.c." updated + "5. Another Possible Solution..." added
  - d. "No-Ad" clarification appended
  - e. "2010 Survey" WW Comments addressed [appended to end of FAQ]
4. [IV.] "Appendix" with [2011-] blank DrawSheet [with "pre-seeded" #'s] added.
5. [ V.] "IV. Recent questions/updates/etc." changed to " V. Update History".

2012-05-29:

0. This is now "Version 1.1"  
NEW stuff to be applied NOW, but, "integrated" in "Version 2.0":
1. Players withdrawing AFTER draw is made but BEFORE playing a single match receive 1 ranking point; failure to even show after calling in = 0 points.
2. Players receiving Main Draw default win(s), who then lose their FIRST ACTUAL match [in the Main Draw], MAY have 2 OPTIONS:
  - a. Accept their default wins as matches played+won and the GREATER accompanying ranking points, or
  - b. If NOT disruptive to the Consolations Draw, play their "guaranteed 2nd" match(es) (for LESS ranking points).
3. Add "FINISHED" time to Drawsheet (so that people looking at recent drawsheets posted in glass case have some idea...)
4. Q: Is there some way to compensate for players who play better/worse than expected/known (based on ranking/health/etc.) so that all WWd teams are as EQUALLY skilled as possible?  
A: Yes, but it would take a considerable amount of time+knowledge, and by the time teams were created, time/fatigue would serve to cause some players/teams to underperform. The WWd "system" is SPECIFICALLY designed to utilize FAIR RANKINGS to minimize the CHANCES of unusually strong/weak teams from being REPEATEDLY formed.