Landslaget

Information copy: Lars Lindin To:
Jean-Pierre Raick
Technical Director
Europen Kendo Federation

### Proposal for ranking system within EKF

#### 1 SUMMARY

It is possible to create an effective ranking system for the nations within EKF based on the results from the Europen Kendo Championships. The primary purpose of this ranking system is to be a yardstick by which each country can measure the development of its kendo relative the other EKF countries.

The method proposed in this document is based on the principle of how far into the individual championship grid the competitors of a country can reach.

In addition the method could probably be used also in the world championships to evaluate Europe with the rest of the world.

Included in this document are preliminary ranking lists for 1995, men only, and 1996 are provided.

#### 2 PURPOSE

The purpose of the ranking system is primarily to create a relative indicator between countries. E.g. the gap between two countries can easily be shown especially when a history of yearly ranking lists exists.

As the method is based on the total accomplishments of the individual competitors it will give a fair impression of the relative standard for a country, compared with a list of medals only. From the ranking lists further analysis could be initiated. Why is the gap so big? Why can some small countries, in membership, be on par, with larger ones? Why is this country climbing/sinking in the list? The results from such an analysis should be beneficial to the overall development of kendo in Europe.

However I expect that the first step must be to create the ranking system. Then depending on interest and the willingness of people analysis efforts could be started. I feel that the Europen Kendo Federation would gain a lot by introducing a ranking system such as this.

I as a coach for the swedish national team thinks that the results presented later in this document has both clarified the status of my own team as well as raised questions regarding the significant gap between us and the number one ranked team, France.

H: 08-722 9121

A: 08-719 4150

Hans Lundberg Fiskebyvägen 9 122 47 ENSKEDE Datum: 1996-08-15 Fil:KE96004.DOC Rev: A

### Landslaget

#### 3 METHOD

The basic hypothesis is to look at how many competitors that advance in the competition grid from respective country. An advancement to the next round gives one point and as we in Europe allow two to continue the winner of the pool is awarded an extra point. I have discarded results from extra qualifications rounds after the pool round but allowed a point for competitors that have advanced an extra round due to the composition of the grid.

This implies that theorethically a country could gain 7 points per round up until the quarter final. In reality some competitors will encounter a team mate already in the first knock-out round. But I do not consider this a problem as the number of points are more or less in direct relation to how many competitors a country can get out of the pool round, especially as pool winners.

I have not used the number of participants, that a country has entered the competition with, to modify the ranking. A country that does not use the allotted number of competitors does not gain anything in the ranking.

I consider this method to be a better indicator for a countries capabilities than the medals gained or placement in the team championship. The medals often will tell you nothing about the overall quality of a team, i.e. all seven members. A team with only three top competitors can win over a team with seven top competitors. But the proposed method would give a better picture of the actual standing between the two countries.

#### 4 ANALYSIS for 1995 and 1996

#### 4.1 General

I have analyzed the individual competions from the EKC 1995 in Glasgow (men only) and the EKC in Miscolc. I would like to point out that these lists are preliminary as I have not had the official results in all cases.

Abbreviations:

WP = Winner of Pool
OP = Out of Pool
Diff. = Difference since last year

#### 4.2 Comments to results - men

The most obvious result is the dominance of France. It indicates clearly a broad and even base within the national team. I have always known they were good but I am surprised by the gap presented here.

Also noteworthy are the results achieved by Hungary and Spain, as well as the stability of Italy and Finland. A warning must be raised for the 'new' countries Jugoslavia and Czech Republic. Disappointments are Germany and Netherlands from which I expected higher ranking.

From the perspective of the swedish team the result for both years gives me added confidence in our capabilities. We have had difficulties creating a winning team but are performing acceptably on the individual level.

#### 4.3 EKC 1995 Men - Individual

Hans Lundberg Datum: 1996-08-15

Rev: A

## Landslaget

Country	PW	OP	1/16	1/8	1/4	Semi	Final	Total
France	7	7	7	5	3	0	0	29
Finland	4	5	4	3	0	0	0	16
Italy	4	6	2	1	1	1	1	16
Germany	1	4	3	1	1	1	1	12
Sweden	3	5	2	1	0	0	0	11
Switzerland	1	5	3	1	0	0	0	10
UK	3	5	2	0	0	0	0	10
Hungary	1	5	2	1	1	0	0	10
Netherlands	1	3	2	1	1	1	0	9
Spain	2	3	2	1	0	0	0	8
Belgium	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	5
Norway	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	5
Austria	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
Israel	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
South Africa	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Denmark	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Iceland	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Luxemburg	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Romania	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

#### 4.4 EKC 1996 Men - Individual

Country	WP	OP	1/16	1/8	1/4	Semi	Final	Total	Diff.
France	7	7	6	3	1	1	1	26	-3
Spain	3	5	3	2	2	1	0	16	+8
Sweden	4	5	3	2	1	1	0	16	+5
Finland	2	6	3	2	1	0	0	14	-2
Italy	3	6	2	2	1	0	0	14	-2
Germany	1	5	3	2	1	1	1	14	+2
Hungary	2	6	3	2	1	0	0	14	+4
UK	2	6	4	0	0	0	0	12	+2
Switzerland	2	5	2	1	0	0	0	10	-
Jugoslavia	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	7	+7
Netherlands	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	6	-3
Czech Rep.	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	6	+6
Belgium	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	-1
Norway	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	4	-1
Austria	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	-
Bulgaria	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	+2
Luxemburg	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	-
Romania	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	-

Hans Lundberg Datum: 1996-08-15 Fiskebyvägen 9 Fil:KE96004.DOC 122 47 ENSKEDE Rev: A

## Landslaget

#### 4.5 EKC 1996 Women - Individual

Country	WP	OP	1/8	1/4	Semi	Final	Total
France	3	5	4	1	0	0	12
Germany	3	3	1	1	1	0	9
Switzerland	0	4	2	1	1	0	8
Finland	0	3	2	1	0	0	6
Italy	1	1	1	1	1	1	6
Netherlands	0	2	1	1	1	1	6
Hungary	1	2	2	1	0	0	6
UK	2	2	1	0	0	0	5
Spain	1	1	1	1	0	0	4
Belgium	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Romania	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Russia	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Jugoslavia	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Norway	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

Please use this proposal as input to the creation of a european ranking system.

Best regards,

Hans Lundberg