

Suburban Friendship League
**Conceptual Approach for Revising the
Wayne Gilbert Memorial Tournament**
(February 4, 2018)

Summary

The ability of the clubs to support the tournament in its current format requires a massive commitment in terms of fields and officials. Between 18 and 20 percent of the SFL games in a given season consist of tournament games, i.e., a significant percentage of the season's games are played on one weekend. It is not a question of "if" but "when" the SFL tournament in its current format can no longer be supported. The SFL has received four options to address the tournament issues that have been identified with the current system. Two of these options are designed to address the core problem with the current tournament format – demand for fields and, more important, game officials. A third option does not address these problems and actually increases the demands. The fourth option, while reducing the field and referee requirements slightly, does not appear to provide a significant enough reduction to ensure a long term solution for the current tournament issues. Accordingly, the SFL Commissioners are not recommending either option 3 or option 4 for adoption. The following is a summary of the four options considered.

- **Create four team single elimination tournament groups** – Under this proposal, the SFL would only have four team tournament groups that play using the current single elimination format. This proposal would result in about the same number of Saturday games as those supported by the clubs for the regular season games and would have about the same number of Sunday games as the current approach.
- **A tournament scheduled for two weeks** – Under this proposal, the regular season would be reduced by one week and the tournament would be expanded to cover two weeks. The tournament formats would be changed to ensure that virtually all teams participating in the tournament are scheduled for at least one game for each SFL game week, i.e., if the season is nine weeks, then each team would be scheduled for nine games. Under this approach, the referee requirements on a given tournament day are greatly reduced and fall below those that the clubs are required to support for their regular season games. For example, during the Fall 2017 season, clubs provided officials for about 255 games on a given regular season weekend. This proposal reduces the number of games that must be supported on a given tournament day by an average of 23 percent over those required by the current format. Specifically, clubs would have had to provide about 15 percent fewer officials on the regular season weekend that is being converted to the tournament and 28 percent fewer officials on the Saturday and Sunday of the actual Fall 2017 tournament weekend.
- **Change the tournament to address tournament format concerns expressed over past seasons** – This proposal was designed to address concerns over the current tournament

format that include teams playing an unequal number of games on the same day and teams not playing the same number of games to win a trophy. The SFL Commissioners are not recommending this proposal for adoption for several reasons that include (1) it does not address the fundamental problem of attempting to play so many games on one weekend and (2) while the total number of games are about the same as the current approach, the number of Sunday game slots increase significantly. Based on past experience, it is unclear whether the clubs could provide the necessary Sunday field slots and, most important, the officials to support the increased Sunday demand. The number of game officials needed to support the current one weekend tournament is the primary driver for generating a study of an alternative.

- **Change the tournament format to only play single elimination games and maintain the current system approach to creating tournament groups** – Under this approach, (1) all tournament groups, except those containing 3 teams, would be scheduled using the single elimination format, i.e., the top tournament teams would no longer be scheduled using the single elimination format and (2) all tournament groups would be established using the current process of pairing teams with comparable records together in a tournament group, i.e, 4, 5, 6, and 7 team single elimination groups would be created to group teams with comparable records together for the vast majority of tournament groups. An analysis of the Fall 2017 tournament showed that this approach would have reduced the number of Saturday tournament games from 319 to 301 games. However, these 301 games are still about 119 percent of the games that clubs would be expected for support on a given regular season week for the same number of teams.

While the options identified may appear to be simple and easy to understand, there are a number of implementation issues that need to be considered and some of these are complex. This paper is organized to, hopefully, make it easier to understand each of these proposals. A summary of each proposal is discussed below that is designed to provide a high level overview of each proposal and its advantages and disadvantages. For those that want more information on the implications and how a given proposal would be implemented, appendixes are provided where necessary. These appendixes are designed, much like the previous documents, to provide additional information on the implementation approach that would be used should the option be adopted and the information used in developing and evaluating a given proposal for historical purposes. In order to determine the impact of the proposed options, the Fall 2017 tournament was used to determine the actual impact of these proposed changes.

Table 1 below shows the number of games, using the Fall 2017 tournament teams, that would be scheduled each game day under each of the proposals.

Table 1: Comparison of Tournament Games Played Under the Various Tournament Options

Option	Week 8	Week 9 (Saturday)	Week 9 (Sunday)
Current	253	319	140
4 Team, Single Elimination Format	253	253	126
Two Week Tournament	215	229	101
Single Elimination – Priority to Higher Ranked Teams	253	247	223
Single Elimination – Current Tournament Format	253	301	134

Notes

- Only includes the tournament teams initially scheduled for the Fall 2017 tournament. Normally, some regular season teams do not participate in the tournament. For example, in the Fall 2017 season, 15 teams did not participate in the tournament when the schedules were initially developed.
- Some numbers in this table may differ slightly from those shown elsewhere in order to ensure comparability. This was caused by an odd number of tournament teams. In some cases the teams may have been rounded down for simplicity. These differences are considered immaterial.

The SFL Commissioners did not reach a consensus on which of the first two options should be recommended to the clubs for adoption and both have their strengths and weaknesses as discussed below.

BACKGROUND

This is not the first time that the SFL has undertaken a study of the tournament format and recommended substantial changes to it. The SFL web site has some of the papers that were developed in the past on the tournament issues. These can be found on the SFL Documents page under the Historical Documents page (<http://www.sflsoccer.org/historical-documents-2/>).

The ability of the clubs to support the tournament in its current format requires a massive commitment in terms of fields and officials. The following are some of the issues caused by the current tournament scheduling approach.

- During the regular season the SFL has about one game each weekend for every two teams with most of those being played on Saturday. For example, in the Fall 2017 season, an average weekend had about 260 games. On the other hand for the tournament weekend, a significant increase in games occurs. During the Fall 2017 tournament, about 460 games were scheduled – an increase of about 175 percent. Another way of looking at this is that between 18 and 20 percent of the SFL games in a given season consist of tournament games, i.e., a significant percentage of the season’s games are played on one weekend. Many clubs also have their House tournaments on the same weekend and the travel leagues also have games on this weekend. The end result is that having enough officials to cover all the games is a major problem.
- During the Fall 2017 tournament almost 70 “standard” fields were used for about 460 games – additional actual fields were used since Sunday fields were not the same as the Saturday fields in several cases
- The SFL currently has 12 age groups and normally all but one generally has two regular season divisions which translate into 23 tournament groups expected to play in the tournament round robin format.¹ In the Spring 2017 season, 22 tournament groups played using the round robin format.² These represented about 20 percent of the 108 tournament groups scheduled. While the rules allow for the top groups to play using the single elimination format, this is normally considered undesirable.
- The number of Saturday field slots impacts number of games that can be supported on a given field. In the fall season, many fields only have five slots since they do not have lights. In the Spring most fields normally have six Saturday slots. Accordingly, about 17 percent fewer field slots are available in the fall than the spring. About 75 percent of the tournament fields in the Fall 2017 season only had five slots.

When a field only has five Saturday slots, the ability to schedule the tournament is made more difficult since it reduces the potential tournament group combinations that can be used to schedule the tournament. The following are the scheduling combinations that can be used on fields that only have five Saturday slots.

- One 4-team round robin group (one slot not used).
- One 4-team single elimination and one 3-team round robin group (one slot not used).

¹ In the Fall 2017, we had fewer age groups with 2 divisions because the clubs did not identify enough division 1 teams.

² In order to accomplish the objective of having teams with comparable abilities play each other some additional round robin groups were created. Specifically, 3 team round robin groups were created rather than adopting 4, 5, 6, or 7 single elimination groups.

- Two four-team single elimination groups or two three team round robin groups (one slot not used).
- One four team and one 5-team single elimination group.
- One five team single elimination and one 3-team round robin group.
- One 6-team single elimination group (one slot not used).
- One 7-team single elimination group.

On the other hand, when 6 Saturday field slots are available, far more flexibility is provided to schedule tournament groups and provides about 17 percent more slots. This translates into not only being able to use the field slots more effectively but also allows the SFL to schedule more games on fewer fields. While this helps with fields, it does not address the referee issues associated with the current approach. The following are examples of additional scheduling combinations supported when 6 Saturday field slots.

- One 6-team single elimination group and one 4-team single elimination group.
- One four team round robin group and one 4-team single elimination group.
- Three four-team single elimination groups.
- Two five team single elimination groups.

In each of these cases, all six slots are used. Also, the first two are slight modifications of those used for the fields with five Saturday slots. Specifically, these combinations, as well as some others, are enabled by combining the one extra time slot with the time slot lost when only 5 Saturday field slots are available.

OPTIONS CONSIDERED

The SFL received proposals that resulted in the following three options for changing the tournament format.

- Create four team single elimination tournament groups.
- Play the tournament for two weekends.
- Change the tournament to address tournament format concerns expressed over past seasons.

- Change the tournament format to (1) eliminate round robin tournament games, except for 3 team groups and (2) maintain the current approach of assigning teams with comparable records to the same tournament group.

Each of these proposals is summarized below with additional information to better understand advantages and disadvantages and how a given proposal would be implemented in the referenced appendixes.

Adopt a Four-Team Single Elimination Tournament Format

Under this proposal, the tournament would still be held during one weekend with all teams divided into four team single elimination tournament groups where possible.³ All teams will play one game on Saturday with the winners playing for trophies on Sunday.

The primary advantage to this proposal is that the number of Saturday games that would need to be supported is about the same as those that the clubs need to support for the regular season games and the Sunday tournament games are about the same as those required by the current tournament format. Accordingly, this proposal addresses the primary concern with the current approach by reducing the field and game official requirements to a much more reasonable level. The following are some additional advantages.

- It maintains a more traditional view of a tournament, i.e., it is held during one weekend.
- Generally, no team is required to play more than game per day and all teams play the same number of games to receive a trophy.

The primary disadvantages to the proposal are the elimination of the round robin tournament groups for the top regular season teams and the ability to pair teams of comparable records together. The round robin tournament groups have been considered a desirable feature of the current tournament format and it is unclear how the elimination of this feature will be accepted by the clubs. Table 1 below shows how this would have been implemented for the regular season Under 16 Boys group two teams.

³ When the number of teams in a given age group are not even divisible by 4, then odd team tournament groups will be created. Specifically, if 3 teams are “left over”, then a 3 team round robin group will be created and one or two 5 team single elimination groups will be created to address those age groups where one or two teams are “left over”.

Table 2: Regular Season Group 2 Under 16 Boys Tournament Groups Using a 4 Game Single Elimination Schedule Format – Fall 2017 Season

Group	Game Point Percentage Range	Group	Game Point Percentage Range
1	100% – 92%	8	63% – 63%
2	92% – 88%	9	58% – 50%
3	88% – 81%	10	50% – 50%
4	79%	11	50% – 42%
5	79% – 75%	12	42% – 25%
6	75% – 67%	13	25%
7	67% – 63%		

As shown above, a number of tournament groups end up having teams competing against teams whose Game Point Percentage is higher or lower than their team rather playing each other. For example, tournament groups 9, 10, and 11 all have teams with a Game Point Percentage of 50 percent. However, only Group 9 has teams with the same Game Point Percentage. Group 8 has these teams play higher ranked teams while Group 9 has these teams playing lower ranked teams. In the actual Fall 2017 tournament schedule, all of these teams were placed in the same tournament group. However, in order to accomplish that objective, a standard tournament schedule was used that did not ensure that all teams played the same number of games for the “trophy games.”

The number of teams in a given age group will not always be evenly divisible by 4. In these cases a traditional single elimination tournament schedule will be used for these “odd team” tournament groups. Normally, the bottom tournament group is used to handle “odd team” tournament groups, e.g., if an age group has 25 teams, then the last tournament group would have 5 teams. However, two exceptions apply. First, the bottom group must have at least 4 teams since history has shown that the bottom teams drop out more often after the schedules are developed so that the games are actually played, i.e., the “odd team” tournament group would be moved up. Second, some exceptions may be made to better pair teams. Table 3 below shows some of the possible combinations.

Table 3: Examples of How Odd Team Scheduling Groups May Be Scheduled

Age Group Teams	4 Team Tournament Groups	Possible Odd Team Groups	Comments
25	5	5 Team	
26	4 or 5	3, 5, or 6 Team	Two 3 team, two 5 team, or one 6 team tournament group will be used depending on which provides the most competitive matches.
27	5 or 6	3 or 7	One 3 team and one 4 team or one 7 team tournament group will be used depending on which provides the most competitive matches.

Appendix III shows how the teams scheduled for the Fall 2017 tournament would have probably been scheduled using this methodology.

Tournament Games Scheduled for Two Weekends

Under this proposal, the regular season would be reduced by one week and the tournament would be expanded to cover two weeks and have three tournament days. The tournament formats would be changed to ensure that virtually all teams participating in the tournament are scheduled for at least one game for each SFL game week, i.e., if the season is nine weeks, then each team would be scheduled for nine games. The following are the primary advantages of this approach.

- The referee requirements on a given tournament day are greatly reduced and fall below those that the clubs are required to support for their regular season games. For example, during the Fall 2017 season, clubs provided officials for about 255 games on a given regular season weekend. This proposal reduces the number of games that must be supported on a given tournament day by an average of 23 percent over those required by the current format. Specifically, clubs would have had to provide about 15 percent fewer officials on the regular season weekend that is being converted to the tournament⁴ and 28 percent fewer officials on the Saturday and Sunday of the actual Fall 2017 tournament weekend.
- In most cases, teams would not have to play more than one game per day. The exceptions are the five and six team round robin tournament schedules which require some teams to

⁴ Part of this reduction was caused by teams deciding not to participate in the tournament.

play two games on the same day because of the way the tournament groups are created. During the Fall 2017 season, only three tournament groups used these formats which represent less than 3 percent of the tournament groups.

- The overall objective of the tournament, as stated in the season registration letter, is accomplished, i.e., (1) teams can be assigned to tournament groups in a manner that matches teams with comparable abilities regardless of how well they did in the regular season and (2) reasonable assurance is provided that each team is assured of being scheduled to play, on average, one game per game week.

The proposed approach has several disadvantages with many of these also associated with the current approach. The major disadvantage is the elimination of one game for most teams. Overall, the SFL would have had 167 fewer games (about 6.6 percent) of the 2,544 games scheduled for the Fall 2017 season if this proposal had been adopted. This translates to an average of a one game loss for about 66 percent of the teams that participated in the Fall 2017 tournament. The following are some other disadvantages.

- Increased tournament confusion. The proposed change will greatly increase the complexity of the tournament over the current format for the coaches and to a lesser extent the clubs. For example, the current approach makes it fairly clear that the teams playing in the last game(s) of the tournament group on Sunday are playing for trophies. Although the tournament package also discusses this, the SFL still receives inquiries asking about whether third place trophies are awarded for 3, 4, and five team tournament groups. The proposed approach increases this complexity since it is not clear when a game is being played for trophies since games are being added to help ensure that teams are scheduled for a certain number of games in a season, e.g., nine games in a 9-week season. The four team single elimination group is a good example of this. On the last game day for that scheduling group two games are scheduled. One game is for first and second trophies while the other game is only being played to increase the number of games scheduled for those teams. While the tournament materials will be adjusted to help reduce this problem, it is still expected to cause confusion and additional efforts on the part of the SFL.
- Teams do not play the same number of games when playing for a trophy for some tournament formats. This is also a weakness with the current approach and is not a problem for the four team round robin schedule and the four team single elimination schedule.
- Risk of tournament group cancellation increases significantly. As noted in the tournament rules, if one tournament game is cancelled, then generally the remaining tournament games are cancelled. Under the current approach the risk of a game cancellation is limited to one weekend. Expanding the tournament to two weekends significantly increases the risks of a tournament group being cancelled. Part of this risk is

mitigated because more tournament games are being played on turf fields than in the past. However, a significant number of tournament games are played on grass fields. Another possible mitigation is to move tournament games that are cancelled on the first week to the fields used on week two (games cancelled during week two would still cancel all remaining games in that tournament group). Whether this can be accomplished is unknown until the implementation methodology is developed. If possible, it will probably have a significant dependence of the type of tournament schedule used. For example, it is much easier to move the two four-team single elimination group games cancelled during week one to week two than when a four or more team round robin group is cancelled or a six or seven-team single elimination group is cancelled.

- The scheduling for the tournament will probably have to start one week earlier. This means that the basis for forming the groups will not be as sound as the current approach. A review will be undertaken to determine whether the tournament can still be scheduled after week six for a 9-week regular season.
- Games not relating to trophy determination may not get played. One unanswered question is whether the tournament games that are designed to provide teams with a ninth game but no trophies will be played. The current tournament format has extra games in the six and seven team single elimination groups for losers in the previous games to determine who wins the third place trophies. We have seen a number of cases where one of these teams did not show up for their third place trophy game. During the Fall 2017 season we had two of these cases. In some cases this was because the game was on Sunday and in other cases it was because the team was not in the running for a first place trophy. In the cases where teams are willing to play an extra game when it is scheduled on Saturday rather than Sunday, then that extra game has a high probability of getting played and the proposed approach offsets the regular season game loss. In only one case is the extra game on Sunday. The SFL will monitor this situation and see if scheduling games designed to only ensure that teams are scheduled to play an average of one game per game week results in the games actually getting played. If many of these games do not get played, then in future seasons the SFL will probably recommend that they be eliminated since it costs clubs money when tournament games are not played.

Appendix I contains additional information on this proposal.

Change Tournament Format to Address Problems With Existing Format

A proposal was received to address problems that have been expressed over the prior seasons with the current tournament format. This proposal included the following requirements.

- All teams play the same amount of games to win a trophy and all teams play the same number of games each day.

- The top one third regular season teams play a guaranteed two games using a new four game format. The remaining teams will play in eight team single elimination groups.

In order to accomplish these objectives, the following game structure would be used.

- **4 Team (4 games – 2 Saturday games and 2 Sunday games)** – Increase of one game for 3rd place (as compared to old four team single elimination format). Used as the preferred method for top one third regular season teams. Each team is guaranteed two games.
- **8 Team (7 games – 4 Saturday games and 3 Sunday games)** – This format is used for the teams not scheduled using the four team format, i.e., the regular season teams not ranked in the top 33 percent.

This proposal would address several concerns with the current approach regarding the teams being required to play an unequal number of games to receive a trophy and having to play two games on the same day when other teams do not. However, the proposal does not address the primary problem of the current tournament format – reducing the demand for tournament officials and fields. In fact, it increases those demands on Sunday. Because it does not address the primary issues relating to the review of the tournament format and other issues discussed in Appendix II, the SFL Commissioners are not recommending that the clubs adopt this proposal.

Eliminate Round Robin Tournament Groups

Under this proposal, the current approach of creating tournament groups would remain the same, i.e., teams with comparable records would be paired together and play games using the current single elimination game schedules, i.e., four, five, six, and seven team single elimination schedules. The only real difference is that the top tournament groups would no longer play using the round robin format. By eliminating the round robin games, the number of tournament games should decrease which should reduce the field and game official requirements.

An analysis of the Fall 2017 tournament schedule shows that while the total number of games would decrease slightly, the Saturday game slots needed would still be about 20 percent more than a regular season game weekend for the teams scheduled for the Fall 2017 tournament. Table 4 shows how this change would have affected the Fall 2017 tournament.

Table 4: Impact of Converting the Fall 2017 Tournament to Single Elimination Tournament Groups

Type Schedule	Groups	Saturday Games Actual	Saturday Games – Proposed	Sunday Games – Actual	Sunday Games – Proposed
3 Team – Round Robin	13	26	26	13	13
4 Team – Round Robin	6	24	12	24	12
5 Team – Round Robin	3	15	9	6	3
4 Team – Single Elimination	39	78	78	39	39
5 Team – Single Elimination	24	72	72	24	24
6 Team – Single Elimination	11	44	44	22	22
7 Team – Single Elimination	12	60	60	24	24
Total	108	319	301	140	134

Note: If the 3 team round robin groups had been converted to 4 team single elimination tournament groups, the best case would be that the Saturday game slot requirements would have been reduced by 6 slots and the Sunday game slot requirements would have been reduced by 3 slots.

The regular season game slots required to support the teams playing in the tournament would have totaled about 252 field slots. Assuming all these games had been played on Saturday, then this option would have still required about 19 percent more Saturday game slots than a regular season game weekend. Another way of looking at this is that this option only reduces the current Saturday game slot requirements by less than 6 percent.

While this option reduces the number of tournament games being played, it does not address some of the complaints with the current approach, e.g., teams playing an unequal number of games to receive a trophy, etc. In fact, it increases the number of tournament groups where this is the case. In addition, as with the thwoe other proposals that only use the single elimination format, it eliminates the round robin tournament format for the top tournament groups. The round robin tournament groups have been considered a desirable feature of the current tournament format and it is unclear how the elimination of this feature will be accepted by the clubs. Since the number of tournament games are not reduced enough to address the primary problem with the current tournament approach – significant increased demands for game officials and fields over the regular season – and it does not address some of the primary complaints with the current approach, the SFL Commissioners are not recommending this option be adopted.

Playing the Tournament for Two Weekends

This appendix provides additional information on the proposal to conduct the tournament for two weekends. It discusses how the game schedules will be developed and conceptually implemented along with the advantages and disadvantages with the proposed change.

GAME SCHEDULES

Playing the tournament for two weekends has advantages and disadvantages. One of the disadvantages is that every team, regardless of whether they desire to participate in the tournament, loses one regular season game. Accordingly, in order to help compensate for the game lost, the standard tournament schedules will be developed to allow the losers of the initial games in most of the single elimination tournament groups to play an additional game. This allows almost every team to be scheduled for nine games in a 9-week season or eight games in an 8-week season.⁵ Under the current approach, each team, using a 9-week season, is scheduled for nine games with about 50 to 60 percent scheduled for 10 or 11 games.

It is envisioned that the same standard schedules, with some modifications would be used. These modifications are needed so that the vast majority of teams would play two tournament games regardless of whether they lost their first game. Accordingly, the overall objective of the tournament, as stated in the season registration letter, is being accomplished with the proposed tournament modification, i.e., (1) teams can be assigned to tournament groups in a manner that matches teams with comparable abilities regardless of how well they did in the regular season and (2) reasonable assurance is provided that each team is assured of being scheduled to play, on average, one game per game week.

In order to evaluate the impact of these schedule changes we applied the modified schedules and then compared the number of games under the current approach for the Fall 2017 tournament. Overall, the tournament would consist of 545 games rather than the 459 games under the current approach. However, these games would occur for three days rather than two days which greatly reduces the field and game officials needed to support the tournament games. As shown in Table

⁵ As noted elsewhere, the proposed 5 and 7 team single elimination tournament groups have one team that is not assured of having at least two games due to the scheduling complexities. Using the Fall 2017 tournament groups, this limitation had the potential to affect 36 teams. This represented about one third of the tournament groups or about 7 percent of the teams. However, over 55 percent of these teams played a second game so only about 3.2 percent of the teams scheduled in the Fall 2017 tournament would have not accomplished the objective of playing 2 tournament games.

1 below, number of Saturday and Sunday games on the traditional tournament weekend would be reduced by almost 30 percent each day.

Table 1: Comparison of Tournament Games

Day	Current Approach	Proposed Approach	Increase/ (Decrease)
1	253 ⁶	215	(38) – 15%
2	319	229	(90) – 28%
3	140	101	(39) – 28%
Total	712	545	(167) – 23%

It is important to note that this proposal results in fewer games during the season. Specifically, using this approach in the Fall 2017 season would have resulted in 167 fewer games (about 6.6 percent) of the 2,544 games scheduled for the Fall 2017 season. In effect, about 60 percent of the teams would lose a game. However, the vast majority of teams losing games will still average at least one game per SFL game weekend. Specifically, as shown in Table 2 below, during the Fall 2017 tournament 36 teams played in five and 7 Team Single Elimination tournament groups. Under the revised schedules, these two tournament formats have one team that does not play a second tournament game if it loses its first game. Accordingly, 36 (about 7 percent) of the 507 teams scheduled for the Fall 2017 season tournament would probably not be scheduled in a manner that made sure that they were scheduled to play nine games had this proposed format been adopted for the Fall 2017 season.

⁶ Under the current approach, these are the regular season games that are expected to be scheduled. When the tournament is spread over two weeks, these games are replaced by tournament games.

Table 2: Group Structure and Game Format Used for the Fall 2017 Tournament

Tournament Format	Number of Groups
3 Team – Round Robin	13
4 Team – Round Robin	6
5 Team – Round Robin	3
4 Team – Single Elimination	39
5 Team – Single Elimination	24
6 Team – Single Elimination	11
7 Team – Single Elimination	12
Total	108

While the same eight standard tournament schedule options will be used to schedule the tournament groups, e.g., four team round robin, seven team single elimination, etc., some additional games are needed for the single elimination schedules. These additional games are needed to support the objective of having each team scheduled to play an average of one game per week. Specifically, games are needed for the teams that lose in their initial game so that they can play a second tournament game. For example, in a four-team single elimination group, the two teams losing their first round game play a game against each other. While the game between these two teams does not result in any trophies, i.e., the winner does not receive third place trophies, they do ensure that the two teams are scheduled to play nine games in a 9-week season.

Table 3 below shows how the revised standard tournament groups are structured. The shaded cells show the games added to support the objective of scheduling teams so that they can, on average, at least one game for each game week in the season.

Table 3: Standard Tournament Game Schedules for Proposed Approach

Format	Teams	Day 1/ Slot 1	Day 1/ Slot 2	Day 1/ Slot 3	Day 2/ Slot 1	Day 2/ Slot 2	Day 2/ Slot 3	Day 3/ Slot 1	Day 3/ Slot 2
3 Team Round Robin	3	T1 v T2			T1 v T3			T2 v T3	
4 Team Round Robin	4	T1 v T4	T2 v T3		T1 v T3	T2 v T4		T1 v T2	T3 v T4
5 Team Round Robin⁷	5	T1 v T2	T3 v T4		T1 v T5	T2 v T3	T4 v T5	TBD	TBD
6 Team Round Robin⁸	6	T1 v T2	T3 v T4	T1 v T3	T4 v T6	T2 v T3	T5 v T6	TBD	TBD
4 Team Single Elimination	4	T1 v T4	T2 v T3		WG1 v WG2	LG1 v LG2			
5 Team Single Elimination⁹	5	T4 v T5	T2 v T3		T1 v WG1	LG1 v LG2		WG2 v WG3	
6 Team Single Elimination	6	T3 v T6	T4 v T5		T1 v WG1	T2 v WG2	LG1 v LG2	WG3 v WG4	LG3 v LG4
7 Team Single Elimination⁷	7	T4 v T5	T3 v T6	T2 v T7	T1 v WG1	WG2 v WG3	LG1 v LG2	WG4 v WG5	LG4 v LG5

ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES

As with any change, there are advantages and disadvantages with the proposed approach. In addition, it is important to remember that some items may first appear to be an advantage or

⁷ Team 5 is required to play two games on one day. This is unavoidable since it is an odd team scheduling group.

⁸ Teams 1 and 6 are required to play two games on one date. This is unavoidable since it is an odd team scheduling group.

⁹ If Team 1 loses its game, then it will not play 2 tournament games. This is unavoidable since attempting to handle this potential issue is very difficult and there are no reasonable options to address the problem. However, the schedule is designed to have the game for Team 1 to play against the winner of the two lowest ranked teams (Team 4 and Team 5).

disadvantage but upon further analysis, that is not the case. The impact on SFL team registration fees is a good example of this. The total items listed for the advantages and disadvantages below should not be used to determine whether the proposal should be adopted or rejected since some issues are more important than others. Overall, the SFL Commissioners believe that the advantages outweigh the disadvantages and this proposal and, if adopted by the clubs, should ensure the long term viability of the Wayne Gilbert Memorial Tournament.

Impact on SFL Team Registration Fees

One important item that is considered neither an advantage nor a disadvantage is the proposal's impact on team registration fees. Because the increased number of tournament games, the SFL will have to increase its team registration fees because of the increased number of tournament games. Specifically, the SFL will incur more costs to reimburse the clubs for the tournament games they cover. However, this increased cost is more than offset by the game officiating costs that the clubs normally incur for the regular season games that are being eliminated. As noted above, the overall number of SFL games is expected to decline which means that the clubs will incur lower overall game officiating costs.

In effect, the clubs are simply transferring some of the game officiating costs they currently incur to the SFL. For example, assume that a club has 12 Under 16/19 teams. Normally six of these teams would be playing at home on the last game of the regular season, e.g., week eight. Using the current game reimbursement rate, they would incur \$750 in game officiating costs for these six games. Under the proposal, these six games would be replaced with tournament games. Assuming that the first day of the tournament the club also hosted six U16/19 games, the SFL would reimburse the club \$750. Accordingly, the club would not have an overall increase or decrease in its game officiating cost. The Procedures and Processes – Tournament Scheduling (July 12, 2014) document discusses this concept.

“In order to ensure that a given club does not incur an unreasonable expense in hosting a tournament site for officials, the SFL reimburses the clubs for the officials provided based on the number of games covered and the age group. These rates are set at the preseason meeting and come from the registration fees. A club that hosts about one tournament game for each team registered will receive a reimbursement for officials that is about equal to the amount of the registration fee that will be used to pay tournament officials. In effect, it is a wash and, based on the Spring 2010 fees, the club would receive all but \$85 to \$90 for each team back from the amount of the payment it made to the SFL.”

Proposal's Advantages

The proposal's key advantage is that it significantly reduces the current approach's field and referee requirements and should ensure the long term viability of the Wayne Gilbert Memorial Tournament. Specifically, the proposed approach is designed to generate field and referee

requirements that are consistent with current season requirements for the Saturday games and less than the current requirements for the Sunday games. In contrast, continuing the current approach for the tournament will result in the eventual elimination of the tournament due to the field and referee requirements. It is really not a question of “if” but “when” the tournament will need to be dropped if the current approach is retained. The following are additional advantages.

- Eliminates the requirement for a team to play two games on the same day while the opponent is only required to play one game in all but two standard tournament schedules – the five team and six team round robin schedules. Three tournament groups used the five team round robin format while none of the tournament groups used the six team round robin format in the Fall 2017 tournament. Historically, the six team round robin format is used for one or maybe two tournament groups.
- The proposed tournament schedule can be “fit” into the existing regular season game slots for the Saturday games needed by a club to support its teams. Accordingly, the minimum number of Saturday game slots required when providing a tournament field to the SFL may be able to be reduced from five to four. The primary reason for this potential change is that only two tournament schedules require a team to play two games on the same day and these two standard schedules are not used for a vast majority fo the tournament groups. While a team may end up playing three games on three different fields, this is really not that much different that we have now when a team uses one field for its final regular season game, another field for its Saturday tournament game, and another field for its Sunday game. Whether the number of required field slots can be reduced, will not be known until the implementation methodology is developed.
- Maintains the current approach’s ability to “mix and match” tournament groups to maximize the field slots provided and continues the benefit of the current approach’s reduced need for Sunday slots. In addition, it may also provide even more flexibility for scheduling games depending on how it is implemented. At this time the actual implementation approach has not been defined so it is unclear whether the increased flexibility will be accomplished.
- In the case of the four team single elimination format, it eliminates the requirement for a team to play on Sunday. As noted above, during the Fall 2017 tournament, 39 or about 36 percent of the tournament groups used the four team single elimination game format. The SFL has received requests to only have tournament games on Sunday in the past.
- The proposed approach accomplishes the objective of having a team scheduled to play an average of one game per week during the SFL season for the vast majority of teams. During the Fall 2017 season, if the proposed approach had been adopted, 36 (about 7 percent) of the 507 teams scheduled for the Fall 2017 season tournament would have played in a tournament group that potentially would have resulted in the team not being

scheduled to play nine games. However, more than 55 percent of these teams played a second game so only about 3.2 percent of the teams scheduled in the Fall 2017 tournament would have not accomplished the objective of playing two tournament games.

Proposal's Disadvantages

The proposed approach has several disadvantages with many of these also associated with the current approach. The major disadvantage is the elimination of one game for most teams. As discussed above, overall, the SFL would have had 167 fewer games (about 6.6 percent) of the 2,544 games scheduled for the Fall 2017 season if this proposal had been adopted. This translates to an average of a one game loss for about 66 percent of the teams that participated in the Fall 2017 tournament. The following are some other disadvantages.

- **Increased tournament confusion.** The proposed change will greatly increase the complexity of the tournament over the current format for the coaches and to a lesser extent the clubs. For example, the current approach makes it fairly clear that the teams playing in the last game(s) of the tournament group on Sunday are playing for trophies. The tournament package also discusses this. Even with this, we still get inquiries asking about whether third place trophies are awarded for 3, 4, and five team tournament groups.

The proposed approach increases this complexity since it is not clear when a game is being played for trophies since games are being added to help ensure that teams are scheduled for a certain number of games in a season, e.g., nine games in a 9-week season. The four team single elimination group is a good example of this. On the last game day for that scheduling group two games are scheduled. One game is for first and second trophies while the other game is only being played to increase the number of games scheduled for those teams. While the tournament materials will be adjusted to help reduce this problem, it is still expected to cause confusion and additional efforts on the part of the SFL.

- **Teams do not play the same number of games when playing for a trophy for some tournament formats.** This is also a weakness with the current approach and is not a problem for the four round robin schedules and the four team single elimination schedule. Table 4 shows the number of teams that can potentially play fewer games.

Table 4: Tournament Schedules Where Teams Do Not Play the Same Number of Games

Tournament Format	Teams	Team(s) Potentially Playing One Less Game
5 Team Single Elimination	5	1
6 Team Single Elimination	6	2
7 Team Single Elimination	7	1

While the above schedules can create conditions where one team does not play the same number of games in the “trophy round” as their opponent, this is not always the case. Specifically, in the 5, 6, and seven team single elimination schedules, both teams that advance to a given “trophy game” may have played the same number of games earlier. Interestingly, in the six team single elimination format, all four teams advancing to the trophy games can end up playing the same number of games, e.g., the teams playing for first and second place trophies have both played two previous games while the teams playing for third have only played one game.

When the standard tournament schedules were initially developed, it was recognized that the standard schedules for the single elimination groups, other than four teams, could result in teams playing for the trophies may play an unequal number of games. However, this is a good example of competing priorities. Specifically, a primary objective is to have teams of comparable ability play each other during the tournament. Adopting a standard tournament scheduling group for the single elimination tournament groups, i.e., four team single elimination schedule, would not always accomplish this objective. The Under 16 Boys regular season group two provides a good example of the impact of using the one standard single elimination tournament schedule where the teams play the same number of games, i.e., four team. Table 5 shows how this would work out.

Table 5: Regular Season Group 2 Under 16 Boys Tournament Groups Using a 4 Game Single Elimination Schedule Format – Fall 2017 Season

Group	Game Point Percentage Range	Group	Game Point Percentage Range
1 (round robin)	100% – 92%	7	67% – 63%
2	92% – 88%	8	58% – 50%
3	88% – 81%	9	50% – 50%
4	79%	10	50% – 42%
5	79% – 75%	11	42% – 25%
6	75% – 67%	12 and 13	25%

As shown above, a number of tournament groups end up having teams playing other teams whose Game Point Percentage is higher or lower than their team. For example, tournament groups 8, 9, and 10 all have teams with a Game Point Percentage of 50 percent. However, only group nine has teams with the same Game Point Percentage. Group 8 has these teams play higher ranked teams while Group 9 has these teams playing lower ranked teams. In the actual Fall 2017 tournament schedule, all of these teams were placed in the same tournament group. However, in order to accomplish that objective, a standard tournament schedule was used that did not ensure that all teams played the same number of games for the “trophy games.”

- Risk of tournament group cancellation increases significantly.** As noted in the tournament rules, if one tournament game is cancelled, then generally the remaining tournament games are cancelled. Under the current approach the risk of a game cancellation is limited to one weekend. Expanding the tournament to two weekends significantly increases the risks of a tournament group being cancelled. Part of this risk is mitigated because more tournament games are being played on turf fields than in the past. However, a significant number of tournament games are played on grass fields. Another possible mitigation is to move tournament games that are cancelled on the first week to the fields used on week two (games cancelled during week two would still cancel all remaining games in that tournament group). Whether this can be accomplished is unknown until the implementation methodology is developed. If possible, it will probably have a significant dependence of the type of tournament schedule used. For example, it is much easier to move the two four-team single elimination group games cancelled during week one to week two than when a four or more team round robin group

is cancelled or a six or seven-team single elimination group is cancelled. The following is one possible scenario.

Example

The field that hosts a 4-team single elimination group is closed due to weather on week one. Accordingly, the first two games are cancelled. These two games can be moved to week two in the two slots already reserved to play that group's championship game and the game between the losers of the first round games. Assuming a Sunday slot is available, then the championship game can then play on Sunday. While the losers of the first round game will lose a game, it is much better than canceling the tournament games in the tournament group. Since the field closing would be known a week before the new Sunday game would be added, it would give the clubs and SFL enough time to determine whether field slots and game officials could be provided to support this new Sunday game.

- **The scheduling for the tournament will probably have to start one week earlier.** This means that the basis for forming the groups will not be as sound as the current approach. A review will be undertaken to determine whether the tournament can still be scheduled after week six for a 9-week regular season.
- **A significant amount of system development effort will be required to support this change.** It is expected that this can be accomplished for the Spring 2018 season. However, if it is not completed, then the existing approach will be used. Specifically, an eighth regular season game will be added and the tournament will be conducted on one weekend.
- **Games not relating to trophy determination may not get played.** One unanswered question is whether the tournament games that are designed to provide teams with a ninth game but no trophies will be played. The current tournament format has extra games in the six and seven team single elimination groups for losers in the previous games to determine who wins the third place trophies. We have seen a number of cases where one of these teams did not show up for their third place trophy game. During the Fall 2017 season we had two of these cases. In some cases this was because the game was on Sunday and in other cases it was because the team was not in the running for a first place trophy. In the cases where teams are willing to play an extra game when it is scheduled on Saturday rather than Sunday, then that extra game has a high probability of getting played and the proposed approach offsets the regular season game loss. In only one case is the extra game on Sunday. The SFL will monitor this situation and see if scheduling games designed to only ensure that teams are scheduled to play an average of one game per game week results in the games actually getting played. If many of these games do

APPENDIX I

APPENDIX I

not get played, then in future seasons the SFL will probably recommend that they be eliminated since it costs clubs money when tournament games are not played.

Tournament Proposal – One Tournament Weekend

The SFL received a proposal to change the current tournament format to address concerns that have been raised over the seasons with the current approach. This appendix discusses the proposal and the issues it is designed to address. It also provides the SFL's observations on the proposal and how the proposal would have been implemented using the Fall 2017 tournament teams. As envisioned, the proposal would have generated about the same number of games as the current system.

PROPOSAL AND ISSUES ADDRESSED

Since it is impossible to truly assign teams correctly at week 5/6 (or even at the final week) the following improvement goals should be kept in mind when grouping and designing a playoff system to equalize the imbalance when creating the groups:

- All teams play the same amount of games to win a trophy (no advantage).
- All teams play the same number of games each day (no advantage).
- The earliest Saturday games will be assigned to the teams closest to the field in distance (reduces the home field advantage and travel time advantages).
- The top one third teams will get to play a guaranteed two games using the new four game format.
- More trophies awarded to the teams who did better in the regular season (top one third) using the new four team playoff bracket (first, second, and third).
- The new even number game system will be used first for all games. However, if the total number of teams in the group does not allow for equal distribution, then one odd team group will be created.
- The total number of games played in the new even team format will be kept similar to the odd team format so field and referee coordination can be maintained.
- With the even team format, the team receiving a trophy will be on the field (fixes issue with the round robin format).

New Game Formats (no byes or more games played by one team on the same day advantage)

- **4 Team (4 games – 2 Saturday games and 2 Sunday games)** – Increase of one game for 3rd place (as compared to old four team single elimination format). Used as the preferred method for top one third teams. Each team is guaranteed two games.
- **6 Team (6 games – 3 Saturday games and 3 Sunday games or 5 Saturday games and 1 Sunday game)** – Same number of games as current format but no team gets a bye.
- **8 Team (7 games – 4 Saturday games and 3 Sunday games)** – The new eight team format has the same number of games as the current seven team format.

ANALYSIS OF PROPOSAL

While the proposal stated that an odd team format would be used for odd team “age group groups,” none was provided in the proposal. For example, it is unclear how many teams should be placed in this odd team group or how they should be scheduled to accomplish the objectives laid out in the proposal. Accordingly it was assumed that a team would need to be eliminated from the tournament for simplicity although, if implemented, no teams would be eliminated. The following discusses each of the items in the proposal.

- **All teams play the same amount of games to win a trophy** – The current tournament approach also provides this for the round robin groups and four team single elimination groups.¹⁰ The proposal eliminates the round robin groups which are generally used for the top teams in each regular season “age group group.” It is unclear whether the elimination of the round robin format is should be considered an important factor to consider in evaluating this proposal. For simplicity, it was not considered as a factor in this analysis other than to note it as a potential issue.
- **All teams play the same number of games each day** – The current tournament approach also provides this for the four team single elimination group and the round robin groups except the three team round robin group. In addition, it does not appear that this could be accomplished for the odd team group that would be needed for odd team tournament groups. In the Fall 2017 season, 10 of the 90 tournament groups would have been scheduled using an odd team scheduling group, i.e., about 90 percent of the groups would have accomplished this objective. Under the current approach about 44 percent of the tournament groups accomplished this objective.

¹⁰ In the Fall 2017 season, about 56 percent of the tournament groups played using these formats. These groups also represented about 46 percent of the teams scheduled.

The proposal also eliminates the round robin groups which are generally used for the top teams in each regular season “age group group.” It is unclear whether the elimination of the round robin format should be considered an important factor to consider in evaluating this proposal. For simplicity, it was not considered as a factor in this analysis other than to note it as a potential issue.

- **The earliest Saturday games will be assigned to the teams closest to the field in distance** – It is unclear how this should be implemented and how to resolve conflicts. For example, the proposal appears to require that the team pairings be strictly based on ranking, e.g., Team 1 plays Team 8, Team 2 plays Team 7 etc. It is unclear what happens when the pairings result in teams that have one close and one “far away” team for all the games. In addition, this would require a great deal of manual effort. As shown below, using the proposed structure for the Fall 2017 tournament, 90 tournament groups would have been created rather than the 108 tournament groups. While this is a significant reduction, it would still be a massive error-prone effort to manually schedule those games to achieve this travel objective.
- **The top one third teams will get to play a guaranteed two games using the new four game format** – It is unclear whether this is a significant advantage over the current approach. The current approach ensures that all teams in the round robin groups play at least two and in many cases three games. Since most of the tournament groups using the round robin approach are already in the top one third of the teams, they would not have an increase in games and may have a decrease since many of the round robin groups allow teams to play three games in most cases. In the single elimination groups, many teams also play two games while this proposal would only have 50 percent of the teams in the bottom two thirds team only play one game.

Another important consideration in using the proposed four team format so that all the top one third teams can play two games is that this eliminates the round robin games that are currently used for the teams in the top tournament group based on the regular season “age group groups.” Accordingly, teams no longer play, for practicable purposes, the other teams in their tournament group to determine the first and second place teams. Rather, the results of the first game they play, determine whether they will get to play for first and second place trophies. It is unclear whether the elimination of the round robin format games would be considered as an advantage to the top teams especially if they lost their first game.

- **More trophies awarded to the teams who did better in the regular season (top one third) using the new four team playoff bracket (first, second, and third)** – Overall the number of trophies would probably decrease. As noted above, the number of tournament

groups would have decreased by 28 in the Fall 2017 season based on this proposal. This would have eliminated 56 teams from getting a trophy. The number of third place trophies would have increased. Specifically, based on the proposal, 47 third place trophies would be awarded based on the Fall 2017 season. The current format awarded 24 third place trophies although it is not readily available to determine how many of these went to the top 33 percent of teams.

It is also unclear whether the clubs view that the majority of the first and second place trophies should be awarded to the top regular season teams. In addition, it is also unclear whether the elimination of third place trophies for the bottom teams is also desirable. Specifically, under the current approach, tournament groups with six or seven teams have three sets of trophies awarded. Under the proposed approach, the six and eight-team tournament groups would only get first and second place set of trophies.

- **The new even number game system will be used first for all games. However, if the total number of teams in the group does not allow for equal distribution, then one odd team group will be created** – It is unclear how many teams should be considered for an odd team group. In the Fall 2017 season, 50 percent of the regular season “age group groups” had an odd number of teams. Using the odd team schedule tournament groups in the Fall 2017 season was one reason the proposal was formulated. Based on the Fall 2017 season, more than 10 percent of the tournament groups would still have the problems that contributed to the development of this proposal since they would have odd team groups.
- **The total number of games played in the new even team format will be kept similar to the odd team format so field and referee coordination can be maintained** – While the total number of games is about the same, the proposal makes two key assumptions in addition to assuming that the elimination of the round robin tournament group for the top teams is considered acceptable. Specifically it assumes (1) the tournament fields used by a tournament group are “paired” for about two thirds of the tournament groups since two of the teams will play two games on Sunday if these teams are expected to have the same amount of time between games and (2) that the number of Sunday field slots can be increased. Another potential issue is what happens when a field can only support 5 Saturday and Sunday time slots which are common in the fall seasons because of the lack of fields with lights. These are discussed below.

Pairing of Tournament Fields

The proposed approach envisions that two teams will play two games on the Sunday for the six and eight team groups. When these games are scheduled on the same field, then one team will have more time between games than the other team – a complaint that has been expressed with the current approach and one of the reasons that the proposal was

developed. Accordingly, to address this issue, the tournament fields assigned to these groups must be “paired”, i.e., the tournament group must be assigned to fields at the same field complex, e.g., Lake Fairfax, Long Park, Tyrell, etc. Otherwise, the teams may not have enough time to get between fields for their game and one team will have an unfair travel time advantage. Unfortunately, many of the tournament fields are not “paired.”

Increased Sunday Field Slots Needed

In many cases, the SFL only has 3 Sunday field slots on a field that may have 6 Saturday time slots. For simplicity, assume that a field has five or 6 Saturday field slots. The examples below compare how the two approaches use those slots for the possible group combinations that maximize the Saturday field slots, i.e., at least five games are scheduled on Saturday and how many Sunday slots are required.

- **Current approach** – All of the possible combinations that generate a maximum of six Saturday games have no more than three Sunday games. In many cases, only two Sunday games are generated.
- **Proposed approach – 3 four-team groups.** This requires 6 Saturday and 6 Sunday time slots.
- **Proposed approach – 1 four team and 1 six/eight team group.** This requires 5/6 Saturday and five Sunday slots.
- **Proposed approach – 2 six-team groups.** This requires 6 Saturday and six Sunday slots.

Fields that Only Have 5 Saturday Time Slots

Another concern that is hard to quantify at this point is the impact on fields that only have 5 Saturday time slots. This condition exists for many fields in the fall since they do not have lights and cannot support 6 Saturday or 6 Sunday field slots. The availability of only 5 Saturday field slots already adversely impacts the current tournament approach since it limits the number of tournament group combinations. The following discussed how this impacts the proposed approach.

- ▶ Only one combination generates 5 Saturday time slots – a six team and four team tournament group. Since only about one third of the teams in theory play a 4-team schedule and eight team groups are the priority for the other teams, it is unclear (1) whether one third of the tournament groups would be in the six team format (in the Fall 2017 season this would not have been the case) and (2) even if they “paired up” number wise, that they could be “paired up” on the same field due to

the requirement that at least one team from a tournament group must come from the club hosting that field along with the desire to place tournament groups with two or more teams from the same club to play on their home field. Furthermore, they would also have to be placed on tournament fields that could be “paired up” to support the tournament scheduling so that teams would have the same time between their Sunday games for the six team scheduling groups. This amount of complexity probably makes this an unrealistic expectation, i.e., one of more of these factors would have to be sacrificed when developing the tournament groups.

- ▶ The proposed approach’s priority is to create eight team groups for two thirds of the teams. These groups require 4 Saturday field slots. Accordingly, a method is needed to either acquire more fields or use those single slots in some other manner. One strength of the proposed approach is that teams only play one game on Saturday which means that they can play on any field on Saturday. For example, one pair of teams in a tournament group can play at a field in Reston, another two teams can play in Alexandria, while the third pair plays in Prince William, etc. This can be a major complexity when developing the schedule which increases the amount of time and effort to generate the schedules. This in turn increases the probability of error since this is a manual process and increases the amount of time needed to develop the schedules.

While the “split the fields” on Saturday approach can be used to maximize the use of Saturday fields, it is unclear what happens on Sunday. Assuming that the 5 Saturday game slots can be used by spreading out the Saturday games for the other tournament group assigned to the field, the Sunday games cannot be spread across fields unless those fields are at the same field complex. As noted above, only the 4/6 tournament group combination requires five Sunday slots. The remaining combinations require 6 Sunday game slots. Since in theory all the four team tournament groups have been paired with six team groups, these groups cannot be “split” among fields.

- ▶ The proposal recognizes that some odd team tournament groups would be required. However, it did not state how these odd team groups would be scheduled, e.g., the number of teams that would be placed in these groups. Based on the Fall 2017 season, the proposed approach would have resulted in about 90 tournament groups with 10 of those using an odd team schedule. Accordingly, about 10 percent of the tournament groups would continue to have the same issues that generated the proposal.
- **With the even format, the team receiving a trophy will be on the field (fixes issue with the round robin format)** – The only format under the current approach where the team is not on the field on Sunday for trophies is the three team round robin format.

Even in that format, the team that plays two games on Saturday does not have to be at the field on Sunday when it wins its two Saturday games since that means that the team can take home the first place trophies.

OTHER OBSERVATIONS

The SFL tournament is not a traditional tournament. As noted in the season registration letter, the goal of the SFL is to have each team play 8 to nine games and to play competitive matches. However, since the SFL does not know the strength of a given team, ensuring competitive regular season games are difficult. Because of this, the SFL adopted an end of season tournament. History has shown that the tournament scheduling process adopted works very well in matching teams with comparable abilities. One possible impact of the proposed approach is that the objectives of having teams with comparable abilities play each other may not be accomplished. The Fall 2017 Under 16 Boys can be used to illustrate the potential issues.

- The regular season Group 1 teams would be broken down into two four-team tournament groups and two six-team tournament groups. These groups would have been similar to those created under the existing system.
- The regular season Group 2 teams would have been broken down into six four-team groups, one 6-team group, and three eight-team groups. These groups had several cases where teams with identical game point percentages would be split between tournament groups rather than playing each other, i.e., teams with the same game point percentage would in some cases be playing teams with a higher or lower game point percentage rather than each other.

HOW THE PROPOSED APPROACH WOULD HAVE BEEN IMPLEMENTED FOR THE FALL 2017 SEASON

The following shows how the proposed approach would have been implemented using the Fall 2017 tournament teams. For simplicity, it was assumed that all the tournament groups would only have an even number of teams. Accordingly, for regular season “age group groups” than had an odd number of teams, one team was dropped for simplicity.

Table 1: Group Structure for the Fall 2017 Tournament Based on Proposed Approach

Age Group/ Group	Teams	4 Team Groups	6 Team Groups	8 Team Groups
U11B1	33	4	0	2
U11G1	22	2	1	1
U12B1	14	2	1	0
U12B2	33	3	2	1
U12G1	26	2	3	0
U13B1	11	1	1	0
U13B2	45	5	0	3
U13G1	37	3	0	3
U14B1	51	3	1	4
U14G1	37	3	0	3
U16B1	20	2	2	0
U16B2	54	6	1	3
U16G1	11	1	1	0
U16G2	31	3	3	0
U19B1	48	4	0	4
U19G1	31	3	3	0
Total	504	47	19	24

Notes

- The total number of games shown is different from the total number of teams shown as scheduled for the Fall 2017 Wayne Gilbert Memorial tournament in the proposed approach elsewhere in this document. This is because 3 teams dropped out after the original schedules were developed and do not affect the analysis of either proposal.
- As noted elsewhere, it was unclear how odd team groups should be scheduled to achieve the desired goals of the proposed approach and the minimum number of teams that should be included in these groups. Accordingly, for simplicity, odd team groups were not used. In cases where an odd number of teams existed, the actual group structure was rounded down for groups that had an odd number of teams.
- The proposal prioritized the proposed tournament group structure into the following order – top one third of the teams are placed in 4 team scheduling groups. The remaining teams are first placed in eight team groups and the remaining teams placed in six team groups. This assumes that the regular season “age group groups” are evenly divisible by 3. The following explains the logic used to handle situations where this was not the case.

- ▶ If the number of teams in a regular season “age group group” when divided by 3 did not result in an even number, then the number of 4 team groups was rounded up. For example, assume that a regular season “age group group” had 27 or 33 teams. The number of 4 team groups would be rounded up, i.e., 3 and 4 four-team groups respectively.
- ▶ After eliminating the teams placed in the four team groups, if the remaining teams in a tournament group did not result in eight team groups, the following was done. First, if an additional 4 team group would help address the issue, then an additional 4 team group may be created to create the desired priority of having the bottom two thirds of the teams play 8 game schedules. The Under 11 Boys are an example of this logic. The Under 11 Boys had 33 (rounded down to 32) teams. Normally this would result in four 3 team groups which covers 12 teams leaving 20 teams. Rather than having two 6 team groups and 1 eight team group, it was decided to have an additional 4 team group and 2 eight team groups since the eight team groups have a higher priority than 6 team groups. On the other hand, in the case of the Under 19 Girls, 12 of the 30 teams (31 teams rounded down) were placed in 4 team groups. Logically, 3 six-team groups would handle the remaining 18 teams. This option was adopted rather than creating another 4 team group which would result in 4 four-team groups, an eight-team group, and a six-team group since this would mean that more than 50 percent of teams in that age group would play in the 4 team group format rather than the desired top one third teams.

The following shows the tournament groups and the game formats that were used in developing the actual Fall 2017 tournament game schedules.

Table 2: Group Structure and Game Format Used for the Fall 2017 Tournament

Tournament Format	Number of Groups
3 Team – Round Robin	13
4 Team – Round Robin	6
5 Team – Round Robin	3
4 Team – Single Elimination	39
5 Team – Single Elimination	24
6 Team – Single Elimination	11
7 Team – Single Elimination	12
Total	108

**Example of How the Four Team Single Elimination
Tournament Format Would Be Implemented
Using the Fall 2017 Tournament Teams**

The following business rules are used for creating the groups for the four team single elimination tournament format option.

- Teams are ranked based on game point percentage, bonus points, and goals allowed.
- When the number of teams in a regular season age group and division is evenly divisible by 4, then 4 team groups are used.
- Normally, the bottom tournament group is used to handle “odd team” tournament groups. For example, if an age group has 25 teams, then the last tournament group would have 5 teams. However, two exceptions apply. First, the bottom tournament group must have at least 4 teams since history has shown that the bottom teams drop out more often after the schedules are developed so that the games are actually played, i.e., the “odd team” tournament group would be moved up. Second, some exceptions may be made to better pair teams.

The discussion of each age group below shows how these criteria would have been implemented for the Fall 2017 tournament teams.

- **Under 11 Boys** – Standard methodology would be used.
- **Under 11 Girls** – Rather than have a 4 and 6 team tournament groups, two five team groups would have been created to better pair teams. This would have no impact on the Saturday game slots needed and reduced the Sunday game slot requirements by one.
- **Under 12 Boys** – For the regular season division 1 teams, rather than have a 4 and 6 team tournament groups, two five team groups would have been created to better pair teams. This has no impact on the Saturday game slots needed and reduces the Sunday game slot requirements by one. The regular season division 2 teams would use the standard methodology.
- **Under 12 Girls** – Standard methodology would be used.
- **Under 13 Boys** – The regular season division 1 teams would be broken down into 2 five team single elimination tournament groups. Two things would be done with the “odd team” tournament group for the regular season division 2 teams. First, a 5 team tournament group would be created in the third from the bottom group and a 5 team

group used for the last tournament group. This would be done to better pair teams with comparable records.

- **Under 13 Girls** – An “odd team” tournament group would be created in the third from the bottom group to better pair teams with comparable records.
- **Under 14 Boys** – The bottom tournament group would be created with 7 teams since (1) all the teams had comparable records and (2) a 3 team tournament group is not considered desirable for the lowest ranked teams.
- **Under 14 Girls** – The “odd team” tournament group was moved up one tournament group to better pair teams with comparable records.
- **Under 16 Boys** – The regular season division 1 teams would use the standard methodology. The bottom tournament group for the regular season division 2 teams would be created with 6 teams as called for by the methodology. However, another option that may have been adopted is to use a 7 team tournament format for this tournament group and then create another 7 team tournament group above it since this would better pair teams with comparable abilities. This change would have required two additional Saturday slots and no additional Sunday slots.
- **Under 16 Girls** – The standard methodology would be used for the regular season division 1 teams and the division 2 teams that were considered division 1 for tournament purposes. The “odd team” tournament group was moved up one tournament group to better pair teams with comparable abilities.
- **Under 19 Boys** – Standard methodology would be used.
- **Under 19 Girls** – Standard methodology would be used.

Below are the details of the Fall 2017 tournament teams that were scheduled and how they would have been broken down into the tournament scheduling groups.

**Projected Fall 2018 Tournament Divisions
Using The 4 Team Tournament Option
(February 5, 2018)**

Age Group	Regular Season Division	Tournament Division	Team Name	Game Point Percentage	Game Points	Bonus Points	Goals Allowed	Goals Scored	Total Wins	Total Losses	Total Ties
U11B	1	1	Reston 3	100.0%	24	17	7	36	6	0	0
U11B	1	1	Herndon 1	92.0%	22	14	6	31	5	0	1
U11B	1	1	Chantilly 2	88.0%	21	14	11	27	5	1	0
U11B	1	1	Annandale 6	88.0%	21	7	23	29	5	1	0
U11B	1	1	Sterling 3	88.0%	21	13	9	24	5	1	0
U11B	1	2	Annandale 4	83.0%	20	12	10	38	4	0	2
U11B	1	2	Gunston 2	79.0%	19	10	12	26	4	1	1
U11B	1	2	Annandale 3	79.0%	19	10	12	24	4	1	1
U11B	1	2	Sterling 1	75.0%	18	9	11	19	4	2	0
U11B	1	2	Fairfax 3	75.0%	18	8	19	18	4	2	0
U11B	1	2	Herndon 3	75.0%	18	9	15	21	4	2	0
U11B	1	2	Gunston 4	75.0%	18	8	16	22	4	2	0
U11B	1	3	Great Falls 1	67.0%	16	6	8	14	3	2	1
U11B	1	3	Reston 4	63.0%	15	9	16	32	3	3	0
U11B	1	3	Fairfax 4	63.0%	15	3	14	8	3	3	0
U11B	1	3	Chantilly 4	63.0%	15	3	20	13	3	3	0
U11B	1	4	Chantilly 3	54.0%	13	5	12	12	2	3	1
U11B	1	4	Annandale 1	54.0%	13	5	23	19	2	3	1
U11B	1	4	Sterling 2	54.0%	13	4	26	22	2	3	1
U11B	1	4	Fairfax 1	54.0%	13	4	22	15	2	3	1
U11B	1	4	Herndon 5	54.0%	13	4	28	22	2	3	1
U11B	1	4	Gunston 3	54.0%	13	3	22	16	2	3	1
U11B	1	5	Fairfax 5	50.0%	12	6	18	12	2	4	0
U11B	1	5	Reston 1	50.0%	12	6	21	20	2	4	0

**Projected Fall 2018 Tournament Divisions
Using The 4 Team Tournament Option
(February 5, 2018)**

Age Group	Regular Season Division	Tournament Division	Team Name	Game Point Percentage	Game Points	Bonus Points	Goals Allowed	Goals Scored	Total Wins	Total Losses	Total Ties
U11B	1	5	Sterling 4	50.0%	12	2	16	9	2	4	0
U11B	1	5	Soccer on the Hill 1	50.0%	12	2	17	16	1	2	3
U11B	1	6	Herndon 2	42.0%	10	3	16	13	1	4	1
U11B	1	6	Fauquier 1	38.0%	9	3	26	6	1	5	0
U11B	1	6	Fairfax 2	38.0%	9	1	31	15	1	5	0
U11B	1	6	Chantilly 1	38.0%	9	2	27	8	1	5	0
U11B	1	6	Gunston 1	29.0%	7	0	31	11	0	5	1
U11B	1	6	Herndon 4	29.0%	7	0	31	4	0	5	1
U11B	1	6	Reston 2	29.0%	7	0	26	4	0	5	1

**Tournament Divisions
Using The 4 Team Tournament Option
(February 5, 2018)**

Age Group	Regular Season Division	Tournament Division	Team Name	Game Point Percentage	Game Points	Bonus Points	Goals Allowed	Goals Scored	Total Wins	Total Losses	Total Ties
U11G	1	1	Reston 1	100.0%	24	16	1	31	6	0	0
U11G	1	1	Gunston 4	100.0%	24	14	2	21	6	0	0
U11G	1	1	Gunston 2	100.0%	24	13	6	23	6	0	0
U11G	1	2	Chantilly 1	88.0%	21	14	4	23	5	1	0
U11G	1	2	Great Falls 1	92.0%	22	14	4	21	5	0	1
U11G	1	2	Fauquier 1	83.0%	20	12	5	24	4	0	2
U11G	1	2	Gunston 1	75.0%	18	7	9	18	4	2	0
U11G	1	3	Team America 1	70.0%	14	9	17	23	3	2	0
U11G	1	3	Chantilly 4	67.0%	16	5	9	15	3	2	1
U11G	1	3	Gunston 3	63.0%	15	8	12	15	3	3	0
U11G	1	3	Fairfax 1	63.0%	15	6	7	13	2	1	3
U11G	1	4	Herndon 3	60.0%	12	2	10	10	2	2	1
U11G	1	4	Chantilly 2	54.0%	13	6	10	10	2	3	1
U11G	1	4	Reston 2	54.0%	13	6	24	20	2	3	1
U11G	1	4	Herndon 2	54.0%	13	4	14	11	2	3	1
U11G	1	5	Soccer on the Hill 1	50.0%	12	4	14	12	2	4	0
U11G	1	5	Annandale 1	50.0%	12	3	15	5	2	4	0
U11G	1	5	Sterling 1	38.0%	9	3	24	6	1	5	0
U11G	1	5	Herndon 1	42.0%	10	3	22	11	1	4	1
U11G	1	5	Chantilly 3	25.0%	5	0	36	1	0	5	0
U11G	1	5	Soccer on the Hill 3	29.0%	7	0	24	5	0	5	1
U11G	1	5	Fairfax 2	25.0%	6	0	31	5	0	6	0

**Tournament Divisions
Using The 4 Team Tournament Option
(February 5, 2018)**

Age Group	Regular Season Division	Tournament Division	Team Name	Game Point Percentage	Game Points	Bonus Points	Goals Allowed	Goals Scored	Total Wins	Total Losses	Total Ties
U12B	1	1	Herndon 4	92.0%	22	15	6	41	5	0	1
U12B	1	1	Herndon 3	88.0%	21	10	9	22	5	1	0
U12B	1	1	Chantilly 3	83.0%	20	6	12	18	4	0	2
U12B	1	2	Gunston 2	75.0%	18	12	13	32	4	2	0
U12B	1	2	Fairfax 5	71.0%	17	8	14	23	3	1	2
U12B	1	2	Herndon 2	67.0%	16	8	16	18	3	2	1
U12B	1	3	Chantilly 1	63.0%	15	9	19	27	3	3	0
U12B	1	3	Annandale 7	63.0%	15	7	17	14	3	3	0
U12B	1	3	Annandale 1	63.0%	15	6	12	19	2	1	3
U12B	1	3	Reston 1	50.0%	12	3	15	14	1	2	3
U12B	1	4	Fauquier 1	38.0%	9	3	29	14	1	5	0
U12B	1	4	Soccer on the Hill 2	38.0%	9	3	27	6	1	5	0
U12B	1	4	Fauquier 2	38.0%	9	3	37	8	1	5	0
U12B	1	4	Gunston 1	25.0%	6	0	33	3	0	6	0
U12B	2	5	Sterling 7	100.0%	24	15	8	34	6	0	0
U12B	2	5	Sterling 5	100.0%	24	13	16	34	6	0	0
U12B	2	5	Annandale 8	92.0%	22	14	21	54	5	0	1
U12B	2	6	Fairfax 1	88.0%	21	10	7	16	5	1	0
U12B	2	6	Gunston 3	79.0%	19	11	15	28	4	1	1
U12B	2	6	Fairfax 3	79.0%	19	6	10	21	4	1	1
U12B	2	6	McLean 4	85.0%	17	9	6	14	4	1	0
U12B	2	6	Annandale 6	79.0%	19	10	12	26	4	1	1

**Tournament Divisions
Using The 4 Team Tournament Option
(February 5, 2018)**

Age Group	Regular Season Division	Tournament Division	Team Name	Game Point Percentage	Game Points	Bonus Points	Goals Allowed	Goals Scored	Total Wins	Total Losses	Total Ties
U12B	2	7	Herndon 5	75.0%	18	9	19	27	4	2	0
U12B	2	7	Annandale 5	75.0%	18	12	9	36	4	2	0
U12B	2	7	Soccer on the Hill 1	75.0%	18	6	16	18	4	2	0
U12B	2	7	Great Falls 2	71.0%	17	9	16	33	3	1	2
U12B	2	7	McLean 5	71.0%	17	8	11	20	3	1	2
U12B	2	7	Chantilly 4	71.0%	17	6	16	21	3	1	2
U12B	2	8	Herndon 1	63.0%	15	8	10	23	3	3	0
U12B	2	8	McLean 3	67.0%	16	8	14	23	3	2	1
U12B	2	8	Chantilly Soccer 1	63.0%	15	8	14	18	3	3	0
U12B	2	8	Annandale 9	58.0%	14	6	21	26	2	2	2
U12B	2	9	Annandale 2	54.0%	13	5	21	20	2	3	1
U12B	2	9	Annandale 4	54.0%	13	6	11	16	2	3	1
U12B	2	9	McLean 1	54.0%	13	5	20	12	2	3	1
U12B	2	9	Sterling 6	54.0%	13	5	24	19	2	3	1
U12B	2	9	Chantilly 2	54.0%	13	2	17	6	2	3	1
U12B	2	9	Herndon 6	54.0%	13	4	21	15	2	3	1
U12B	2	10	Reston 4	50.0%	12	6	21	13	2	4	0
U12B	2	10	Reston 3	42.0%	10	3	27	9	1	4	1
U12B	2	10	Reston 2	42.0%	10	1	21	7	1	4	1
U12B	2	10	Annandale 3	38.0%	9	2	41	21	1	5	0

**Tournament Divisions
Using The 4 Team Tournament Option
(February 5, 2018)**

Age Group	Regular Season Division	Tournament Division	Team Name	Game Point Percentage	Game Points	Bonus Points	Goals Allowed	Goals Scored	Total Wins	Total Losses	Total Ties
U12B	2	10	McLean 2	38.0%	9	1	35	14	1	5	0
U12B	2	11	Fairfax 4	35.0%	7	0	16	6	0	3	2
U12B	2	11	Chantilly 5	29.0%	7	0	37	20	0	5	1
U12B	2	11	Great Falls 1	25.0%	6	0	39	7	0	6	0
U12B	2	11	Soccer on the Hill 3	25.0%	5	0	47	5	0	5	0

**Tournament Divisions
Using The 4 Team Tournament Option
(February 5, 2018)**

Age Group	Regular Season Division	Tournament Division	Team Name	Game Point Percentage	Game Points	Bonus Points	Goals Allowed	Goals Scored	Total Wins	Total Losses	Total Ties
U12G	1	1	Chantilly 1	100.0%	24	13	1	15	6	0	0
U12G	1	1	Herndon 2	92.0%	22	14	7	26	5	0	1
U12G	1	1	Gunston 4	100.0%	20	15	2	26	5	0	0
U12G	1	2	McLean 4	88.0%	21	11	5	15	5	1	0
U12G	1	2	Annandale 4	88.0%	21	13	6	21	5	1	0
U12G	1	2	Great Falls 1	88.0%	21	11	6	17	5	1	0
U12G	1	2	Gunston 3	82.0%	23	10	8	19	5	1	1
U12G	1	3	Chantilly 3	75.0%	18	8	6	17	3	0	3
U12G	1	3	Annandale 2	75.0%	15	5	5	8	3	1	1
U12G	1	3	Sterling 1	67.0%	16	7	14	16	3	2	1
U12G	1	4	Fairfax 2	63.0%	15	6	11	14	3	3	0
U12G	1	4	Annandale 3	63.0%	15	6	16	14	3	3	0
U12G	1	4	Fairfax 3	63.0%	15	4	4	7	2	1	3
U12G	1	4	McLean 3	58.0%	14	3	9	7	2	2	2
U12G	1	5	Gunston 2	54.0%	13	4	14	12	2	3	1
U12G	1	5	Soccer on the Hill 1	54.0%	13	3	10	7	2	3	1
U12G	1	5	Chantilly 2	54.0%	13	2	15	7	2	3	1
U12G	1	5	McLean 1	50.0%	12	4	19	7	2	4	0
U12G	1	6	Reston 1	46.0%	11	2	8	7	1	3	2
U12G	1	6	Fairfax 1	42.0%	10	1	8	3	1	4	1

**Tournament Divisions
Using The 4 Team Tournament Option
(February 5, 2018)**

Age Group	Regular Season Division	Tournament Division	Team Name	Game Point Percentage	Game Points	Bonus Points	Goals Allowed	Goals Scored	Total Wins	Total Losses	Total Ties
U12G	1	6	Soccer on the Hill 3	38.0%	9	1	11	3	1	5	0
U12G	1	6	Herndon 1	38.0%	9	1	25	7	1	5	0
U12G	1	7	Annandale 1	33.0%	8	0	12	3	0	4	2
U12G	1	7	Fauquier 1	33.0%	8	0	17	3	0	4	2
U12G	1	7	McLean 2	30.0%	6	0	22	5	0	4	1
U12G	1	7	Great Falls 2	29.0%	7	0	19	5	0	5	1

**Tournament Divisions
Using The 4 Team Tournament Option
(February 5, 2018)**

Age Group	Season	Division	Team Name	Percentage	Points	Points	Allowed	Scored	Wins	Losses	Ties
U13B	1	1	Herndon 4	100.0%	24	17	10	43	6	0	0
U13B	1	1	Prince William 1	92.0%	22	14	6	31	5	0	1
U13B	1	1	Annandale 1	75.0%	18	10	7	14	4	2	0
U13B	1	1	Prince William 2	75.0%	18	7	19	22	4	2	0
U13B	1	2	Fairfax 2	71.0%	17	8	11	18	3	1	2
U13B	1	2	Northern VA 5	67.0%	16	3	15	11	3	2	1
U13B	1	2	Reston 4	54.0%	13	2	16	8	2	3	1
U13B	1	2	Reston 1	50.0%	12	5	26	22	2	4	0
U13B	1	2	Herndon 1	50.0%	12	4	22	12	2	4	0
U13B	1	2	Fairfax 3	42.0%	10	3	23	17	1	4	1
U13B	2	3	Sterling 1	100.0%	24	16	5	36	6	0	0
U13B	2	3	Sterling 9	100.0%	24	14	8	28	6	0	0
U13B	2	3	McLean 3	100.0%	24	13	7	36	6	0	0
U13B	2	3	Northern VA 6	100.0%	20	15	4	24	5	0	0
U13B	2	3	Annandale 4	100.0%	24	14	11	36	6	0	0
U13B	2	4	Springfield 5	88.0%	21	15	6	47	5	1	0
U13B	2	4	Prince William 7	88.0%	21	14	8	28	5	1	0
U13B	2	4	Herndon 3	88.0%	21	11	11	29	5	1	0
U13B	2	4	Prince William 3	88.0%	21	14	10	37	5	1	0
U13B	2	4	Annandale 5	88.0%	21	14	16	41	5	1	0
U13B	2	4	Springfield 1	88.0%	21	14	9	33	5	1	0
U13B	2	5	Haymarket 3	85.0%	17	8	10	17	4	1	0
U13B	2	5	Soccer on the Hill 1	79.0%	19	12	8	23	4	1	1
U13B	2	5	Fairfax 1	79.0%	19	12	14	32	4	1	1
U13B	2	5	Prince William 6	79.0%	19	9	13	19	4	1	1
U13B	2	5	Annandale 2	75.0%	18	6	9	12	4	2	0

**Tournament Divisions
Using The 4 Team Tournament Option
(February 5, 2018)**

Age Group	Season	Division	Team Name	Percentage	Points	Points	Allowed	Scored	Wins	Losses	Ties
U13B	2	6	Chantilly 1	71.0%	17	6	7	12	3	1	2
U13B	2	6	Springfield 4	67.0%	16	9	18	29	3	2	1
U13B	2	6	Reston 2	63.0%	15	8	11	14	3	3	0
U13B	2	6	Herndon 2	70.0%	14	6	10	17	3	2	0
U13B	2	6	Annandale 7	63.0%	15	5	17	22	3	3	0
U13B	2	6	Braddock Road 2	63.0%	15	5	23	18	3	3	0
U13B	2	6	Haymarket 1	63.0%	15	9	15	20	3	3	0
U13B	2	7	McLean 1	54.0%	13	6	20	17	2	3	1
U13B	2	7	Chantilly 3	60.0%	12	5	12	16	2	2	1
U13B	2	7	McLean 2	54.0%	13	4	13	14	2	3	1
U13B	2	7	Braddock Road 1	54.0%	13	4	14	15	2	3	1
U13B	2	8	Sterling 2	50.0%	12	5	16	14	2	4	0
U13B	2	8	Braddock Road 3	50.0%	12	5	27	16	2	4	0
U13B	2	8	Haymarket 2	50.0%	12	5	27	19	2	4	0
U13B	2	8	Burke Athletic 1	50.0%	12	5	32	26	2	4	0
U13B	2	8	Chantilly 2	50.0%	12	2	17	10	2	4	0
U13B	2	9	Great Falls 2	45.0%	9	2	19	6	1	3	1
U13B	2	9	Northern VA 7	33.0%	8	0	30	15	0	4	2
U13B	2	9	Prince William 4	38.0%	9	3	34	11	1	5	0
U13B	2	9	Fauquier 1	33.0%	8	0	21	10	0	4	2
U13B	2	9	Northern VA 1	40.0%	8	3	27	15	1	4	0
U13B	2	10	Springfield 2	29.0%	7	0	33	8	0	5	1
U13B	2	10	Burke Athletic 2	29.0%	7	0	27	9	0	5	1
U13B	2	10	Prince William 5	29.0%	7	0	43	3	0	5	1
U13B	1	10	Gunston 1	29.0%	7	0	19	5	0	5	1

**Tournament Divisions
Using The 4 Team Tournament Option
(February 5, 2018)**

Age Group	Season	Division	Team Name	Percentage	Points	Points Allowed	Scored	Wins	Losses	Ties	
U13B	2	11	Great Falls 1	25.0%	6	0	29	3	0	6	0
U13B	2	11	McLean 4	25.0%	6	0	43	6	0	6	0
U13B	2	11	Springfield 3	25.0%	6	0	46	5	0	6	0
U13B	2	11	Fairfax 4	25.0%	6	0	49	7	0	6	0
U13B	2	11	Reston 3	25.0%	5	0	42	8	0	5	0

**Tournament Divisions
Using The 4 Team Tournament Option
(February 5, 2018)**

Age Group	Regular Season Division	Tournament Division	Team Name	Game Point Percentage	Game Points	Bonus Points	Goals Allowed	Goals Scored	Total Wins	Total Losses	Total Ties
U13G	1	1	Great Falls 2	100.0%	24	18	6	35	6	0	0
U13G	1	1	Northern VA 5	100.0%	24	15	4	23	6	0	0
U13G	1	1	Gunston 3	92.0%	22	10	7	19	5	0	1
U13G	1	1	Burke Athletic 1	92.0%	22	8	6	14	5	0	1
U13G	1	2	Chantilly 2	88.0%	21	10	6	15	5	1	0
U13G	1	2	Prince William 1	88.0%	21	13	10	34	5	1	0
U13G	1	2	Annandale 3	88.0%	21	9	4	13	5	1	0
U13G	1	2	Prince William 2	83.0%	20	6	5	12	4	0	2
U13G	1	3	McLean 1	79.0%	19	8	10	18	4	1	1
U13G	1	3	Northern VA 1	75.0%	18	9	13	20	4	2	0
U13G	1	3	Northern VA 6	75.0%	18	8	10	16	4	2	0
U13G	1	3	Haymarket 1	75.0%	18	8	13	18	4	2	0
U13G	1	3	Sterling 3	75.0%	18	6	9	10	4	2	0
U13G	1	3	Springfield 4	71.0%	17	6	10	12	3	1	2
U13G	1	3	Gunston 1	75.0%	15	6	6	11	3	1	1
U13G	1	4	Soccer on the Hill 1	65.0%	13	4	4	7	2	1	2
U13G	1	4	Great Falls 1	63.0%	15	9	15	17	3	3	0
U13G	1	4	Springfield 2	63.0%	15	6	9	8	3	3	0
U13G	1	4	Chantilly 1	63.0%	15	5	12	11	3	3	0
U13G	1	4	Sterling 2	63.0%	15	5	14	10	3	3	0
U13G	1	5	Reston 1	54.0%	13	5	14	12	2	3	1
U13G	1	5	McLean 2	58.0%	14	5	10	12	2	2	2
U13G	1	5	Herndon 1	54.0%	13	4	13	9	2	3	1
U13G	1	5	McLean 3	54.0%	13	3	9	3	2	3	1

**Tournament Divisions
Using The 4 Team Tournament Option
(February 5, 2018)**

Age Group	Regular Season Division	Tournament Division	Team Name	Game Point Percentage	Game Points	Bonus Points	Goals Allowed	Goals Scored	Total Wins	Total Losses	Total Ties
U13G	1	5	Herndon 2	54.0%	13	2	14	7	2	3	1
U13G	1	6	Northern VA 8	50.0%	12	2	16	10	2	4	0
U13G	1	6	Fairfax 2	45.0%	9	1	8	4	1	3	1
U13G	1	6	Springfield 3	42.0%	10	3	10	6	1	4	1
U13G	1	6	Springfield 1	42.0%	10	1	26	12	1	4	1
U13G	1	7	Haymarket 2	38.0%	9	3	12	9	1	5	0
U13G	1	7	McLean 4	38.0%	9	3	13	4	1	5	0
U13G	1	7	Chantilly 7	38.0%	9	2	16	5	1	5	0
U13G	1	7	Prince William 3	38.0%	9	1	20	5	1	5	0
U13G	1	8	Gunston 2	30.0%	6	0	10	3	0	4	1
U13G	1	8	Annandale 1	33.0%	8	0	11	1	0	4	2
U13G	1	8	Reston 2	29.0%	7	0	20	5	0	5	1
U13G	1	8	Haymarket 3	25.0%	6	0	28	4	0	6	0

**Tournament Divisions
Using The 4 Team Tournament Option
(February 5, 2018)**

Age Group	Regular Season Division	Tournament Division	Team Name	Game Point Percentage	Game Points	Bonus Points	Goals Allowed	Goals Scored	Total Wins	Total Losses	Total Ties
U14B	1	1	Chantilly 1	100.0%	24	17	5	40	6	0	0
U14B	1	1	Herndon 3	100.0%	24	17	6	48	6	0	0
U14B	1	1	Annandale 1	100.0%	24	17	13	44	6	0	0
U14B	1	1	Chantilly 4	100.0%	24	12	10	30	6	0	0
U14B	1	2	Northern VA 1	92.0%	22	13	5	28	5	0	1
U14B	1	2	Reston 1	88.0%	21	15	7	26	5	1	0
U14B	1	2	Herndon 4	88.0%	21	12	10	24	5	1	0
U14B	1	2	Herndon 6	88.0%	21	11	5	28	5	1	0
U14B	1	2	Herndon 5	88.0%	21	12	10	24	5	1	0
U14B	1	3	Springfield 1	79.0%	19	12	7	27	4	1	1
U14B	1	3	Gunston 1	79.0%	19	12	9	35	4	1	1
U14B	1	3	Springfield 3	79.0%	19	9	7	16	4	1	1
U14B	1	3	Prince William 2	79.0%	19	10	12	20	4	1	1
U14B	1	3	Annandale 4	79.0%	19	9	10	23	4	1	1
U14B	1	4	Chantilly 3	75.0%	18	12	18	36	4	2	0
U14B	1	4	Annandale 3	75.0%	18	12	9	38	4	2	0
U14B	1	4	Northern VA 8	75.0%	18	10	9	24	4	2	0
U14B	1	4	Prince William 1	75.0%	18	9	11	22	4	2	0
U14B	1	4	McLean 1	75.0%	18	8	9	14	4	2	0
U14B	1	5	Fairfax 2	75.0%	15	9	6	20	3	1	1
U14B	1	5	McLean 2	75.0%	15	6	7	11	3	1	1
U14B	1	5	Alexandria 4	71.0%	17	9	13	40	3	1	2
U14B	1	5	Prince William 3	71.0%	17	8	14	27	3	1	2
U14B	1	6	Fauquier 2	67.0%	16	7	16	19	3	2	1

**Tournament Divisions
Using The 4 Team Tournament Option
(February 5, 2018)**

Age Group	Regular Season Division	Tournament Division	Team Name	Game Point Percentage	Game Points	Bonus Points	Goals Allowed	Goals Scored	Total Wins	Total Losses	Total Ties
U14B	1	6	Reston 2	67.0%	16	9	25	26	3	2	1
U14B	1	6	Herndon 1	67.0%	16	8	18	23	3	2	1
U14B	1	7	Alexandria 2	63.0%	15	8	16	17	3	3	0
U14B	1	7	Fairfax 1	63.0%	15	9	11	20	3	3	0
U14B	1	7	Prince William 5	63.0%	15	8	19	17	3	3	0
U14B	1	7	Burke Athletic 1	63.0%	15	4	17	10	3	3	0
U14B	1	7	Braddock Road 1	63.0%	15	7	15	15	3	3	0
U14B	1	7	McLean 4	63.0%	15	6	10	13	3	3	0
U14B	1	8	Haymarket 1	54.0%	13	5	20	12	2	3	1
U14B	1	8	Sterling 3	54.0%	13	4	14	11	2	3	1
U14B	1	8	Northern VA 5	50.0%	12	5	22	19	2	4	0
U14B	1	8	Herndon 2	50.0%	12	3	17	17	1	2	3
U14B	1	9	Springfield 4	46.0%	11	3	18	12	1	3	2
U14B	1	9	Alexandria 3	42.0%	10	2	32	7	1	4	1
U14B	1	9	Alexandria 5	40.0%	8	2	27	9	1	4	0
U14B	1	10	Braddock Road 2	38.0%	9	3	36	14	1	5	0
U14B	1	10	Sterling 7	38.0%	9	3	27	14	1	5	0
U14B	1	10	Springfield 5	38.0%	9	3	26	8	1	5	0
U14B	1	10	Springfield 2	38.0%	9	2	32	11	1	5	0
U14B	1	10	Clarke 2	38.0%	9	2	45	8	1	5	0
U14B	1	11	Prince William 4	29.0%	7	0	40	8	0	5	1
U14B	1	11	Fairfax 3	25.0%	6	0	18	2	0	6	0
U14B	1	11	Gunston 2	25.0%	6	0	37	7	0	6	0
U14B	1	11	Haymarket 3	25.0%	6	0	36	8	0	6	0
U14B	1	11	Great Falls 1	25.0%	6	0	39	2	0	6	0
U14B	1	11	Haymarket 2	25.0%	6	0	59	8	0	6	0
U14B	1	11	McLean 3	25.0%	5	0	23	1	0	5	0

**Tournament Divisions
Using The 4 Team Tournament Option
(February 5, 2018)**

Age Group	Regular Season Division	Tournament Division	Team Name	Game Point Percentage	Game Points	Bonus Points	Goals Allowed	Goals Scored	Total Wins	Total Losses	Total Ties
U14G	1	1	Annandale 2	100.0%	24	18	2	53	6	0	0
U14G	1	1	Fairfax 2	100.0%	24	16	0	21	6	0	0
U14G	1	1	Herndon 1	100.0%	24	16	3	37	6	0	0
U14G	1	1	Reston 2	100.0%	24	15	2	21	6	0	0
U14G	1	2	Northern VA 5	100.0%	24	14	4	29	6	0	0
U14G	1	2	Reston 1	100.0%	24	14	7	27	6	0	0
U14G	1	2	Haymarket 1	100.0%	24	11	2	15	6	0	0
U14G	1	3	Gunston 1	92.0%	22	12	7	22	5	0	1
U14G	1	3	Burke Athletic 2	92.0%	22	13	1	17	5	0	1
U14G	1	3	Soccer on the Hill 2	79.0%	19	9	7	18	4	1	1
U14G	1	3	Annandale 1	75.0%	18	8	14	11	4	2	0
U14G	1	3	Chantilly 2	75.0%	18	9	5	15	4	2	0
U14G	1	4	Springfield 1	71.0%	17	4	6	7	3	1	2
U14G	1	4	Springfield 2	71.0%	17	7	6	14	3	1	2
U14G	1	4	McLean 2	67.0%	16	8	16	15	3	2	1
U14G	1	4	Burke Athletic 1	67.0%	16	5	10	8	3	2	1
U14G	1	5	Chantilly 1	63.0%	15	9	10	18	3	3	0
U14G	1	5	Braddock Road 2	63.0%	15	9	18	18	3	3	0
U14G	1	5	Herndon 3	63.0%	15	6	12	15	3	3	0
U14G	1	5	Alexandria 3	60.0%	12	3	16	14	2	2	1
U14G	1	6	Prince William 2	54.0%	13	6	10	9	2	3	1
U14G	1	6	Sterling 1	50.0%	12	6	18	20	2	4	0
U14G	1	6	Fauquier 1	46.0%	11	2	13	5	1	3	2
U14G	1	6	Northern VA 1	50.0%	12	5	9	8	2	4	0

**Tournament Divisions
Using The 4 Team Tournament Option
(February 5, 2018)**

Age Group	Regular Season Division	Tournament Division	Team Name	Game Point Percentage	Game Points	Bonus Points	Goals Allowed	Goals Scored	Total Wins	Total Losses	Total Ties
U14G	1	6	Chantilly 3	46.0%	11	2	14	7	1	3	2
U14G	1	7	Springfield 3	42.0%	10	3	19	9	1	4	1
U14G	1	7	Reston 3	42.0%	10	2	14	5	1	4	1
U14G	1	7	McLean 1	42.0%	10	2	27	10	1	4	1
U14G	1	7	Annandale 3	40.0%	8	3	25	6	1	4	0
U14G	1	8	Springfield 4	38.0%	9	2	19	6	1	5	0
U14G	1	8	Braddock Road 1	38.0%	9	2	30	4	1	5	0
U14G	1	8	Alexandria 2	38.0%	9	2	33	7	1	5	0
U14G	1	8	Alexandria 1	38.0%	9	1	32	12	1	5	0
U14G	1	9	Haymarket 2	33.0%	8	0	17	2	0	4	2
U14G	1	9	Herndon 2	25.0%	6	0	22	2	0	6	0
U14G	1	9	Prince William 1	25.0%	6	0	23	4	0	6	0
U14G	1	9	Northern VA 6	25.0%	6	0	28	2	0	6	0

**Tournament Divisions
Using The 4 Team Tournament Option
(February 5, 2018)**

Age Group	Regular Season Division	Tournament Division	Team Name	Game Point Percentage	Game Points	Bonus Points	Goals Allowed	Goals Scored	Total Wins	Total Losses	Total Ties
U16B	1	1	Annandale 5	100.0%	24	16	7	44	6	0	0
U16B	1	1	Northern VA 7	100.0%	20	14	4	25	5	0	0
U16B	1	1	Prince William 3	88.0%	21	12	9	24	5	1	0
U16B	1	2	Gunston 1	85.0%	17	11	9	22	4	1	0
U16B	1	2	Northern VA 1	79.0%	19	12	7	28	4	1	1
U16B	1	2	Herndon 3	75.0%	18	11	7	27	4	2	0
U16B	1	2	Prince William 10	75.0%	18	10	21	24	4	2	0
U16B	1	3	Great Falls 1	71.0%	20	7	10	16	4	2	1
U16B	1	3	Annandale 8	70.0%	14	7	18	28	3	2	0
U16B	1	3	Gunston 2	63.0%	15	5	24	14	3	3	0
U16B	1	3	Prince William 9	63.0%	15	6	13	9	3	3	0
U16B	1	3	Fairfax 6	60.0%	12	5	15	17	2	2	1
U16B	1	3	Prince William 6	54.0%	13	4	18	9	2	3	1
U16B	1	3	Northern VA 6	54.0%	13	4	15	11	2	3	1
U16B	1	4	Northern VA 2	38.0%	9	1	33	12	1	5	0
U16B	1	4	Annandale 10	38.0%	9	2	39	14	1	5	0
U16B	1	4	Annandale 11	25.0%	6	0	28	6	0	6	0
U16B	1	4	Prince William 1	30.0%	6	0	20	7	0	4	1
U16B	1	4	Herndon 2	25.0%	6	0	41	8	0	6	0
U16B	1	4	Haymarket 2	25.0%	4	0	14	5	0	4	0
U16B	2	5	Sterling 1	100.0%	24	18	8	34	6	0	0
U16B	2	5	Lee-Mt. Vern. 1	100.0%	24	16	7	42	6	0	0
U16B	2	5	Northern VA 5	100.0%	24	15	7	29	6	0	0
U16B	2	6	Prince William 7	92.0%	22	12	2	26	5	0	1

**Tournament Divisions
Using The 4 Team Tournament Option
(February 5, 2018)**

Age Group	Regular Season Division	Tournament Division	Team Name	Game Point Percentage	Game Points	Bonus Points	Goals Allowed	Goals Scored	Total Wins	Total Losses	Total Ties
U16B	2	6	Annandale 6	92.0%	22	13	5	35	5	0	1
U16B	2	6	Lee-Mt. Vern. 2	88.0%	21	14	12	32	5	1	0
U16B	2	6	Prince William 8	88.0%	21	13	7	24	5	1	0
U16B	2	6	Fairfax 3	88.0%	21	13	14	30	5	1	0
U16B	2	6	Chantilly 3	88.0%	21	11	11	25	5	1	0
U16B	2	6	McLean 3	88.0%	21	13	9	37	5	1	0
U16B	2	7	Haymarket 4	80.0%	16	9	8	24	3	0	2
U16B	2	7	Alexandria 1	81.0%	13	9	11	23	3	1	0
U16B	2	7	Chantilly 1	79.0%	19	8	12	19	4	1	1
U16B	2	7	Alexandria 3	79.0%	19	12	9	27	4	1	1
U16B	2	7	Herndon 4	79.0%	19	10	24	32	4	1	1
U16B	2	7	Herndon 1	79.0%	19	11	12	31	4	1	1
U16B	2	7	Braddock Road 3	79.0%	19	9	12	22	4	1	1
U16B	2	8	Springfield 2	75.0%	18	12	17	31	4	2	0
U16B	2	8	Braddock Road 2	75.0%	18	10	7	16	4	2	0
U16B	2	8	Sterling 6	75.0%	18	10	12	21	4	2	0
U16B	2	8	Lee-Mt. Vern. 3	75.0%	18	10	18	29	4	2	0
U16B	2	9	Haymarket 5	70.0%	14	6	17	22	3	2	0
U16B	2	9	Annandale 9	67.0%	16	9	11	25	3	2	1
U16B	2	9	Loudoun 2	67.0%	16	5	13	14	3	2	1
U16B	2	9	Springfield 4	67.0%	16	8	15	21	3	2	1
U16B	2	9	Reston 1	67.0%	16	4	19	17	3	2	1
U16B	2	10	Annandale 2	63.0%	15	9	22	36	3	3	0
U16B	2	10	Burke Athletic 2	63.0%	15	8	23	22	3	3	0

**Tournament Divisions
Using The 4 Team Tournament Option
(February 5, 2018)**

Age Group	Regular Season Division	Tournament Division	Team Name	Game Point Percentage	Game Points	Bonus Points	Goals Allowed	Goals Scored	Total Wins	Total Losses	Total Ties
U16B	2	10	Lee-Mt. Vern. 4	63.0%	10	5	13	16	2	2	0
U16B	2	10	McLean 1	63.0%	15	7	20	17	3	3	0
U16B	2	10	Prince William 2	63.0%	15	7	20	22	3	3	0
U16B	2	10	McLean 2	63.0%	15	7	17	20	3	3	0
U16B	2	11	Loudoun 4	58.0%	14	4	16	12	2	2	2
U16B	2	11	Fauquier 1	54.0%	13	4	20	19	2	3	1
U16B	2	11	Haymarket 3	54.0%	13	3	22	11	2	3	1
U16B	2	12	Northern VA 8	50.0%	12	6	13	16	2	4	0
U16B	2	12	Fairfax 5	50.0%	12	6	27	19	2	4	0
U16B	2	12	Springfield 1	50.0%	12	5	23	12	2	4	0
U16B	2	12	Gunston 3	50.0%	12	6	32	14	2	4	0
U16B	2	12	Prince William 4	50.0%	12	3	10	14	1	2	3
U16B	2	12	Sterling 3	50.0%	12	4	15	8	2	4	0
U16B	2	12	Springfield 3	46.0%	11	1	21	7	1	3	2
U16B	2	13	Loudoun 3	42.0%	10	3	16	13	1	4	1
U16B	2	13	Haymarket 1	42.0%	10	3	14	6	1	4	1
U16B	2	13	Northern VA 3	42.0%	10	1	30	11	1	4	1
U16B	2	13	Loudoun 1	42.0%	10	3	20	13	1	4	1
U16B	2	13	Alexandria 2	38.0%	9	3	43	14	1	5	0
U16B	2	14	Prince William 5	25.0%	6	0	28	4	0	6	0
U16B	2	14	Burke Athletic 1	25.0%	6	0	30	4	0	6	0
U16B	2	14	Braddock Road 4	25.0%	6	0	35	6	0	6	0
U16B	2	14	Southwestern 1	25.0%	6	0	35	5	0	6	0
U16B	2	14	Annandale 1	25.0%	6	0	38	8	0	6	0
U16B	2	14	Great Falls 2	25.0%	6	0	38	3	0	6	0
U16B	2	14	McLean 4	25.0%	5	0	50	7	0	5	0

**Tournament Divisions
Using The 4 Team Tournament Option
(February 5, 2018)**

Age Group	Regular Season Division	Tournament Division	Team Name	Game Point Percentage	Game Points	Bonus Points	Goals Allowed	Goals Scored	Total Wins	Total Losses	Total Ties
U16G	1	1	Haymarket 2	89.0%	25	15	13	40	6	1	0
U16G	2	1	Haymarket 3	92.0%	22	8	7	16	5	0	1
U16G	1	1	Northern VA 2	100.0%	24	13	4	21	6	0	0
U16G	2	1	Prince William 3	100.0%	20	10	2	17	5	0	0
U16G	1	2	Chantilly 1	70.0%	14	9	17	20	3	2	0
U16G	1	2	Herndon 2	75.0%	15	7	17	14	3	1	1
U16G	1	2	Annandale 2	70.0%	14	8	12	20	3	2	0
U16G	1	2	Northern VA 1	75.0%	15	7	1	11	3	1	1
U16G	1	2	Fauquier 1	60.0%	12	5	15	17	2	2	1
U16G	1	3	Herndon 1	38.0%	9	2	27	5	1	5	0
U16G	1	3	Lee-Mt. Vern. 1	25.0%	6	0	28	2	0	6	0
U16G	1	3	Burke Athletic 2	42.0%	10	2	6	3	1	4	1
U16G	1	3	Chantilly 5	33.0%	8	0	22	9	0	4	2
U16G	2	4	McLean 2	88.0%	21	14	4	26	5	1	0
U16G	2	4	Alexandria 1	88.0%	21	13	7	21	5	1	0
U16G	2	4	Northern VA 5	88.0%	21	12	3	20	5	1	0
U16G	2	4	McLean 1	88.0%	21	12	6	22	5	1	0
U16G	2	4	Loudoun 1	88.0%	21	9	7	14	5	1	0
U16G	2	5	Haymarket 1	79.0%	19	7	5	12	4	1	1
U16G	2	5	Reston 3	83.0%	20	8	5	14	4	0	2
U16G	2	5	Prince William 2	75.0%	18	9	9	16	4	2	0
U16G	2	5	Gunston 1	75.0%	18	4	9	8	4	2	0
U16G	2	6	Southwestern 1	70.0%	14	8	11	18	3	2	0
U16G	2	6	Prince William 5	67.0%	16	6	5	10	3	2	1
U16G	2	6	Burke Athletic 3	63.0%	15	4	9	10	3	3	0

**Tournament Divisions
Using The 4 Team Tournament Option
(February 5, 2018)**

Age Group	Regular Season Division	Tournament Division	Team Name	Game Point Percentage	Game Points	Bonus Points	Goals Allowed	Goals Scored	Total Wins	Total Losses	Total Ties
U16G	2	6	Annandale 1	54.0%	13	4	7	7	2	3	1
U16G	2	6	Burke Athletic 1	55.0%	11	2	6	7	1	1	3
U16G	2	6	Fairfax 3	54.0%	13	1	6	6	1	1	4
U16G	2	6	Loudoun 2	54.0%	13	2	8	7	2	3	1
U16G	2	7	Annandale 3	50.0%	12	3	25	11	2	4	0
U16G	2	7	Haymarket 4	50.0%	10	1	8	4	1	2	2
U16G	2	7	Annandale 4	46.0%	11	2	19	8	1	3	2
U16G	2	7	Sterling 2	46.0%	11	1	22	14	1	3	2
U16G	2	8	Haymarket 5	42.0%	10	3	13	10	1	4	1
U16G	2	8	McLean 3	42.0%	10	3	19	8	1	4	1
U16G	2	9	Northern VA 3	42.0%	10	1	13	4	1	4	1
U16G	2	8	Fairfax 2	38.0%	9	0	10	1	0	3	3
U16G	2	8	Great Falls 1	38.0%	9	0	18	11	0	3	3
U16G	2	8	Northern VA 6	35.0%	7	0	15	7	0	3	2
U16G	2	9	Prince William 1	25.0%	6	0	29	1	0	6	0
U16G	2	9	Alexandria 2	25.0%	6	0	20	5	0	6	0
U16G	2	9	Prince William 4	30.0%	6	0	11	3	0	4	1

**Tournament Divisions
Using The 4 Team Tournament Option
(February 5, 2018)**

Age Group	Regular Season Division	Tournament Division	Team Name	Game Point Percentage	Game Points	Bonus Points	Goals Allowed	Goals Scored	Total Wins	Total Losses	Total Ties
U19B	1	1	Clarke 1	100.0%	24	18	10	50	6	0	0
U19B	1	1	Northern VA 9	100.0%	24	17	6	27	6	0	0
U19B	1	1	Herndon 1	100.0%	24	16	5	33	6	0	0
U19B	1	1	Haymarket 5	100.0%	24	12	4	19	6	0	0
U19B	1	2	Alexandria 1	92.0%	22	15	3	36	5	0	1
U19B	1	2	Soccer on the Hill 4	92.0%	22	11	13	32	5	0	1
U19B	1	2	Prince William 1	90.0%	18	11	4	21	4	0	1
U19B	1	2	Sterling 1	83.0%	20	11	6	21	4	0	2
U19B	1	3	Soccer on the Hill 1	75.0%	18	12	9	20	4	2	0
U19B	1	3	McLean 3	79.0%	19	9	7	18	4	1	1
U19B	1	3	Springfield 3	79.0%	19	6	7	10	4	1	1
U19B	1	3	Southwestern 1	75.0%	18	11	8	14	4	2	0
U19B	1	3	Annandale 1	75.0%	18	8	16	23	4	2	0
U19B	1	3	Lee-Mt. Vern. 2	75.0%	18	11	14	27	4	2	0
U19B	1	4	Prince William 4	71.0%	17	8	14	21	3	1	2
U19B	1	4	Northern VA 1	71.0%	17	9	7	18	3	1	2
U19B	1	4	Herndon 2	67.0%	16	5	12	13	3	2	1
U19B	1	4	Great Falls 1	67.0%	16	5	18	18	3	2	1
U19B	1	4	Springfield 1	67.0%	16	7	14	12	3	2	1
U19B	1	4	Northern VA 2	67.0%	16	8	9	14	3	2	1
U19B	1	5	Southwestern 2	63.0%	15	9	12	13	3	3	0
U19B	1	5	Haymarket 3	63.0%	15	9	16	17	3	3	0
U19B	1	5	Chantilly 2	63.0%	15	6	12	14	3	3	0
U19B	1	5	Braddock Road 3	63.0%	15	8	23	15	3	3	0

**Tournament Divisions
Using The 4 Team Tournament Option
(February 5, 2018)**

Age Group	Regular Season Division	Tournament Division	Team Name	Game Point Percentage	Game Points	Bonus Points	Goals Allowed	Goals Scored	Total Wins	Total Losses	Total Ties
U19B	1	5	Chantilly 1	63.0%	15	6	20	14	3	3	0
U19B	1	6	Loudoun 1	58.0%	14	4	20	15	2	2	2
U19B	1	6	Loudoun 2	58.0%	14	4	18	17	2	2	2
U19B	1	6	Fauquier 1	55.0%	11	6	17	21	2	3	0
U19B	1	6	Prince William 3	55.0%	11	4	16	13	2	3	0
U19B	1	6	Sterling 3	54.0%	13	5	17	21	2	3	1
U19B	1	7	Springfield 2	50.0%	12	4	23	13	2	4	0
U19B	1	7	Reston 1	50.0%	12	6	17	11	2	4	0
U19B	1	7	Springfield 4	46.0%	11	1	17	13	1	3	2
U19B	1	7	McLean 1	50.0%	12	2	25	10	2	4	0
U19B	1	8	Prince William 2	42.0%	10	3	17	10	1	4	1
U19B	1	8	Burke Athletic 1	45.0%	9	2	14	9	1	3	1
U19B	1	8	Haymarket 2	40.0%	8	3	11	7	1	4	0
U19B	1	8	Annandale 4	44.0%	7	2	15	7	1	3	0
U19B	1	8	Prince William 5	40.0%	8	3	20	8	1	4	0
U19B	1	8	Alexandria 3	40.0%	8	3	23	7	1	4	0
U19B	1	9	McLean 4	38.0%	9	3	23	7	1	5	0
U19B	1	9	Fairfax 1	38.0%	9	3	27	13	1	5	0
U19B	1	9	Haymarket 1	38.0%	9	1	26	3	1	5	0
U19B	1	9	Loudoun 3	38.0%	9	1	31	12	1	5	0
U19B	1	10	Braddock Road 4	25.0%	6	0	33	4	0	6	0
U19B	1	10	Haymarket 4	25.0%	6	0	26	5	0	6	0
U19B	1	10	McLean 2	25.0%	6	0	34	5	0	6	0
U19B	1	10	Loudoun 4	25.0%	6	0	42	8	0	6	0

**Fall 2018 Tournament Divisions Using 4 Team Tournament Option
(February 5, 2018)**

Age Group	Regular Season Division	Tournament Division	Team Name	Game Point Percentage	Game Points	Bonus Points	Goals Allowed	Goals Scored	Total Wins	Total Losses	Total Ties
U19G	1	2	Loudoun 3	92.0%	22	10	3	14	5	0	1
U19G	1	2	Chantilly Soccer 1	90.0%	18	10	0	16	4	0	1
U19G	1	2	Prince William 1	88.0%	21	10	10	19	5	1	0
U19G	1	2	Fairfax 3	88.0%	21	13	5	22	5	1	0
U19G	1	2	Sterling 2	88.0%	21	12	8	26	5	1	0
U19G	1	3	Northern VA 1	79.0%	22	13	11	26	5	2	0
U19G	1	3	Annandale 3	81.0%	13	8	3	10	3	1	0
U19G	1	3	Northern VA 2	79.0%	19	11	14	26	4	1	1
U19G	1	3	Loudoun 2	75.0%	18	11	9	19	4	2	0
U19G	1	3	Lee-Mt. Vern. 1	75.0%	18	9	8	17	4	2	0
U19G	1	4	Southwestern 1	67.0%	16	8	7	15	3	2	1
U19G	1	4	McLean 1	70.0%	14	6	14	19	3	2	0
U19G	1	4	Fauquier 1	64.0%	18	6	20	21	3	2	2
U19G	1	4	Burke Athletic 1	63.0%	10	5	9	10	2	2	0
U19G	1	5	Gunston 1	55.0%	11	6	14	21	2	3	0
U19G	1	5	Northern VA 8	55.0%	11	4	20	14	2	3	0
U19G	1	5	Sterling 3	50.0%	12	5	16	13	2	4	0
U19G	1	5	Chantilly 1	45.0%	9	3	16	7	1	3	1
U19G	1	5	Fauquier 2	45.0%	9	2	12	7	1	3	1
U19G	1	6	Great Falls 1	44.0%	7	3	19	6	1	3	0
U19G	1	6	Haymarket 1	42.0%	10	3	13	9	1	4	1
U19G	1	6	Soccer on the Hill 1	42.0%	10	2	19	5	1	4	1
U19G	1	6	McLean 2	38.0%	9	1	17	4	1	5	0
U19G	1	7	Loudoun 1	33.0%	8	0	21	6	0	4	2

**Fall 2018 Tournament Divisions Using 4 Team Tournament Option
(February 5, 2018)**

Age Group	Regular Season Division	Tournament Division	Team Name	Game Point Percentage	Game Points	Bonus Points	Goals Allowed	Goals Scored	Total Wins	Total Losses	Total Ties
U19G	1	7	Southwestern 2	29.0%	7	0	23	3	0	5	1
U19G	1	7	Haymarket 2	29.0%	7	0	21	8	0	5	1
U19G	1	7	Herndon 1	29.0%	7	0	24	4	0	5	1
U19G	1	7	Prince William 2	25.0%	6	0	32	5	0	6	0