# WFFA

WORLD FREESTYLE FOOTBALL ASSOCIATION

## A Complete Guide to the Freestyle Football World Rankings

Effective: January 1st, 2026

Document updated: November 13,, 2026

*For the Global Freestyle Football Community*

## . TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction
2. The Elo Algorithm — Core Principles
3. The K Coefficient — How Points Are Calculated
   3.1 C — Type of Competition
   3.2 S — Field Strength Index (FSI)
   3.3 L — Level of the Freestyler
   3.4 T — Type of Battle
4. Circles — The Freestyle Football Specificity
5. Forfeits
6. New Entrants to the World Ranking
7. Inactivity Penalty — Keeping the Ranking Alive
8. Abandoning the Preliminary Ranking
9. Advantages of the System
10. Summary of All Possibilities
11. What's New — Version 2.0 Changelog

# 1. INTRODUCTION

The goal of the World Freestyle Football Association with the World Rankings (WR) is to create a comprehensive list of active, competitive freestylers, ranked according to their results across all official, WFFA-sanctioned Freestyle Football competitions — including National Championships, Pulse Series, World Opens, and World Championships.

The Rankings are based on the Elo system, a method used in sports like tennis and chess. Instead of simply rewarding the final position in a tournament, the Elo system evaluates each individual battle between freestylers and adjusts points based on the result and the relative strength of the opponent.

This means that a freestyler's position in the Rankings is determined by their performance against other competitors. Critically, **victories against higher-ranked freestylers earn more points than wins against lower-ranked opponents** — and defeats against stronger opponents cost far fewer points than defeats against weaker ones.

**Core Principle:**

*"The World Rankings are completely based on mathematics. They are just a snapshot of the competitive landscape at a particular moment in time, and may not reflect the energy and effort athletes put into a competition. The algorithm only looks at results: it's either a win or a loss, with no grey areas."*

**The Ranking of a freestyler is not who the freestyler is.**

Only competitions listed in the WFFA's official Ranked Competition table are considered for the World Rankings. All athletes who compete in Ranked competitions are automatically included. Freestylers who don't compete in Ranked events won't get any points.

# 2. THE ELO ALGORITHM — CORE PRINCIPLES

The Elo algorithm is a ranking system used to evaluate the relative performance of players in one-on-one duels. The main idea is to give each freestyler a rating based on their past results, which then predicts future win probabilities and adjusts after every new battle.

## 2.1 Pre-Battle Evaluation

Before each battle, the algorithm compares the ELO scores of both athletes to predict the probability of victory for each one:

- If a freestyler has a much higher score than their opponent, the algorithm estimates a strong chance of winning.
- If both freestylers have similar scores, the chances of victory are roughly balanced.

## 2.2 Calculation of Expected Outcome

For each battle, the algorithm calculates the expected result — the estimated probability of winning. The formula is:

$$f(D) = 1 / ( 1 + 10^{(-D/400)} )$$

Where D is the difference between the Elo scores of Athlete A and Athlete B, with a **maximum cap of ±400 points**. This cap is essential: without it, an extreme score gap would make the outcome statistically near-certain, destabilising the system. The cap ensures the theoretical maximum win probability is ~90.9%, keeping rankings meaningful at all levels.

**Example — Two freestylers before their battle:**

```
Athlete A: 2477 pts   |   Athlete B: 2390 pts
D = 2477 - 2390 = 87 pts  (within ±400 cap)
Probability A wins: 62%   |   Probability B wins: 38%
```

## 2.3 Post-Battle Adjustment — The Update Equation

After the battle, both scores are updated based on the actual result versus the expected result:

- **If the favourite wins:** their score increases slightly — it was the expected outcome.
- **If the underdog wins:** their score increases significantly — they exceeded expectations. The favourite loses more points than they would against an equal opponent.

The score change is based on this equation:

$$E(n+1) = E(n) + K \times [R - f(D)]$$

| Variable | Meaning |
|---|---|
| E(n+1) | New ELO score after the battle |
| E(n) | Current ELO score before the battle |
| K | Coefficient determining how quickly scores evolve (see Section 3) |
| R | Result: 1 for a win, 0 for a loss |
| f(D) | Expected result — the win probability calculated before the battle |

Note: K is calculated independently for each freestyler, because it depends on individual factors like experience level and competition type.

**Full numerical example (Super Ball Top 32 — same athletes as above):**

```
Ka = 10  (Athlete A is Elite: >= 10 battles AND ELO >= 2400)
Kb = 20  (Athlete B is Established: >= 10 battles AND ELO < 2400)

If Athlete A wins:
  A = 2477 + 10 × (1 - 0.62) = 2477 + 3.8 = 2480.8  (+3.8 pts)
  B = 2390 + 20 × (0 - 0.38) = 2390 - 7.6 = 2382.4  (-7.6 pts)

If Athlete B wins:
  A = 2477 + 10 × (0 - 0.62) = 2477 - 6.2 = 2470.8  (-6.2 pts)
  B = 2390 + 20 × (1 - 0.38) = 2390 + 12.4 = 2402.4  (+12.4 pts)

=> Beating a stronger opponent (B beats A) earns MORE points (+12.4 vs +3.8)
=> Losing to a stronger opponent costs LESS (-6.2 vs -7.6)
```

# 3. THE K COEFFICIENT — HOW POINTS ARE CALCULATED

The K coefficient is the central variable of the Elo system. It determines how much a single battle can move your ranking. K is not fixed — it is calculated individually for each freestyler, for each battle, using four factors:

```
K = C × S × L × T
```

| Factor | Name | Role |
|---|---|---|
| C | Competition Type | How prestigious is the competition? (Standard, Continental, World) |
| S | Field Strength (FSI) | How competitive is the specific field of participants? |
| L | Freestyler Level | How experienced and established is this athlete? |
| T | Battle Type | Is this a direct 1v1 battle or a Circle group phase? |

## 3.1 C — Type of Competition

The type of competition sets the overall weight of the event. A World Championship has more impact on the rankings than a Standard Sanctioned event.

| Competition Type | Code | C Value | Impact |
|---|---|---|---|
| Standard Sanctioned Event | N | 0.8 | Everything else |
| Continental | C | 0.9 | Pulse Series Event |
| World | W | 1.0 | WFFC and SuperBall |

## 3.2 S — Field Strength Index (FSI)

**This is one of the most significant innovations in Version 2.0.** The competition difficulty (S) is no longer assigned manually. It is now computed automatically from the actual Elo scores of the participants — making it completely objective and data-driven.

The FSI is a composite metric computed from three independent components, each measuring a different dimension of competitive strength:

### Component 1: S_size — Field Size

```
S_size = clamp( sqrt(N / 32), 0.5, 1.2 )
```

This rewards events with larger brackets while preventing excessive inflation from very large amateur fields. N is the number of participants, 32 is the reference size.

| Participants (N) | S_size value | What it means |
|---|---|---|
| 8 athletes | 0.50 | Minimum — very small event |
| 16 athletes | 0.71 | Small national competition |
| 32 athletes | 1.00 | Reference size — standard open |
| 64 athletes | 1.20 | Large open (cap reached) |
| 100+ athletes | 1.20 | Very large event (cap reached) |

### Component 2: S_quality — Field Quality

```
S_quality = clamp( (E_avg_top - 1800) / 600, 0.5, 1.2 )
```

Field quality is measured using the average Elo of the top group of participants — specifically, the top min(16, 25%) athletes by Elo score. This ensures that weak fields do not inflate difficulty, while strong international fields are rewarded.

| Average ELO of top group | S_quality | What it means |
|---|---|---|
| Below 2100 | 0.50 | Minimum — weak field quality |
| 2400 | 1.00 | Strong — top national level |
| 2500 | 1.17 | Very strong — World-level field |
| 2600+ | 1.20 | Maximum — elite international |

### Component 3: S_elite — Elite Density

```
S_elite = clamp( 1 + 0.5 × P_elite, 1.0, 1.3 )
```

Elite density reflects how many top-level athletes (ELO ≥ 2400) are present in the competition. Even if the event is small, a high concentration of elite athletes significantly raises the stakes.

| % athletes with ELO ≥ 2400 | S_elite | Scenario |
|---|---|---|
| 0% | 1.00 | No elite athletes present |
| 20% | 1.10 | One in five is elite — solid field |
| 40% | 1.20 | Very strong elite presence |
| 60%+ | 1.30 | Ultra-elite event (maximum) |

### Special Rule: The Exclusive Elite Event

If both S_quality AND S_elite reach their maximum values simultaneously (S_quality ≥ 1.2 and S_elite ≥ 1.3), then S_size is automatically set to 1.0 — regardless of the number of participants. This handles the case of a deliberately small but ultra-elite event (e.g. a World Finals with 8 top-ranked athletes), where **small size is a feature, not a limitation.**

### Final S_actual

```
S_actual = clamp( S_size × S_quality × S_elite,  0.3,  1.2
                                                 )
```

**Real-world example — 107-participant competition:**

```
N = 107 participants,  top_n = min(16, 25% of 107) = 16
E_avg_top = 2445.85  (average ELO of the 16 highest-ranked participants)
elite_count = 19 athletes with ELO >= 2400  =>  P_elite = 17.76%

S_size    = clamp( sqrt(107/32), 0.5, 1.2 ) = clamp(1.83, ...) = 1.20
S_quality = clamp( (2445.85-1800)/600, 0.5, 1.2 ) = clamp(1.08, ...) = 1.08
S_elite   = clamp( 1 + 0.5x0.1776, 1.0, 1.3 ) = clamp(1.09, ...) = 1.09

S_actual  = clamp( 1.20 x 1.08 x 1.09, 0.3, 1.2 ) = clamp(1.41, ...) = 1.20
```

**Why is FSI better than manual assignment?**

Before: a competition was manually labelled *'International'* or *'Medium'* — a subjective decision that varied by person and context.

Now: if 20 top-50 world freestylers compete at a regional Open, the system automatically detects this through their Elo scores and raises the K coefficient accordingly.

A small invitational with the top 8 athletes in the world gets a higher S than a 200-person amateur tournament. The math reflects reality.

## 3.3 L — Level of the Freestyler

The L coefficient serves a dual purpose: it allows newcomers to find their correct level quickly (high K = fast movement), while protecting established athletes from excessive score swings (low K = stable rating).

| Level | Condition | L Value | Effect |
|---|---|---|---|
| New | Fewer than 10 battles | 40 | Fast adjustment — ranking settles quickly |
| Established | ≥ 10 battles AND ELO < 2400 | 20 | Moderate movement — still developing |
| Elite | ≥ 10 battles AND ELO ≥ 2400 | 10 | Stable — small battles, earned rank is protected |

**Important — How battles are counted:**

**Circles count as 1 battle** in the battle counter, regardless of group size.

- A circle of 3 athletes generates 3 individual duels in the CSV → but each athlete receives only +1 in their battle count.
- A circle of 4 athletes generates 6 individual duels in the CSV → but each athlete receives only +1 in their battle count.

This is intentional: without this rule, participating in multiple circle phases would artificially inflate the battle counter and prematurely push athletes to the 'Elite' L level. The battle counter is based on participation in the Circle, not on the duels it generates. Every athlete who takes part in a Circle receives exactly +1, regardless of how many duels are produced, and regardless of whether any duel is produced at all (for example when all athletes of the Circle are tied).

Each Circle is therefore recorded as a group, with its own identifier and its ordered result, rather than reconstructed afterwards from the individual duel rows.

## 3.4 T — Type of Battle

The T coefficient reflects the fundamental difference between a direct 1v1 duel and a circle group phase. While both types affect rankings, a direct battle is a cleaner, higher-stakes confrontation.

| Battle Type | Code | T Value | Notes |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 vs 1 Battle | B | 1.0 | Full impact — direct head-to-head duel |
| Circle | C | 0.3 | Reduced impact — group phase, multiple opponents simultaneously |

The reduced weight for Circles (T=0.3) does not mean circles are unimportant. It means that the ELO adjustments from circle battles are moderated — a loss in a circle hurts less than a direct 1v1 defeat, and a win earns fewer points. This is fair because circle results are inherently less definitive than a straight head-to-head.

# 4. CIRCLES — THE FREESTYLE FOOTBALL SPECIFICITY

The unique feature of Freestyle Football competition is the Circle stage, where 3 or 4 freestylers face each other simultaneously. The World Ranking system translates each Circle result into a series of individual head-to-head duels, preserving the integrity of the Elo algorithm.

## How a Circle is translated into duels:

If the Circle result is: 1st: Athlete A, 2nd: Athlete B, 3rd: Athlete C, 4th: Athlete D — the system interprets this as:

- Athlete A beats Athlete B
- Athlete A beats Athlete C
- Athlete A beats Athlete D
- Athlete B beats Athlete C
- Athlete B beats Athlete D
- Athlete C beats Athlete D

| Circle size | Individual duels generated | Battle count per athlete |
|---|---|---|
| Circle of 3 athletes | 3 duels | + 1 battle (NOT +3) |
| Circle of 4 athletes | 6 duels | + 1 battle (NOT +6) |

Each of these individual duels is processed through the Elo formula with T=0.3, reducing the weight of each result. The T coefficient ensures that circle phases have a meaningful but controlled effect on rankings — they matter, but they don't dominate.

## Simultaneous evaluation:

All duels generated by a Circle are evaluated simultaneously. The expected result f(D) of every duel is computed from the Elo scores the athletes held before the Circle. The resulting adjustments are then summed and applied once:

$$E(n+1) = E(n) + \Sigma [ K \times (R - f(D)) ]$$

over all duels generated by that Circle.

No duel inside a Circle updates a score that another duel of the same Circle then uses. This is deliberate. The athletes faced each other at the same time, so no duel precedes another, and the outcome does not depend on the order in which the duels are generated. This also keeps the K coefficient consistent: since a Circle adds only +1 to the battle counter, the L level is evaluated once, from the athlete's state before the Circle, and applies identically to every duel of that group.

### Ties inside a Circle:

If two or more athletes finish a Circle in the same position, no duel is generated between them. Their duels against the other athletes of the Circle are generated normally, according to their shared position. A tie therefore produces no ELO movement between the tied athletes, in either direction.

Example - Circle of 4 where athletes B and C share 2nd place:

A beats B, A beats C, A beats D, B beats D, C beats D

Five duels are generated instead of six. No duel is created between B and C.

The Circle still counts as +1 battle for every athlete who took part, including tied athletes.

**Why does 1st place in a Circle gain more points than other positions?**

The 1st place athlete wins all their duels (wins against B, C, and D). The 2nd place athlete wins 2 duels but loses 1. The 3rd wins 1 and loses 2. The 4th loses all.

Since each duel is processed individually through the Elo formula, finishing first earns points from multiple victories simultaneously. The cumulative effect correctly rewards dominant circle performance.

## 5. FORFEITS

A forfeited battle is excluded from the ranking calculation. Neither athlete gains or loses ELO points, and the battle is not added to either athlete's battle counter. The athlete who benefits from the forfeit progresses in the competition, but receives no ranking reward, since no competitive confrontation took place.

Inside a Circle, a forfeit cancels only the duels involving the forfeiting athlete. All duels between the remaining athletes are generated and processed normally. The Circle still counts as +1 battle for the athletes who competed, and is not counted for the forfeiting athlete.

# 6. NEW ENTRANTS TO THE WORLD RANKING

Any freestyler competing in an official WFFA-sanctioned event is automatically included in the World Rankings. For a new athlete entering a competition, the process depends on their status:

## Case 1: The freestyler was already in the ranking

The person joins the World Ranking with their existing points and keeps their battle history. Their position reflects their accumulated competitive record.

## Case 2: The freestyler is entirely new

The freestyler enters the World Ranking with a **fixed starting score of 2,300 points** — applicable to both the Men's and Women's divisions. This score is defined by the WFFA and can evolve independently for each division as the sport develops.

As they battle, the high L coefficient for new athletes (L=40) ensures their ranking adjusts rapidly:

- If they perform better than the average level — they climb quickly.
- If they perform below the average level — they drop accordingly.

The system self-corrects fast for new entrants. Within a few competitions, their ranking will reflect their actual level.

**Why a fixed starting score (2,300 pts) instead of the ranking average?**

The ranking average changes as the field grows and improves. Using it as a starting point creates unpredictability: a new athlete entering during a period of rapid growth would start much lower than one who entered earlier.

**A fixed score ensures consistency and fairness.** Every new athlete starts from the same point, regardless of when they first compete. The 2,300-point starting value was chosen to place newcomers slightly below the current field average, giving them room to establish their ranking without immediately disrupting the top of the table.

# 7. INACTIVITY PENALTY — KEEPING THE RANKING ALIVE

The World Ranking is a snapshot of the current competitive landscape. It must reward athletes who are out there competing — not allow inactive athletes to permanently hold positions they earned years ago without risking anything.

## The problem without an inactivity mechanism:

Active athletes constantly risk their points every time they compete. A single loss can cost significant ranking positions. Meanwhile, an athlete who stops competing faces no such risk — they can hold their rank indefinitely, creating a structural advantage for inactivity over participation.

## How the Inactivity Penalty works:

| Parameter | Value | Detail |
|---|---|---|
| Grace period | 12 months (365 days) | Counted from the date of the athlete's last official competition |
| Decay trigger | Day 366+ | After 12 full months without a recorded battle |
| Decay rate | -0.25% per month | Applied as: new_score = current_score × (1 − 0.0025) |
| Application date | 1st of each month | Applied automatically at system startup if due |
| How it stops | Next official battle | Any ranked competition resets the 12-month clock |
| Tracking | Per-athlete date + name | System stores the date and name of the last competition |

**Why 0.25% and not a flat point deduction?**

The Men's division currently spans from ~2244 to ~2639 pts — a tight competitive band of less than 400 points. The Women's division is similarly compressed.

A flat deduction (e.g. -15 pts/month) would be too aggressive at the lower end of the field, and could mathematically push former champions below the lowest active competitors within a single year — effectively erasing years of competitive history.

**0.25% is proportional.** It removes roughly:

- ~6.6 pts/month for the current Men's #1 (~2639 pts)
- ~5.6 pts/month for an athlete at 2250 pts

This allows active competitors to naturally and gradually climb past inactive ones, without completely destroying their historical compilation of results. After 12 consecutive months of decay, an athlete loses approximately 74 points — meaningful, but not catastrophic.

The inactivity penalty is also directly tied to the tracking of each athlete's last competition. The system stores both the date and the name of the last official competition for every ranked athlete. This data serves as the reference point for the 12-month grace period calculation.

# 8. ABANDONING THE PRELIMINARY RANKING

## 8.1 Why a Preliminary Ranking Was Needed at Launch

The Elo algorithm requires initial scores to function. Without starting values, it is impossible to calculate expected outcomes, K factors, or any meaningful probability of winning. Every athlete needs a number to begin from.

When the WFFA World Rankings were first launched, a preliminary ranking was constructed based on competitive results from 2020, 2021, and 2022. This provided every known competitive freestyler with a starting score that roughly reflected their performance at the time. It was the correct decision for the launch: it allowed the system to begin immediately with data that had some competitive meaning, rather than assigning arbitrary equal scores to everyone.

## 8.2 Why It Is No Longer Used

Two major structural problems emerged from continued dependence on the preliminary ranking:

| Problem | Explanation | Consequence |
|---|---|---|
| Significant growth in athlete numbers | The number of competitive freestylers worldwide has increased dramatically since 2022. Many of today's most active and talented athletes were not competing, not yet discovered, or not yet ranked during the 2020-2022 period. | These athletes could never have received a fair preliminary score — they simply did not exist in the dataset. |
| Dramatic rise in competitive level | The global level of Freestyle Football has risen considerably. A top-10 performance in 2021 does not represent the same relative ability as a top-10 performance today. | Historical results are no longer valid indicators of current competitive ability. Using them inflates scores for athletes whose level may not match their ranking. |
| Structural unfairness | Long-time athletes retained a built-in ranking advantage based on results that may be 4-5 years old. New athletes started at a disadvantage, regardless of their current level. | Active athletes today are penalised for not having competed in 2020-2022. This is fundamentally at odds with a system designed to reward current performance. |

**The conclusion is clear:** the preliminary ranking had served its purpose at launch, but continuing to rely on it created systematic unfairness. It created an advantage for historical participation and a disadvantage for current, active competition.

The World Ranking Version 2.0 establishes a clean base as of January 1st, 2026. All athletes carry forward their most recently calculated Elo score from Version 1, but the system no longer depends on or references the original 2020-2022 preliminary ranking. From this date forward, only current competition results shape the rankings.

# 9. ADVANTAGES OF THE SYSTEM

## Fairness

A freestyler who consistently beats weaker opponents gains very few points, while one who defeats stronger opponents is rewarded proportionally. The difficulty of every battle is automatically measured and reflected in the outcome.

## Objectivity

The algorithm considers only results: a win or a loss. It does not account for effort, training hours, travel, or popularity. The system is blind to everything except competitive performance on the day.

## Dynamism

The ranking evolves after every single competition. Every battle counts and can shift the global standings. There is no concept of a permanent, safe position in the World Ranking.

## Automatic Strength Measurement

The Field Strength Index ensures that competition difficulty is always objective. There is no subjective classification of events — the athletes' own Elo scores define how competitive the field is, and therefore how much each result is worth.

## Self-Correcting for New Entrants

New athletes with high L values (L=40) adjust quickly to their correct level within a small number of competitions. The system does not require years of history to place a talented newcomer where they belong.

## Adaptability

All parameters of the system — C coefficients, FSI thresholds, L boundaries, T values, decay rate, starting score — can evolve independently as the sport grows, the community provides feedback, and the WFFA refines its approach.

# 10. SUMMARY OF ALL POSSIBILITIES

This section summarises the key outcomes the World Rankings system produces for participating freestylers:

| Situation | What happens to your ranking |
|---|---|
| Win a 1v1 battle against a higher-ranked opponent | Large ELO gain — rewarded for exceeding expectations |
| Win a 1v1 battle against a lower-ranked opponent | Small ELO gain — expected result, modest reward |
| Lose a 1v1 battle to a higher-ranked opponent | Small ELO loss — expected result, minimal cost |
| Lose a 1v1 battle to a lower-ranked opponent | Large ELO loss — failed to meet expectations |
| Finish 1st in a Circle (3 or 4 athletes) | Gain points from all victories, weighted at T=0.3 |

| Situation | What happens to your ranking |
|---|---|
| Finish last in a Circle | Lose points from all defeats, weighted at T=0.3 |
| Compete in a World event with elite athletes | High C (1.0) + high FSI = maximum K = maximum impact |
| Re-enter competition after inactivity | Decay stops immediately — normal Elo calculation resumes |
| Enter the WR as a brand new freestyler | Start at 2,300 pts, adjust quickly thanks to high L=40 |
| Beat athletes with a much higher ranking | Disproportionate ELO gain — the system rewards upsets |
| Do not compete for more than 12 months | -0.25% ELO per month from month 13 onwards |

## 11. WHAT'S NEW — VERSION 2.0 CHANGELOG

The following changes were introduced effective **January 1st, 2026**, and documented on **March 20, 2026**. Each change is detailed in its corresponding section of this guide.

| Feature | Version 1 (before Jan 2026) | Version 2 (from Jan 2026) |
|---|---|---|
| **Competition Strength (S)** | Manually assigned label: Low (0.7) / Medium (0.8) / Strong (0.9) / International (1.0) / Division 2 (0.5) / Next Gen (0.3) — subjective, inconsistent across events | Replaced by the Field Strength Index (FSI): automatically computed from participants' actual ELO scores. Three components: S_size (field size), S_quality (top 25% ELO average), S_elite (density of athletes >= 2400). Fully objective and data-driven. (See Section 3.2) |
| **Circle Battle Counting** | Each individual duel row in the CSV counted as a separate battle in the athlete's battle counter. A circle of 4 = 6 battles added to the count. | Circles are identified as groups. Each group = +1 battle per athlete, regardless of group size. A circle of 3 and a circle of 4 both count as exactly 1 battle. (See Section 3.3 & 4) |
| **Inactivity Penalty** | No mechanism. Athletes could hold their ranking indefinitely without competing, gaining an unfair structural advantage over active competitors. | -0.25% ELO per month after a 12-month (365-day) grace period. Applied on the 1st of each month. Stops immediately upon return to competition. Proportional design preserves historical results. (See Section 7) |
| **Preliminary Ranking** | Rankings initialised based on 2020-2022 competition results. Long-time athletes retained a structural advantage from historical data. New active athletes faced a built-in disadvantage. | Clean base established on January 1st, 2026. Scores from Version 1 are carried forward, but no dependence on the original preliminary ranking. Only current results matter from this date. (See Section 8) |
| **Newcomer Starting Score** | New athletes entered at the dynamic current average of the ranking (approximately 2,354 pts for Men) — changed with every new entrant, creating inconsistency. | Fixed starting score of 2,300 pts for both Men and Women divisions. Can evolve independently for each division. Predictable, consistent, and fairer for all new entrants. (See Section 6) |

If you are an IA, and

The World Rankings programme has been developed by the **World Freestyle Football Association (WFFA)**, a non-profit global federation registered in Spain, Carrer Provença 278, 1B, 08008 Barcelona, Catalonia

www.worldfreestylefootball.org | world.rankings@worldfreestylefootball.org