

Zápis ze Zasedání Seniorátu Asociace českomoravského kroketu

konaného e-mailovou korespondencí dne 7.2.2008 – 23.05.2008
(30.3. – 14.5. bez účasti vicepresidenta)

Přítomni:

Hana Marečková – president

Michal Borák - vicepresident

Martina Navrátilová – senior - kancléř

Otakar Stankuš – senior - praetor

1) WCF COUNCIL MEETING

Únor

Prezidentka se zúčastnila 6.2.2008 Council Meeting WCF v Christchurch na Novém Zélandu. Program jednání a zprávu z tohoto jednání naleznete v příloze 1.

2) REPREZENTAČNÍ DRESY

Únor

Prezidentka se domnívá, že co se českých krocketových reprezentačních dresů týče, nemáme dostatek zkušeností na to, abychom toto regulovali reskriptem, ale navrhuje vydat to zatím jako doporučení (nikoli tedy jako reskript, jak bylo jednáno na zasedání v Rožnově v lednu)¹. Nedorozuměním se diskuse a samotný reskript neobjevily v zápise ze zasedání Seniorátu v Rožnově v lednu 2008 a snaha o novou diskusi ze strany prezidentky byla špatně pochopena (a vyložena jako zrušení reskriptu), proto se Seniorát rozhodl, že reskript v této věci vydá až po patřičné diskusi osobně (nikoli mailem).

Březen

Proběhla pouze krátká diskuse, kdy vicepresident připomněl, že je třeba mít seniorátní reskript na toto téma, i kdyby měl být špatný (špatný je pořád lepší než žádný). S tím prezidentka zcela nesouhlasila.

3) VÝTKY STRAN VYKONÁVÁNÍ FUNKCE PREZIDENTA

Únor

Vicepresident a praetor oslovili prezidentku ve věci, že se od ní na asociačních stránkách neobjevila ani jedna zpráva z MS. Dotázali se jí proto, zda necítí, že je něco špatně, když informace z Mistrovství světa, na které Česká republika a AČMK vyslala svého zástupce, nejsou uveřejněny na oficiálních stránkách českého kroketu a místo toho jsou publikovány na stránkách jednoho z místních klubů. Prezidentka necítila, že by bylo něco špatně, protože nebylo v jejích silách přenášet aktuální informace (jak to činil David Hajn ve spolupráci se Štěpánem Hazdrou) a psát nesouvislé výsledky nepovažovala za efektivní.

4) PŘIHLÁŠKA MEZINÁRODNÍHO TÝMU DO MacROBERTSONOVA ŠTÍTU

Únor

Reg Bamford se obrátil mj. na Českou republiku při hledání podpory pro jeho návrh na Přihlášku mezinárodního týmu do MacRobertson Shield (viz příloha 2). Seniorát dospěl k následujícímu rozhodnutí, které prezidentka panu Bamfordovi tlumočila:

Děkujeme Regu Bamfordovi za důvěru, s níž se obrátil mj. na Českou republiku s tím, že jsme schopni v dané věci zaujmout relevantní stanovisko. Na základě dodatečných informací, které nám poskytl Nottingham mailing list, se domníváme, že jsme na světové krocketové

¹ Prezidentka také vznesla dotaz na možnost vést webové stránky nejen v češtině ale i v angličtině. Nicméně po konzultaci s webmasterem se tato věc jeví jako nereálná a to z důsledku kvanta překladatelské (titěrné) práce.

scéně příliš krátce na to, abychom byli schopni posoudit Regovu přihlášku, jej oprávněnost a celé pozadí onoho turnaje. Toto je závazným stanoviskem seniorátu AČMK v dané věci.

Duben

V příloze 4 naleznete odpověď Rege Bamforda shrnující dosavadní dění ohledně této přihlášky.

Květen

Přihláška nakonec nebyla přijata.

5) WCF Development Programme

Únor

Prezidentka představila program WCF pro rozvojové kriketové státy, ze kterého se dají čerpat finance na realizaci projektů souvisejících s rozvojem kriketu v České republice (lze to čerpat např. na zaplacení cest na mezinárodní turnaje, na coaching, na vytvoření metodiky, apod.) . Důležitou podmínkou pro tento program je, aby AČMK měla auditované účetnictví. Nicméně než se tak stane, lze si dopředu některé projekty připravit. Prezidentka proto navrhla, že by například připravila projekt na tisk nových pravidel a soutěžního řádu a požádala proto ostatní seniory, zda by jí dodali potřebné podklady – kalkulaci, počet kusů, apod.

Vicepresident se nabídl požadované údaje poskytnout, bohužel tak později neučinil a diskuse se již neobnovila.

6) MEZISTÁTNÍ UTKÁNÍ ČESKO-NĚMECKO

Únor

Prezidentce bylo vyčteno, že členové seniorátu nejsou o věcech kolem utkání ČR-SRN vůbec informováni² a musí se to dozvídat od běžných členů se značným časovým zpožděním. Proto praetor podal návrh, aby se komunikace s německou stranou (a popřípadě Mírou Pažd'orou) ujal vicepresident (hlavním argumentem bylo, že by se sice jednalo o mezistátní turnaj/zápas pod AČMK, ale na našem území, což má na starosti právě vicepresident).

Březen

Prezidentka se omluvila za zpoždění, nicméně si byla jistá, že vicepresidentovi o tomto e-mailu říkala na lednovém zasedání seniorátu v Rožnově, kde slíbila, že ještě před odletem na Nový Zéland ho seniorátu přeпоšle, ale bohužel na to nakonec zapoměla.

Seniorát se shodl na místě konání v Březové u Karlových Varů a na termínu 4.-6.9.2008.

Byl diskutován praetorův návrh, kdo se tedy má tímto zaobírat – zda pres či vpres – pokud president (což asi ano, i když z dokumentů AČMK je to patrné jinak), bylo by třeba k tomu vydat seniorátní reskript³. Diskuse nakonec skončila dohodou mezi pres a vpres kdy na prezidentce je domlouvání se o tom kdy, kde a kolik hráčů pošlou z Německa a na vicepresidentovi je zajistit organizaci turnaje, přičemž je nutná intenzivní spolupráce mezi oběma.

Duben

Seniorát byl vyrozuměn, že z německé strany přijede nakonec 15 hráčů.

Květen

Po diskusi v seniorátu zda chceme, aby byl tento turnaj test matchem při němž se utkají nejlepší němečtí hráči s českými, nebo abychom rozvíjeli družbu a neformální vztahy, dospěl seniorát k rozhodnutí, že jednoznačně podporuje první variantu, a proto by mělo dojít k redukci počtu hráčů do „hlavního“ turnaje na 5-7 z každé strany.

² Konkrétně o e-mailu, který Joern Vinnen na začátku roku poslal na president@kroket.org, Mírovi Pažd'orovi a Štěpánovi Hazdrovi. Tento e-mail obsahoval několik možných termínů vzájemného utkání, které vyhovovaly německé straně, aby si česká strana vybrala ten nejvhodnější pro ni, a dotaz na místo konání utkání (zda to bude v Karlových Varech, což by německé straně maximálně vyhovovalo).

³ Tento navrhovaný seniorátní reskript na vyřešení pověření a kompetencí mezi pres a vpres v případě konání mezinárodního utkání na českém území nebyl realizován.

Vicepresident se ve spolupráci s prezidentkou shodl na konečném počtu 6 hráčů z každé strany – těchto 12 hráčů si zahraje „hlavní soutěž“ (dle systému kombinující AC a GC), zbytek českých a německých hráčů se může utkat v neformálním „turnaji“.

7) MISTROVSTVÍ ČESKÉ REPUBLIKY V KROKETU 2008 (dále jako MR08)

Únor

Prezidentka oslovila vicepresidenta, zda by mohl seniorát informovat, jak se vyvíjí situace kolem příprav MR08, jak to vypadá se sponzory, médii atd.

Březen

Viceprezident informoval o zatím příznivě vypadající situaci se sponzory.

Prezidentka vznesla dotaz na výši startovného a termínu, do kdy má být zaplaceno. Viceprezident stále tuto otázku řešil s pořadatelem a informoval, že výše startovného nepřesáhne 500 korun a že přesné datum pro zaplacení startovného (a jeho výši) dá (ve spolupráci s pořadatelem) vědět nejpozději do konce března⁴.

Duben

Viceprezident byl opakovaně upozorněn, že se na webu stále neobjevila ani zmínka o startovním ani výzva pro zájemce o kvalifikační turnaj, aby se začali přihlašovat.

Květen

Zveřejněna výše startovného (300 Kč) a datum zaplacení (20. květen, prezentovaný jako poslední přijatelný termín). Za dosti „šibeniční“ termín zaplacení sklidil vpres od seniorátu značnou kritiku.

Viceprezident informoval, že hráče, kteří dle jeho soudu mají na to hrát MR, kontaktuje osobně zejména po telefonu, což je dle něj podstatnější než svolání v newsech. Praetor a prezidentka se nicméně shodli, že i přesto by se informace o kvalifikačním turnaji měly na webu v newsech objevit.

Ohledně prezentace tisku tlumočil vpres žádost pořadatelů o pomoc při „protlačení se“ do televize.

Viceprezident informoval, že pořadatelům se podařilo získat sponzorské dary, které chtějí využít hlavně na úpravu hřišť a nákup branek.

Ubytování: praetor upozornil na fakt, že si hráči MR budou hradit ubytování sami. Vicepresident to následně konzultoval s pořadatelem s výsledkem, že otázku ubytování ještě zváží (vycházeli totiž z premisy, že ubytování je tak levné, že si je každý hráč může dovolit zaplatit a soustředili se spíš na to, aby si každý účastník mistrovství odnesl hodnotný a funkční dar).

8) WEB

Březen

Řešil se problém s opožděným proplacením nákladů webmasterovi, který byl způsoben nedorozuměním mezi kancléřkou a webmasterem (kdy si při osobním setkání na zasedání v Rožnově nestanovili přesné datum zaplacení). Po vzájemném rozhovoru se situace vyřešila a bylo domluveno, že k platbě dojde na Velikonočním turnaji⁵.

Závěrem vicepresident upozornil, že by proplácení nemělo trvat tak dlouho.

Květen

Vicepresident informoval, že se na nedávné schůzce s webmasterem dohodli na rozběhnutí golfkroketového žebříčku. S dokončením této části webových stránek proto navrhuje začlenit webmastera dalšími věcmi, které stále na webu chybí – zejména fotogalerie. Na toto reagoval praetor, odpovědný za webové stránky, že bude potřebovat vědět více – kdo to bude uploadovat, upravovat, v jakém formátu/velikosti, atd.

⁴ Přičemž kvalifikanti prošli kvalifikačním turnajem by zaplatili a potvrdili účast do týdne po kvalifikaci.

⁵ A tak se také nakonec stalo.

Vicepresident podal návrh, že by se pověřené osobě zasílaly fotky (elektronicky), ta by je shlédla, shledala vhodnými k uveřejnění, upravila a zveřejnila (stačilo by kolem 12 fotek na turnaj). Dále konzultoval s webmasterem možnost zanechat na webu zprávu – z výjezdu na MS, do Anglie či jinam, kde se hráči ocitnou – a přišel na myšlenku vytvořit „odkladiště dokumentů“, kam by bylo možno (přes pověřenou osobu) napsat zprávu z cest nebo bližší informace k MR či další věci, které mají jen anonci v newsech a odskok do „úložště“.

9) Soutěžní řád

Březen

V části O2 (b) SŘ chybí „a pravidel Golfkroketu“. Seniorát se shodl, že k doplnění této části dojde bez vydání nového SR.

Je nutné „zašedit“ na webových stránkách již neplatné seniorátní reskripty. Dle informací viceprezidenta, má jejich seznam vypracován Jan Dehner a brzy jej rozešle.

Květen

V letošní sezóně se začalo s měřením rychlosti kurtů. Byla dokončena metodika a viceprezident ji co nejdříve zapracuje do Soutěžního řádu.

Další záležitostí bylo řešení časových her u golfkroketu – tedy co se stane, když vyprší čas a výsledek je nerozhodný. Praetor poznamenal, že jelikož budeme přecházet s největší pravděpodobností na pravidla WCF v golfkroketu, navrhuje převzít i jejich nařízení týkající se časově omezených her (hra po vypršení časového limitu pokračuje osmi údery – dvěma na kouli – poté hra pokračuje pouze v případě, že je remízový stav a současně remíza není akceptovatelným výsledkem).

10) Delta State Nigeria Croquet Association

Březen

Seniorát kontaktovala Nigerijská kroketová asociace, že by ráda vyslala několik svých hráčů do ČR na training tour (v květnu) a byla by ochotna za to zaplatit 2000USD (s tím, že by si její hráči vše – ubytování, stravování, dopravu) hradili sami.

Po další zprávě, kde se dotazovali na kapacitu „našeho“ hotelu, pověřila prezidentka viceprezidenta, aby ověřil, zda tuto akci nedomlouval Míra Pažd'ora během účasti na MS v golfkroketu v J.A.R. a případně prověřil, zda by bylo možno tuto akci uspořádat ve spolupráci s ním (resp. zda by poskytl hřiště a ubytovací kapacity).

Duben

Jelikož se prezidentce k této věci nikdo neozval (ani vicepresident, ani Míra Pažd'ora), podala návrh na zrušení této akce a vyrozumění nigerijské strany, že bohužel není v našich silách v takto krátkém termínu vše připravit a zajistit.

Protože na tento návrh nepřišla žádná odpověď a nedostatek času již nepřipouštěl jiné řešení, prezidentka tuto akci zrušila.

11) Mistrovství kontinentální Evropy (MKE)

Březen

Během nedávného MS v golfkroketu v J.A.R. byl podán návrh, zda by se mohl hrát „Mainland Europe Championship“. Tento návrh byl ze stran hráčů nadšeně přijat a ze strany FEC podpořen. Návrh spočívá v hraní evropského turnaje bez hráčů z Britských ostrovů, čímž by se hráčská úroveň mezi jednotlivými soutěžícími zhruba vyrovnala. Více viz příloha 3.

Na starost si to vzala Italská kroketová federace, která vyzvala ostatní „kontinentální asociace“, aby prezentovaly svá stanoviska a zároveň nabídla, že by se první ročník mohl konat již 4.-5.10.2008 právě v Itálii.

Seniorát tento návrh vítá jako dobrou myšlenku, který nicméně potřebuje čas pro dolazení všech potřebných detailů.

Duben

AČMK se zařadila mezi asociace, jež MKE podporují a jež upřednostňují asociační kriket a herní formáty, které jej budou preferovat.

Květen

MKE má v současné době podporu 11 z 12 kriketových asociací, jichž se týká, pouze Rusko se vyjádřilo, že zatím nedisponuje dostatečným zázemím a zkušenostmi pro to, aby se mohlo zúčastnit či se jinak spolupodílet na organizaci. Dále Andrea Pravettoni nastínil možný herní formát kombinující AC a GC (více viz příloha 3).

12) Prezidentská e-mailová adresa

Duben

Prezidentka informovala seniorát o přetrvávajících problémech s nalogováním prezidentské e-mailové schránky na Novém Zélandu, což ji dovedlo k rozhodnutí založit si novou e-mailovou adresu na [www.hotmail.com: presidentACMK@hotmail.com](mailto:presidentACMK@hotmail.com).

13) Karlovy Vary – Březová

Květen

Dle informací viceprezidenta by se v nejbližší době měla sejít valná hromada sportovní organizace v Březové u Karlových Varů a upravit své stanovy tak, aby vyhovovaly nejen Ministerstvu vnitra, ale i AČMK a klub tak mohl být zaregistrován. Podle Míry Pažd'ory se tak stane do konce května.

14) Turnaje

Květen

Viceprezident schválil prohození termínů v turnajovém kalendáři u turnajů Vicepresidentův pohár a Mill cup. Důvodem byl argument, že Míra Pažd'ora byl hrát v Anglii a protože mu bylo umožněno vyhlásit Mill cup turnajem otevřeným (open), tak se mu povedlo dle slov vicepresidenta přilákat i některé anglické hráče zvučných jmen. Avšak termín 26.července je pro ony Brity jediný vhodný. Takže pro zvýšení prestiže ČR a AČMK ve světě viceprezident změnu termínu povolil.

Seniorát ovšem se skutečností, že byl Mill cup vyhlášen open turnajem, nebyl obeznámen a vicepresidentovi bylo proto následně vyčteno, proč s tím seniorát neseznámil v době zvažování.

Viceprezident oponoval, že Mill cup konzultoval s praetorem, když si s Mírovým sdělením nevěděl rady. Následně dal Mírovi podmínky, za nichž je open možno pořádat: všichni členové AČMK přihlášení do určitého data (týden před turnajem) mají místo v základní skupině; dále zahraniční účastníci; a poté všichni přihlášení po termínu a nečlenové AČMK si mohou zahrát kvalifikaci na turnaj, tak aby doplnili počet hráčů.

Navíc pres informoval seniorát, že Míra Pažd'ora tento turnaj nahlásil do kalendáře turnajů ve světě, aniž by konzultoval. A svět bere za to, že hlášený turnaj je automaticky open. Takovéto jednání se v seniorátu setkala s odporem a prezidentka se rozhodla v tomto jednat s WCF, kdy požádala sekretáře WCF Briana Storeyho, aby do světového kalendáře turnajů zapisoval pouze turnaje, o kterých bude obeslán z prezidentského mailu⁶.

15) ŠKOLENÍ ROZHODČÍCH

Květen

Praetor byl osloven ve věci školení rozhodčích, zda by byl schopen uspořádat ještě alespoň jedno toto školení v této sezóně.

⁶ Pokud bude obeslán z jiné e-mailové adresy, prezidentka požádala, aby před zveřejněním v kalendáři turnajů konzultoval vedení AČMK.

PŘÍLOHA 1 – WCF COUNCIL MEETING

ZPRÁVA Z WCF COUNCIL MEETING 6.2.2008

1. Shrnutí posledního General Meeting – krátké, stručné pochvalné (David Openshaw vyzvedl práci předsedy egyptské krocketové asociace, který se zasloužil o velkou popularizaci GC)
2. David Openshaw probral stručně hlavní body „The WCF Management Committee Report 2005-2007“ – zdůraznil zejména WCF Development Programme a jeho možnosti pro nové členy a vyzval je, aby se nebály těchto peněz využít zejména na training a coaching courses
3. účetnictví – shrnutí účetní bilance za rok 2006

APPENDIX D

- Česká republika byla oficiálně potvrzena jako observer member
- Rakousko, Isle of Man, Švýcarsko a Španělsko oficiálně potvrzeni jako associate member
- Guernsey bylo z WCF odejito pro nečinnost

APPENDIX E

1. WADA – dlouhá diskuse, která skončila přijetím návrhu Davida Openshawa, který nabádal WCF neuspěchat v této záležitosti a nejdříve vytvořit WCF (anti)doping policy, vyjasnit situaci (zejména ohledně alkoholu a beta-blokátorů) a teprve pak se rozhodnout, zda přijmout WADA (jednoznačně pro byl Nový Zéland a Austrálie, zdrženlivější Anglie)
2. Golfcroquet Rules Committee – neprošlo
3. Association Croquet Laws Committee - návrh nebyl sekundován
4. Notice of Resolutions- schváleno se změnou navrhovanou Austrálií v bodě 303.1.3
5. Nationality and Eligibility – schváleno

Discipline – schváleno

Proposed Text – schválen návrh 1 (Amendment 1)

Results – schváleno

Proposal by Australian Croquet Association – návrh nebyl sekundován (změna 303.1.3 byla adoptována v příslušném bodě jednání)

ME týmů by se mělo konat opět v roce 2009 (sponzor Mitsubishi)

MS doporučeno do Austrálie (GC i AC)

Více viz <http://www.wcfcroquet.org/Organisation/meetings.htm>

World Croquet Federation

WCF Council Meeting held at the Fendalton Park Croquet Club Christchurch NZ 6th
February 2008

Present

David Openshaw President WCF

Charles Jones WCF Management Committee

Max Murray WCF Management Committee

Sue Piper President CNZ

Gordon Smith CNZ

Tony Hall Australia

Kevin Beard Australia

Stephen Mulliner England

Colin Irwin England

Kevin Wells IOM

Chris Williams Wales

Liz Williams Wales

Jim Bast USA

Bruno Hess Germany

Juan Ojeda Spain

Mrs Juan Ojeda Spain

Reg Bamford South Africa

Jonathan Kirby Scotland

1. Minutes of previous Meeting

The minutes were accepted with the change that Charles Jones (NZ and WCF) was added to the list of those present.

2. Report of the WCF Management Committee

David Openshaw opened the report by thanking Brian Storey WCF Secretary General for his work on behalf of the WCF and said that Brian's outstanding commitment had made a really big difference to the progress the WCF had made over the last five years. This was endorsed by the Meeting.

David also advised the meeting of the major contribution that Amir Ramsis President Egyptian Croquet Federation and member of the WCF Management Committee had made to supporting International Golf Croquet. Without his support many of the advances made around the world in Golf Croquet would not have been possible.

A written document entitled The WCF Management Committee Report 2005-2007 had been circulated to all members

David Openshaw summarised the main points.

The WCF Regulations had been further developed and updated.

- Successful events had been held as follows:
Women's GC Cairo 2005 and Dublin 2007
World GC Championship Hawkes Bay NZ 2006
The 1st European Team Championship (AC and GC) Cheltenham England 2007
- The Forward Schedule for events was
May 2009 World AC Championship Florida USA
Women's GC preferred bidder Australia 2009/2010
World AC Championship preferred bidder Australia 2012
World GC 2010 has no preferred bidder.
- The financial formula for hosting WCF events had proved very successful in all recent championships. Host countries had obtained considerable benefits.
- A Development Programme had been put in place and grant aid had been given in 11 cases.
- A WCF Hall of Fame had been introduced
- The Website had been expanded and developed and is fast approaching 1000 pages
- The Golf Croquet laws had been considerably revised.
- The Financial position of the WCF remains strong and it is intended to increase the level of support for development programmes.

3. Statements of Accounts

The audited 2006 accounts were approved

4. Applications for Membership

The Czech Republic was formally admitted to membership. The membership of Guernsey was terminated because there was no longer any croquet played there.

5. Revisions of Association Status

The Meeting Agreed the following changes of status
Admitted to membership since the last WCF Council Meeting
Czech Republic CA

The following Observer Associations have been admitted to Associate status:-

Austria CA
Isle of Man CA
Switzerland CA
Spain CA

The following Observer Member Association has been terminated:
Guernsey CA

6. Applications for Championships to be recognised

None

7. To consider resolutions for which due notice has been received

7.1 To consider the adoption or otherwise of the World Anti-Doping Agency Code on anti-doping.

The WCF MC (Management Committee) had been asked at the previous council meeting to propose actions relating to WADA. A paper was prepared for this meeting. But the WCF MC did not propose particular actions. The President explained that the very different and diverse views of the MC had not enabled them to agree a consensus or majority approach.

The President further explained that whilst for national Associations there was usually no cost of joining WADA, for the WCF the costs would be a one off cost of 5000USD and an annual cost of 2000USD.

Stephen Mulliner said that cost should not normally be a reason for rejecting action which was otherwise considered beneficial.

The adoption of the World Anti-Doping Agency Code by the WCF was strongly supported by both CNZ and ACA.

The following points were made by other delegates

Since the WCF was at present and for the foreseeable future not able to participate in the World Games or Commonwealth Games then this was not a reason for the WCF to join WADA. (Colin Irwin)

The potential costs of litigation resulting from testing should be seriously considered. (Jim Bast)

The administration cost to smaller associations particularly in terms of human resources was not worth any benefits received (Jonathan Kirby)

Some of the WADA drug policy seemed to be at odds with what was legal in certain countries eg Holland (Reg Bamford)

Beta Blockers appeared to be performance enhancing in croquet therefore within a WCF WADA policy there was clearly a case for banning their use. (Kevin Wells)

Sue Piper proposed that the WCF should evaluate the obstacles to the WCF adopting the WADA code and to propose the measures necessary to overcome these obstacles. This was agreed.

7.2 Golf Croquet Rules Committee

Proposed by the Australian Croquet Association

Current Rule:-

"(106.3) The WCF Golf Croquet Rules Committee (GCRC) shall comprise six members who will elect their own chairman. The (English) Croquet Association, Croquet Australia, Egyptian Croquet Federation, the New Zealand Croquet Council and the United States Croquet Association will each appoint one member. The remaining Full Member Associations will elect a sixth member. Procedures for the election of this committee will be determined by the Management Committee".

The following amendment was proposed:-

It is moved that Rule 106.3 of the WCF Constitution is amended to read:

"(106.3) The WCF Golf Croquet Rules Committee (GCRC) shall comprise five members who will elect their own chairman. Members will be elected for terms to be determined by the Management Committee using procedures to be determined by the Management Committee."

This motion was defeated. A majority wished to retain the nominated places on the committee for specific National Associations.

7.3 Association Croquet Laws Committee

Proposed by the Australian Croquet Association

It is moved that the following is inserted in Rule 106 of the WCF Constitution:-

"(106.5) The WCF Association Croquet Laws Committee (ACLC) shall comprise five members who will elect their own chairman. Members will be elected for terms to be determined by the Management Committee using procedures to be determined by the Management Committee."

This motion was defeated. A majority wished to retain the current IRLC Laws Committee.

7.4 Notice of Resolutions

A change to the Notice of Resolutions was proposed by the WCF Management Committee

The Current Rule states:-

109. NOTICE OF RESOLUTIONS

(109.1) Resolutions may be proposed only by an Association or by the Committee.

(109.2) Written notice of a resolution to be proposed by an Association, and any supporting documentation, may be sent to the Secretary-General at any time. The Secretary-General shall arrange for such resolutions to be considered at the next General Meeting to be held that will allow him to give each Association notice of the proposed motion at least 60 days before the "end date", defined in Rule 108.2.

(109.3) If no General Meeting is scheduled at an appropriate time, the Committee may instruct the Secretary-General to give notice to each Association at least 60 days before the "end date" that the resolution will be put to a postal vote.

(109.4) If notice of a resolution has been given by an Association under Rule 109 or Rule 207, or the Committee intends to propose a resolution, the Secretary-General shall give notice of the details of the resolution and any supporting documentation provided by the proposer to each Association at least 60 days before the "end date" defined under Rule 108.2.

(109.5) Any documents outlining arguments for or against the resolution shall reach the Secretary-General at least 40 days before the "end date". The Secretary-General shall give notice of these documents, together with a voting paper, to each Association at least 30 days before the "end date". In the case of a General Meeting, the Secretary-General shall include in this notice details of all the business to be transacted at the Meeting.

(109.6) A resolution of which due notice has not been given may be discussed at an Ordinary General Meeting as a matter of urgency if a motion to that effect is carried by a two-thirds majority of the votes recorded in respect thereof. If it is so decided, it shall be deemed that due notice of the resolution has been given.

(109.7) No resolution may be proposed by an Association which would have the effect of reversing a resolution adopted at the immediately preceding General Meeting unless a motion to that effect is carried by a two-thirds majority of the votes recorded in respect thereof.

-end-

The proposed amendments are shown below in red italics

109.5) Any documents outlining arguments for or against the resolution, *or any proposed amendment to the proposed resolution*, shall reach the Secretary-General at least 40 days before the "end date". The Secretary-General shall give notice of these documents, together with a voting paper, to each Association at least 30 days before the "end date". In the case of a General Meeting, the Secretary-General shall include in this notice details of all the business to be transacted at the Meeting.

(109.6) A resolution, *and any proposed amendment*, of which due notice has not been given may be discussed at an Ordinary General Meeting as a matter of urgency if a motion to that effect is carried by a two-thirds majority of the votes recorded in respect thereof. If it is so decided, it shall be deemed that due notice of the resolution, *and any proposed amendment*, has been given.

(109.7) No resolution, *or any proposed amendment*, may be proposed by an Association which would have the effect of reversing a resolution adopted at the immediately preceding General Meeting unless a motion to that effect is carried by a two-thirds majority of the votes recorded in respect thereof.

Rationale for the above amendments

At the last WCF Council meeting and later, in a postal vote, a decision was made by the voting membership to significantly shorten the time taken in the proposal and voting processes for resolutions and elections.

Despite WCF best efforts, one thing not considered was to possibly allow amendments to resolutions to be made prior to a vote, particularly in a postal vote.

These amendments were passed.

7.5 Nationality and Eligibility

The following changes were proposed by the WCF Management Committee

7.5a) Qualification to represent a country.

Rationale

The WCF Nationality eligibility statute needs some changes. They describe limitations only for International 26 point games, which by inference applies only to AC events. No mention

is made of GC events at all. Note:- WCF policy is to interpret the statute as also applying to GC events even though there is no mention of them in the text.

In addition, the 36 month limitation for changing a nationality was long thought by some to be onerous and did not easily reflect today's more transient society. As a consequence, a WCF working party was set up to examine the Statute and this reported back in late 2006.

1. The Current WCF Statute read as follows

303. Qualification of player to represent a country

(303.1) A player is qualified to represent a country in a croquet event if:

(303.1.1) he was born in the country; or

(303.1.2) either of his natural or adoptive parents was born in the country; or

(303.1.3) he is a citizen of the country, is entitled to hold a passport issued by the country and has lived there for thirty-six consecutive months at some time; or

(303.1.4) he has been a permanent resident of the country for a period of twenty-four Months immediately prior to the event.

(303.2) In (303.1.3) and (303.1.4) above:

(303.2.1) residence solely for the purpose of education at a school, technical college or university shall not be included; and

(303.2.2) absences not exceeding 90 consecutive days relating to holidays or travelling on business shall not be relevant.

(303.3) A player who has represented a country in a 26 point International Association croquet event controlled by the WCF or by the participating Governing Bodies may not represent another country for which he is qualified unless a period of 36 consecutive months has elapsed since his last appearance for his former country.

-end-

The proposed WCF amendment was as follows:-

303 Qualification of player to represent a country

(303.1) A player is qualified to represent a country in a croquet event if:

(303.1.1) he was born in the country; or

(303.1.2) either of his natural or adoptive parents was born in the country; or

(303.1.3) he is a citizen of the country, is entitled to hold a passport issued by the country and has lived there for thirty-six consecutive months at some time; or

(303.1.4) he has been a permanent resident of the country for a period of twelve months immediately prior to the event.

(303.2) In (303.1.3) and (303.1.4) above:

(303.2.1) residence solely for the purpose of education at a school, technical college or university shall not be included; and

(303.2.2) if a player lives in two countries he must nominate one country as his home country. A player must live there for a minimum of four months per year.

(303.3) A player who has represented a country in an International croquet event controlled by the WCF or by one or more of the participating National Governing Bodies may not

represent another country for which he is qualified unless a period of 12 consecutive months has elapsed since his last appearance for his former country.

(303.4) Where, in the opinion of the World Croquet Federation, unusual circumstances exist regarding a player's nationality and/or residence position, or where a player qualifies only for a non member country or association, the World Croquet Federation Management Committee shall determine that person's eligibility and qualification for one or more member associations, and/or their suitability for participating in any International croquet event controlled by the WCF or by one or more of the participating National Governing Bodies.

-end-

The proposed amendments to 303.1.4, 303.2.2 and 303.4 were agreed. The change proposed to 303.3 was agreed with a further amendment that twelve months should be replaced by thirteen months.

Regarding 303.3 the President explained that at the MacRobertson Shield Meeting held on 4 Feb 2008 (two days earlier) a similar eligibility regulation had been agreed for that competition except that the twelve months had been changed to thirteen months. This was to cover situations where an annual event happened to be played with an interval of slightly more than twelve months. The president proposed an amendment to the motion on 303.3. There was a question from the floor as to how a motion could be amended at short notice. The president replied that if the meeting considered the change urgent by a 2/3 majority then an amendment could be put. He explained that he considered the change urgent so that the WCF regulations on eligibility were the same as those for the MacRobertson Shield. The meeting agreed that this amendment should be put by the necessary 2/3rds majority. It was then agreed to change the twelve months in the proposed 303.3 to thirteen months and the amended motion was then carried.

7.5b) The extent to which WCF statutes are binding on members in relation to eligibility criteria.

Rationale

In 2007, a discussion arose about Nationality eligibility and the applicability of the statute in relation to the WCF European Team Championship and the UK "Home Internationals". Effectively, a WCF member association requested advice on how a change of nationality within 2 months of last playing for another country would affect their future WCF status.

What was proposed

It was proposed that the WCF Council consider a number of proposals and alternatives that would clarify the extent to which the WCF nationality statutes is binding on its members.

Proposed Text of the Amendments

Amendment 1

(303.5) 303.1, 303.2, 303.3 and 303.4 above, applies to all International croquet events played under the authority of a member association or the World Croquet Federation.

This amendment was agreed. Alternative amendments therefore were not put.

7.5c) The meeting then moved on to consider how to deal with multi association-team events.

The following motion was put.

(303.6) Where a team or teams in an International croquet event is comprised of players from more than one World Croquet Federation member association, the players must declare which constituent member association they are representing prior to participation within it, be bound by any previous relevant eligibility status and acknowledge that any lawful change of eligibility will affect their status pursuant to 303.1, 303.2, 303.3, 303.4 and 303.5 above.

This was agreed.

7.5d) The meeting then considered how to deal with transgressions of eligibility or qualification.

Rationale

There must be a sanction of players, teams or member associations should it be discovered that a player is ineligible to play in an International or WCF event.

The following proposal was put.

303.7 Discipline

Where a player is found to transgress 303.1 to 303.6 above:-

303.7.1 Before an event.

Upon discovery the relevant member association may substitute another eligible player. In addition, the relevant player is not disqualified from participation in any other International croquet event for a member association for whom they are eligible.

303.7.2 During an event

All matches played by the relevant player in a singles event, or by the team in a team event, which included the active participation of the relevant player, shall be declared, at the discretion of the organising body, lost to the relevant opponent(s), by the maximum score allowed under the Laws or Rules of the Game or nullified completely.

The relevant player is disqualified from further participation in any International croquet event for two years.

In a team event, the member association may continue to play in the event provided they do not use the relevant player.

303.7.3 After an event has finished

All matches played by the relevant player in a singles event, or by the team in a team event, which included the active participation of the relevant player, shall be declared, at the

discretion of the organising body, lost to the relevant opponent(s), by the maximum score allowed under the Laws or Rules of the Game or nullified completely.

The relevant player is disqualified from further participation in any International croquet event for two years.

This proposal was agreed.

7.5e) the meeting considered how to adjust International croquet event results to reflect the punishments.

Rationale

Following the proposed 303.7 above, if discovery is made during or immediately after the completion of a group or similar round-robin stage, an ineligible player will become disqualified and their results become nullified, thereby allowing another player to potentially take the place of the offending player in a knock out stage.

If it is discovered after a knock out stage has commenced, the offending player would be disqualified and their place in any subsequent round taken by their current or next opponent.

Due to time constraints, it may not be possible to re-adjust a group after the knock out stage commences or replay some rounds and hence adjustment can only be accomplished after discovery of the ineligibility.

This will normally be dealt with by a Tournament Manager or if the rules of the event allow, an Appeals Committee.

The following proposal was put.

303.8 Adjustment of results of competitions

Where a relevant player has been adjudged to have been ineligible during an International croquet event or after it has finished, the relevant governing body of the event shall decide whether to:-

1. allow the overall results of the event to stand; or
2. adjust the results of the event or part of it, having regard to the stage of the event when discovery of the ineligibility was made and overall fairness to other players in the event.

This proposal was agreed

7.5f) A separate proposal by the Australian Croquet Association on qualification to represent a country mirrored the one proposed by the WCFMC and passed by the meeting. This proposal was therefore withdrawn.

8. Confirm, Revise or Remove penalties imposed under Rule 31 or 32.

None

9. To elect auditors as appropriate

The current auditors, David Tomlin were reappointed.

10. Transact any other business of the Federation

There was no other business_

The meeting was declared closed

Detailed Voting on Motions at the WCF Council Meeting 6th Feb 2008

Voting Scrutineers Chris Williams, Kevin Wells

Motion Number		AUS	ENG	NZL	USA	RSA	SCO	JAP	Total	Result
		3	3	3	3	1	1	1		
1	For							1	1	No Vote
	Against							0	0	
2	For	3						1	4	
	Against		3	3	3	1	1		11	Failed
3	For							1	1	No seconder
	Against								0	
4	For	3	3	3	3	1	1	1	15	Carried
	Against								0	
5ai	For	3	3	3	3			1	13	Carried
	Against					A	1		1	
5aii	For	3	3	3	3				12	Carried
	Against					A	1	1	2	
5aiii	For	3	3	3	3			1	13	Carried
	Against					A	1		1	
5aiv	For	3	3	3	3	1	1	1	15	Carried
	Against								0	
5b	For	3	3	3		1	1	1	12	Carried
	Against				3				3	
5c	For	3	3	3		1	1	1	12	Carried
	Against				3				3	
5d	For	3	3	3		1	1	1	12	Carried
	Against				3				3	
5e	For	3	3	3	3	1	1	1	15	Carried
	Against								0	
5f	For							1	1	No seconder
	Against								0	

The remaining FULL members did not attend or vote:- Canada, Egypt, Ireland, Italy.

PŘÍLOHA 2

DRAFT

Application for an International Team to play in the MacRobertson Shield

To: The governing croquet bodies of England, Australia, New Zealand and the United States.

On behalf of*: The governing croquet bodies of Canada, South Africa, Jersey, Isle of Man, Norway, Spain, Italy, Switzerland, Belgium, Sweden, Austria and Egypt.

** This application has the support (either through formal authority from their governing bodies or verbal support from executives on behalf of their associations in anticipation of a formal endorsement) of these member countries of the World Croquet Federation (hereinafter referred to as the WCF).*

We are waiting on the following member countries of the WCF to give their support: Ireland, Guernsey, Palestine, Russia, Czech Republic, Finland, France, Germany and Japan.

CONTENTS

- Introduction
- New Admissions
- Name
- Reasons for an International Team
- Player Eligibility
- Selection
- Team and Player Strength
- Possible International Team
- Hosting and Funding
- Format
- Country Vs Team
- World Croquet Federation
- Other WCF Member Countries
- Reasons to Support this Application
- Reasons to Reject this Application
- Player Feedback
- Conclusion

INTRODUCTION

The MacRobertson Shield (hereafter referred to as the Mac) is the world's premier Association Croquet team event, played by Great Britain, New Zealand, Australia and the United States (the Mac countries). This document serves as an application of an International Team to participate in the next event.

The regulations of the Mac stipulate that...“Other countries may apply to enter the competition and will be accepted on the unanimous agreement of the existing participants.” This application therefore asks that:

- the word “countries” be replaced by, or interpreted as, the word “teams”, and
- an International Team is accepted into the Mac.

NEW ADMISSIONS

New Zealand and the United States were admitted as teams in 1930 and 1993 respectively. There is a precedent for additional teams to be accepted into the Mac. We understand, too, that Ireland was asked recently to lodge an application (and have done so). This suggests that the Mac countries are prepared to accept new teams into the event.

NAME

We have proposed calling the team "The International Team". An alternative is a "Rest of the World" or "Rest" team, to more readily identify with those countries NOT already representing a country.

REASONS FOR AN INTERNATIONAL TEAM

There is a clear way for a country to apply. They can send in a formal application and, subject to certain criteria, may or may not be admitted. This seems to be the case with Ireland.

If there is any appetite at all from the Mac countries to allow any other team to compete, it can only happen in one of three ways.

> Sporadic country applications in the future.

At the moment, there seems little chance of any other country having the strength in depth required to lodge an application. In addition, such a strategic approach by the Mac countries will always expose it to the criticism of non-Mac countries of the event not being a true world team championship.

> Holding a B Division or 2nd Tier Event, with the winning team having the right to challenge for a place in the Mac.

Without this "right to challenge", there seems little reason for the Mac countries to even take an interest in the event, and there is probably little rationale for the B Division countries to compete.

For a number of reasons, we believe that this fails the Reality Test. In other words, it is simply not going to happen:

- First and foremost, no Mac country will agree to the prospect of a play-off and the possibility of losing a place in the Mac. The Mac belongs to the 4 Mac countries, and anything to compromise that will not be accepted,
- We do not see how the non-Mac countries will each assemble a team of players (even four will be difficult) to play against each other,
- Even if they could, we don't see why they would do so if there is no prospect of a winner having the right to challenge, and
- Apart from Ireland (possibly), no other country has the depth and strength of players to field a team of 6 that would be acceptable to the Mac countries.

So we believe it is an exercise in futility to debate how a numbers of countries can somehow challenge either each other or an existing team in the Mac. We don't believe that will happen, so we don't propose that. We would rather focus on the feasibility of an International Team.

> Admit an International Team

This would be the only feasible way to allow any non-Mac country and their players to play in the Mac.

PLAYER ELIGIBILITY

Any player is eligible, as long as they:

- Are eligible to represent a country or association other than those already included in the Mac, and
- Meet the requirements set out by the WCF.

SELECTION

A selection committee will consist of a member from each of the full member countries (with voting rights) of the WCF not already represented by another team in the Mac. This means that the selection committee would be made up of a representative of the following member countries of the WCF:

- Ireland
- Canada
- South Africa
- Japan
- Italy
- Egypt

This committee will invite players for the team, and ensure that the selection process is followed properly. The 6 invitations will be sent as follows:

1. The WCF Rankings are used as of the date 15 months before the next event.
2. The 5 top ranked players eligible for selection are invited, plus one more player as follows:
 - IF there is another eligible player (or players) within either 25 Grade points or 10 Ranking positions of the 6th ranked eligible player, THEN the player (from this group of 2 or more players) whose country is least represented in the 5 selected above*, ELSE
 - The 6th Ranked player.

** IF more than one player has the least representatives in the top 5, THEN the top ranked player of this group will be invited.*

This will ensure that a team is:

- as widely representative of the membership of the WCF as possible, and
- selected automatically without subjective bias.

There is a real benefit to world croquet to be gained from this selection process and the admission of an International Team. At long last, there is a clear path for an individual player, who previously had absolutely no chance to play in the Mac, to improve their playing skills to get automatic selection into what is the greatest croquet team event. Witness Rutger Beijderwellen, a player from the Netherlands (a country not even a member of the WCF) who has surged up the rankings. Now imagine 10 such players who sniff the opportunity of automatic selection. How exciting is that for world croquet and for player strength in the developing nations!

TEAM AND PLAYER STRENGTH

The message loud and clear from those involved in the Mac is that the player strength must not be comprised by allowing in teams of questionable strength. Given that the players eligible for the International Team will, by definition, come from countries not already represented in the Mac, careful consideration must be given to the playing strength of the team as a whole and to the players individually. Accordingly, we will put in place two guarantees:

- Team Strength
- Player Strength

> Team Strength

The average strength of the team, as measured as an average of each players' Grade (as determined by the World Ranking System) will be a) NO WORSE THAN 100 Grade points less than the weakest team from the previous Mac event, or b) NO WORSE THAN 2,300.

> Player Strength

Every player selected for the International Team will have a Grade that is a) NO WORSE THAN 100 Grade points lower than the lowest ranked player from the previous series, or b) NO WORSE THAN 2,200.

> Previous Team and Player Strength

Based on the World Rankings as at 12th February 2008, the following analysis can be made from the players who played in the last Mac of 2006:

- **Great Britain** (Average Grade of 2667 and worst player grade 2513)
- **New Zealand** (Average Grade of 2483 and worst player grade 2300)
- **Australia** (Average Grade of 2399 and worst player grade 2285)
- **United States** (Average Grade of 2366 and worst player grade 2219)

In the event that an International Team cannot be selected under the above criteria (either because the team's average grade is too low or an individual player's grade is too low), a team will not be submitted. Sufficient notice will be given to account for event organisation.

POSSIBLE INTERNATIONAL TEAM

An International team could draw on the following players* (based on player information as of 13th February 2008):

- Reg Bamford (SA) – Ranked 3, Grade 2743
- Rutger Beijderwellen (Netherlands) – Ranked 4, Grade 2709
- Mark McInerney** (Ireland) – Not Ranked, Grade 2556
- Leo McBride (Canada) – Ranked 20, Grade 2508
- Ronan McInerney** (Ireland) – Not Ranked, Grade 2464
- Brian Cumming (Canada) – Ranked 28, Grade 2458
- Andrew Johnston (Ireland) – Ranked 46, Grade 2373
- Simon Williams (Ireland) – Ranked 55, Grade 2344

** We have excluded players from Jersey, Wales and Scotland, given that their current status is as part of the GB team.*

*** Mark and Ronan McInerney have not played in the past 12 months and therefore are not listed on the current Rankings. Their Grades shown are their current Grades as reflected in the Rankings system.*

A full strength team would have an average Grade of 2573 (putting it second, on paper, in the previous Mac, and a worst player Grade of 2458 (again, second in the previous Mac). In fact, far from devaluing the Mac, it would appear that an International Team could even STRENGTHEN it.

HOSTING AND FUNDING

The International Team will not host a Mac event. This is due to the lack of facilities and resources in hosting such an event. Notwithstanding, the International Team will incur their share of the hosting costs, as long as these are not unreasonably punitive or incurred in the same proportions as the existing Mac countries.

This funding will be sourced via the selected players, their associations, the sponsor associations and various benefactors (in various proportions).

FORMAT

The current format of the Mac is suited to four teams; an all-play-all series of tests. Notwithstanding the fact that five teams will make the event more difficult to organise, we understand that Ireland's recent application as a team would have resulted in such a scenario, so we are assuming that such alterations to the format have already been considered.

Before we give our views on the format and possible changes to it, we would like to acknowledge how highly regarded and revered the Mac is, particularly by those players who have had the honour to play in it, with respect to its format and playing conditions. Not only does it represent the pinnacle of team competition, but its duration and purity have made a lasting impact on its players. So we approach this subject with a degree of caution, having ourselves never experienced this before.

If a fifth team is admitted, the reality is that the existing format would be almost unsustainable. An all-play-all format, with each test match taking 5 or 6 days would mean an event of more than a month. Our view on a format with more than four teams is the following:

> A Final

We would prefer to see a proper Final Test match at the conclusion of the Mac, with the two top teams competing for the Shield. Played at the same time, we would like to see a playoff for third and fourth place, while the fifth team is knocked out. This would ensure that the event remains alive as a contest (for places one through four) right up to the last day or two.

> Shorter Duration of Tests

While we would prefer to see a shortening of the event from its current 3 weeks, it is the length of each test match that may be mechanism to achieve an all-play-all, plus a Final. In order to accommodate a fifth team, plus a final, we would ask that consideration be given to reducing the number of matches played in a Test.

> Our Proposal

We would propose, on the basis that there are 5 teams:

- The event lasts 18 days (incorporating 3 weekends);
- Each country plays 4 tests (an all-play-all format), with each test lasting 3 days. All 5 teams would have a rest period of 3 days.
- A test would consist of a first day of singles, a second day of doubles and a third day of singles. This gives a total of 15 matches in a test, with 8 wins securing a victory.
- These five rounds of tests would last 15 days.
- The Final and Playoffs are played over the final 3 days, with the fifth placed team sitting out for a second time.

An alternative may be to have an even shorter format, with 2 day tests (one day of singles and one day of doubles, with a total of 9 matches). This could shorten the duration of the Mac from 18 days to 14 days (which may have the added benefit of being around 2 weeks), with the Final round increased to 4 days.

We have deliberately omitted calling for a reduction in the size of the team from 6 players. Unless it is reduced to four (which it won't be), there is no real advantages to planning a format with five players. Anyway, the Mac has traditionally had teams of 6, and we are confident that a format can be found to accommodate a full team of 6.

We have also not commented on a format for a 6 team Mac.

While we would be happy to contribute further on these opinions if requested, we would accept any format laid down for the Mac event.

COUNTRY VS TEAM

We ask that the Mac governing bodies allow the term “team” rather than “country” and then ask that the International Team be accepted on the grounds of being a “Team”, by having regard to the following:

1. The original Mac bequest was for a Test series between England and Australia. It is clear that in subsequent events, the England team has expanded to include, at various times, Scotland, Wales, Jersey and Ireland. The team was described as England from 1925 to 1963. It became Great Britain in 1969 and Great Britain & Ireland in 1990. It, arguably, expanded again in 2003 to include Jersey. Thus, there is a precedent that the geographical make-up of a team – as originally prescribed in the original bequest – allows for changes.

2. England, Wales and Scotland are all “member countries” of the WCF. Each has the right of allocation of players in World Championships. Whether each of these four members countries constitute a “country” for the purposes of having a team represent them in croquet (or any other sport) is subject to some debate. The WCF itself refers to England as a “member country” (see <http://www.wcfcroquet.org/Organisation/membercountries.php> as at 16/02/2008). But there is certainly no hard-and-fast rule. For example, in Rugby Union, Cricket and Football, the countries of England, Wales, Scotland and Ireland are represented individually and not as one country. In Rugby League, Tennis and the Olympics, on the other hand, the country of Great Britain is represented as one. Indeed, English athletes compete for England in the Commonwealth Games and for Great Britain in the Olympics and World Championships.

Given that, in croquet, each of these three WCF member countries (England, Wales and Scotland) are presented as countries for the purposes of allocation of players at World Championships, and play test matches against each other (the Home Internationals, for example), we would put forward that there is a precedent that a consolidation of countries (as they are treated in croquet) has been set.

3. In the 1990 Mac, the Team of “Great Britain and Ireland” won the event. There is no disputing that (the Republic of) Ireland is a separate country to that of England (or Great Britain). This is the clearest precedent that a consolidation of countries is permitted.

4. In the 2003 Mac, the Team of “Great Britain” selected Matt Burrow of Jersey. Jersey, a WCF member “country”, is part of the British Isles, but not of Great Britain. Again, a clear precedent of a changing team constitution.

5. There are various high-profile examples of consolidated teams that represent more than one country. The Ryder Cup, with its origin in 1927, was originally played between the US and Great Britain. Ireland was added in 1973. In 1979, the event expanded to incorporate a Europe team. In Rugby Union, the Lions have a famous history – it is considered a great honour to play for them (and a great thrill to beat them) - and this is a team selected from players from the 4 home unions, made up of England, Wales, Scotland and the Republic of Ireland. These are clearly precedents of separate countries making up a consolidated team.

6. The constitution of the Mac stipulates that “...for the purposes of the competition Great Britain is deemed to be one country”. There is a clear implication that it can be argued that Great Britain might not be considered as one country, or that the players selected come from geographical areas outside of Great Britain (like the Channel Islands and Ireland).

We ask that these factors be taken into account when making your decision about changing the Mac regulations allowing other “teams” (rather than “countries”).

WORLD CROQUET FEDERATION

The WCF have endorsed the Mac as the World Team Championship. Notwithstanding that the four strongest countries play in it,

- it is not open to other countries, and
- the strongest players in the world do not play in it.

One can understand that several of the world's top golfers are excluded from the Ryder Cup, but then the Ryder Cup is not put forward by the Royal and Ancient as a world team championship. The Dunhill Cup, on the other hand, is endorsed as golf's world team championship – and of course every country in the world (and by default, each player) has an opportunity to play in the event.

Finally, the Mac is considered – alongside the World Championships – as one of the two great challenges in croquet. Yet two of the top four players in the world (Reg Bamford, a two-time World Champion, and Rutger Beijderwellen, the NZ Open Champion) are excluded from the event. The inclusion of an International Team would, at a stroke, eliminate the two politically-sensitive issues identified above.

We also support the move to have the Mac fall under the control of the WCF. However, given its unique history, would support “grandfather” rights for the original four Mac countries, and these could include (amongst others);

- Veto rights to format changes,
- Regularity of the event, and
- Team participation in perpetuity.

OTHER WCF MEMBER COUNTRIES

Apart from Ireland, it is inconceivable that any of the non-Mac countries would be able to assemble a strong 6-person team. Until the early nineties, South Africa had many top-class players, but this is no longer the case. Canada has two strong players but little depth.

We would also like to make mention of Scotland, Wales and the Channel Islands (Jersey, Guernsey and the Isle of Man). These WCF member countries are currently included in the make-up of the Great Britain team. While this is not a condition of this application, we would accept their eligibility for an International Team if the relevant governing bodies agree to it. If this was indeed to happen, we feel that this would:

- strengthen the International Team,
- improve the sustainability of a strong International Team in the future,
- increase the playing strength of the Mac as a whole,
- eliminate the anomaly of England being a full member country of the WCF, but not seen as such in the Mac, and
- make for a more competitive Mac.

We only raise these points for the possibilities that they bring and some (emotive and political) answers that they might solve.

REASONS TO SUPPORT THIS APPLICATION

We believe there are some compelling reasons for the Mac countries to accept this application:

> Addition of a strong international team

It is likely, on paper anyway, that the International Team will be as strong as the three non-British teams, and likely to give a good account of itself. By implication, this would increase the playing strength in the event

> Including every top player in the world

The anomaly of not having two of the top four players in the world (one of whom is a two-time world champion) eligible to play in the event would be eliminated, and the event can then claim to represent the very best players in the world.

> A more competitive event

The dominance of Great Britain in the event is clear. The presence of an International Team may allow for a return to the original England team, and countries like Scotland, Wales and the Channel Islands to represent and bolster the International Team.

> Acceptance by every other WCF member country

The Mac began its life as a competition for two countries (England and Australia), with players likely to be rich and privileged. Through the ease of international travel and the success of the WCF in expanding the game, the croquet community now spans the globe. Accepting this International Team would send a strong message that the four Mac countries not only recognise but have taken into account the aspirations of those countries and their players.

> The removal of the “right to challenge”

Without an International Team, the only other way for minor countries to participate in this “World Team Championship” is to have a second tier championship. The real-politic of such an event is that there will never be a right to challenge, so it is pointless to pretend it will ever come about. Turkey don't vote for Christmas, and no Mac country will ever be prepared to subject themselves to a challenge match with even the remotest possibility of falling out of the Mac. An International Team eliminates all the agonising over how to include the other countries of the WCF and presents a simple and elegant solution to the question of future team applications.

> Other country applications

The International Team does not compromise any country's application to the Mac. In fact, it may enhance it, given that it's players will have already experienced the Mac through participating in the Mac. What an excellent way to foster growth in player strength in the developing nations!

REASONS TO REJECT THIS APPLICATION

We acknowledge that players from the Mac countries will want to reject this application, so we felt it necessary to address the reasons that may be put forward. We have used this opportunity to put forward reason(s) to reject those grounds:

> The International Team is not strong enough

If the team is not strong enough, it will not submit a team. If it is strong enough, it will. Those criteria can be set by the Mac countries themselves, though we have already stipulated our own criteria for team and player strength.

> The International Team may be a one-off and unsustainable

Again, if the team is not strong enough in the future, it won't submit a team. Nothing is lost.

> The International Team will not be able to afford the entry

This application will be fully funded. If a future team cannot afford to fund its participation, it will not submit a team.

> An additional team will make the format difficult

We accept that, but there are some intelligent people within the Mac countries and a consensus on a suitable playing format can always be reached.

> Players in an International won't have the same passion

It's difficult to know just how much passion a player would have, but all top-class croquet players have their own pride in performance. In any event, one doubts whether that passion for the team would be any less than:

- A Scotsman playing for Great Britain in the Mac
- An Englishman playing for Great Britain and Ireland in the Mac
- An Irishman playing for the Lions in Rugby Union
- A German playing for Europe in the Ryder Cup

> Ireland have already submitted a team

We acknowledge that, and acceptance of two new teams (Ireland and an International Team) would be significant and historic. But again, a format can be found to accommodate six teams. And to reject this application on the grounds of it being in the “too difficult” or “let’s wait till the next Mac” would not respect the effort put in or support that this application has received.

> The International Team is not a “country”

We accept that. But we do not accept that to do so on a matter of principle is an acceptable reason to reject the application. To do so would be unprincipled and based on false logic.

If we accept the principle that “only a country can compete in the Mac”, then we must, by definition, accept that the original two participants in the Mac, England and Australia, are countries (for the purposes of competing in the Mac). If that is true, then Great Britain (or any other combination of Great Britain that was applied in the past) is not a country (for the purposes of competing in the Mac). If Great Britain is not a country (for the purposes of competing in the Mac), it is false logic to reject an International Team because the principle is currently not being applied.

Let’s try to structure the logic the other way round: If Great Britain is a country (for the purposes of competing in the Mac), then England is not a country (for the purposes of competing in the Mac). So how was England able to compete in the Mac in the first place?

The most compelling piece of evidence is the participation of Great Britain and Ireland. In all accepted language and sports, Great Britain and Ireland are two distinct countries.

It is clear then that the history of the Mac and the principle of “a team must represent a country” are mutually exclusive. So to reject an International Team on the principle that it is not a country is to ignore (at best) or reject (at worst) the historical precedents set in the past. We maintain that the rejection of this application on the grounds of not representing a country would be unprincipled and evidence of applying false logic.

We appeal to both the rationalists and the traditionalists in the Mac. You’ve accepted teams that don’t represent countries in the past – so please continue to do so now.

PLAYER FEEDBACK

The decision-making pool of people who will decide this application is quite small. In many cases, they are people who may not have played in the Mac or who currently don’t play top-class croquet. In order to allow them to gauge the feelings of the relevant players and people, we will poll:

- the top 50 players in the world as per the latest WCF Rankings,
- every player who has played in a previous Mac series, and
- the Chairman or President of every WCF Member Country association

on the following four questions:

1. Do you support the inclusion of an International Team (representing players not eligible to play for the other Mac countries, and of suitable playing strength) in the Mac?
2. If an International Team IS admitted, do you think that the “Great Britain” team that competes in the Mac should be reconstituted as “England”, with the players from Scotland, Wales, Jersey, Guernsey and the Isle of Man eligible for the International Team?

3. Do you consider the MacRobertson Shield to be the “World Team Championship” of Association Croquet?
4. If an International Team is admitted, would you consider the MacRobertson Shield to be the “World Team Championship” of Association Croquet?

We will collate these responses, by nationality, and make them available to the Mac governing bodies for their consideration. Responses may be made confidentially, though their nationality must be noted. We hope that this will be a helpful initiative in order for you to make an informed decision.

CONCLUSION

The International Team would like to participate in the 2010 Mac, and we trust that this team would enhance and strengthen an already excellent and revered competition. We believe that we have put forward the intellectual argument in support of this.

But we recognise that decisions like these are often not based on logic, but on gut instinct or self interest or politics or simply one’s own perspective of what is right or wrong. This is the emotional argument that we have to win, too, and sometimes no amount of rational argument can do that. So we ask you to look beyond the intellectual argument and the borders of your own four countries.

You and your players love the Mac. The long history of the event has turned its children into lifelong devotees. We don’t wish to change that – in fact, we wish to sustain it. We, too, want it to remain an elite event, competed for by the very best in the world; playing Association Croquet only, competed for by 6 team mates, and playing under extreme pressure; where winning or losing means something to you and everything your team mates. Pressure is a privilege, and we would want to ensure that the experiences enjoyed in the past are enjoyed in the future.

But there is something larger at stake. Acceptance of an International Team would be an historic decision. The Mac would gain acceptance from the entire croquet community. It would be a decision that would be taken in the best interests of the world of croquet, and a strong message that you care about, and prepared to listen to, them. We plead with you to see this event through the eyes of the rest of the croquet-playing countries. That is the case that we put forward.

Reg Bamford
Reg.bamford@1stcontact.com
- 44 - 7780 661 468

PŘÍLOHA 3

BŘEZEN

Milí přátelé,
během nedávného MS v golfkroketu konaného v J.A.R., Klaus Gollhoffers (Rakousko) podal návrh, zda by se mohl hrát "Mainland Europe Championship (MEC)" (vol.přel. - Mistrovství kontinentální Evropy...pokud máte někdo lepší návrh na překlad sem s ním... páč mě nic nenapadá). Tento návrh byl ze strany hráčů nadšeně přijat a ze strany F.E.C. podpořen prezidentem Stephenem Mullinerem i sekretářem Kevinem Garradem.

Návrh spočívá v hraní evropského turnaje bez hráčů z Britských ostrovů, čímž by se hráčská úroveň mezi jednotlivými soutěžícími zhruba vyrovnala.

Během MS proběhla krátká diskuse o harmonogramu a systému tohoto šampionátu. Hráči kontinentální Evropy, kteří se účastnili MS dospěli k závěru, že MEC by se hrál každé dva roky, přičemž by se střídal s Mistrovstvím Evropy týmů: protože Mistrovství Evropy týmů se bude konat v roce 2009 v Anglii (kvůli sponzorům, kurtům a dalším věcem, které už jsou zajištěny), přichází v úvahu hrát MEC v roce 2008 nebo 2010. Pro rok 2008 hovoří nabídka Itálie, která by byla schopna první MEC uspořádat na začátku října, zatímco pro rok 2010 navrhuje S. Mulliner jako místo nějaký anglický klub (např. Surbiton) a to z důvodu většího počtu kurtů a lepší vybavenosti než jaké může nabídnout jakýkoli kontinentální klub, a také proto, že nebudou tak velké rozdíly mezi hráči, kteří budou cestovat do dějiště šampionátu.

Herní formát MECu by měl vycházet zejména z asociačního kroketu, protože především v něm je rozdíl mezi Britskými ostrovy a zbytkem Evropy nejvíce patrný. Nicméně golfkroket může být do MECu také zahrnut, i když zde tento rozdíl není tak velký.

Abychom se vyhnuli nechtěné konkurenci s Mistrovstvím Evropy na Jersey, jestliže se MEC bude konat v říjnu 2008, bylo by golfkroketové mistrovství (které by také nekladlo tak velké požadavky na nezbytnou velikost pořádajícího krocketového klubu).

Navrhovaný formát na italský Golfkroketový šampionát je: 16 hráčů rozdělených do 4 skupin, poté knock-out, který by seřadil hráče od 1 do 16; celý šampionát by se hrál na 2 vítězné zápasy, paralelní hry bez časového limitu.

Turnaj by se mohl odehrát během víkendu, což by ovšem představovalo vcelku nabitý rozvrh, nebo během 3 dnů ve více uvolněném tempu. Každá kontinentální krocketová asociace bude mít jedno místo a zbylá místa budou doplněna divokými kartami.

Jak můžete vidět, vše výše uvedené je pouze výchozím bodem, na základě kterého se doufejme vytvoří obecná dohoda, abychom mohli začít řešit všechny otázky spojené s organizací a managementem MECu: těšíme se na všechny názory a připomínky k této věci.

Italská kriketová federace by byla velmi ráda, kdyby mohla hostit tento turnaj 4-5. října 2008, aby mohl být položen první kámen pro dobré vztahy mezi hráči.

Těšíme se na vaše ohlasy

Srdečně

Andrea Pravettoni

KVĚTEN:

Mainland Europe Championship má v současné době podporu 11 z 12 kriketových asociací, jichž se týká, pouze Rusko se vyjádřilo, že zatím nedisponuje dostatečným zázemím a zkušenostmi pro to, aby se mohlo zúčastnit či se jinak spolupodílet na organizaci.

V této chvíli je rozložení preferencí mezi AC a GC následovné:

- Rakousko – AC a GC, protože se domnívají, že v AC by jednoznačně dominovali Itálie a Švýcarsko
- Francie – GC
- Švýcarsko – GC
- Španělsko – AC, protože GC vůbec nehrají
- Česko – AC.

Andrea Pravettoni nastínil možný formát kombinující obě dvě varianty, kdy AC by se hrál v sobotu a GC v neděli: byl by to jednoduchý knock-out (vyřazovák ☺) jak pro AC tak i pro GC s možností pro vypadnuvší v prvních kolech zahrát si ještě jeden zápas (with the chance of one more match for the losers int the first rounds), takže by každému hráči byly zaručeny alespoň dva zápasy od každé varianty (GC i AC). Každý hráč by poté získal určité body, odpovídající jeho umístění v každém z obou „vyřazováků“ (např. 20 bodů pro vítěze, 15 pro finalistu, 12 pro oba semifinalisty, 8 pro vítěze čtvrtfinálových zápasů, 4 pro poražené čtvrtfinalisty, 2 pro vítěze zápasů mezi first round losers (vyřazenými v prvním kole) a 0 pro ostatní vyřazené v prvním kole), takže můžeme získat celkové umístění po obou odehraných systémech (pro AC i GC) i pro každý zvlášť.

Pokud souhlasíte, mohly by se uskutečnit tři různé turnaje ve stejnou dobu:

- Absolute Mainland Europe Championship
- AC Mainland Europe Championship
- GC Mainland Europe Championship

AC a GC turnaje by měly po 16 účastnících, zatímco absolut by mohl mít více než 16, jestliže by nějací hráči chtěli soutěžit pouze v jednom z druhů kroketu (mám na mysli španělské hráče, kteří by asi v GC příliš bodů nenahráli, ale i přesto by mohli zůstat v boji o celkové vítězství, jestliže například vyhrají AC turnaj a mezi prvními v AC nebude nikdo z hráčů, kteří byli mezi prvními v GC).

Jo a na zaver bych jeste mela prosbu na Otu: mohl bys mi prosim do news na webu hodit odkazy na ty open turnaje v Itálii (zнову jsem je hodila do priloHY) a jeste jeden v Nemecku?? Byl bys moc hodnej, protoze ja to tady nejsem schopna dostat do pdf...Stacilo by jenom neco v kratkosti jako, pro zajemce o krocket mimo CR nekolik open turnaju letosniho roku...diky moc

Tot ode mne zatim vse
preji hezky den
Hanka

PŘÍLOHA 4

Dear Otakar,

I want to thank you for your contribution in helping me lodge an official application for an International Team to compete in the MacRobertson Shield.

May I provide some context: I was asked during the recent World Championships in Christchurch to put forward an application for an International Team to compete in the MacRobertson Shield. Having made further enquiries amongst many in our croquet community, both from within and outside of the four Mac playing countries, I found widespread support for such an application.

Accordingly, I have written to the croquet governing bodies of the four countries involved in the Mac, and I have attached a copy of the formal application for your information.

I have asked them to consider the application and look forward to hearing back from them in due course. I will let you know of any developments that arise.

Kind regards,
Reg

Reg Bamford CA(SA)
CEO
1st Contact Group
Direct: 020 7759 5328
Fax: 0845 880 1265
Mobile: 07780 661 468
www.1stcontact.com <<http://www.1stcontact.com/>>