

WCF Notice  
6<sup>th</sup> April 2009.

Dear WCF Member Association,

As indicated to you on 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2008, formally advised to you on 13<sup>th</sup> January 2009, and 13<sup>th</sup> March 2009, the next WCF Ordinary General (Council) Meeting will take place on Tuesday 12<sup>th</sup> May 2009 at the National Croquet Center, West Palm Beach, Florida, USA at 8.00pm. A buffet meal will be served to delegates at 7.00pm.

Following the original circulation of documents on 13<sup>th</sup> March 2009, two proposals have been withdrawn, two proposed amendments to resolutions made have been received and, ratification to a change of membership category is now required.

In accordance with WCF Statute 109.5, please find attached the following full set of documents, except Appendix B (previously circulated) incorporating:-

1. Revised Agenda (changes marked in red)
2. Revised Appendix D – Resolutions to record withdrawn proposals, renumbering and proposed amendments
3. Response to Appendix E – Agenda Item 10.5 - The allocation of places for WCF Championships
4. Delegate list to date (6<sup>th</sup> April 2009)
6. Voting paper for members associations with scrutineer details.

Member Associations are advised that the following timetable still applies:

- Full voting member associations shall advise the Secretary-General of the names of their delegates, or any possible substitutes, who will represent them at the meeting no later than 12<sup>th</sup> April 2009 (Article 110.2)
- Full voting member associations may vote by "post", by sending it to the designated returning officer(s), no later than 5<sup>th</sup> May 2009 (Article 110.3)

**Non voting members**

Although voting can only be undertaken by Full member associations, all other member associations are encouraged to send a delegate to observe the proceedings and otherwise participate in the proceedings. In this case, it would be useful for catering purposes, for details to be sent to the Secretary-General no later than 12<sup>th</sup> April 2009.

**Note:**

Details of returning officers for the receipt and validation of postal votes shall be notified in due course.

regards



Brian Storey  
Secretary-General  
World Croquet Federation  
[www.wcfcroquet.org](http://www.wcfcroquet.org)



### WCF COUNCIL MEETING

Notice is hereby given to all WCF Member Associations that a WCF Council Meeting will be held at National Croquet Center, West Palm Beach, Florida, USA commencing at 8.00pm on Tuesday 12<sup>th</sup> May 2009 in conjunction with the 2009 WCF World Association Croquet Championship.

An evening meal, at WCF expense, has been arranged for association delegates at 7.00pm.

#### Business to be transacted

1. To confirm the minutes of the last General Meeting (6<sup>th</sup> February 2009).  
See enclosed documentation – Appendix A
2. To receive the Report of the Committee.  
See enclosed documentation – Appendix B
3. To receive the Statement of Accounts.  
See enclosed documentation – Appendix C - 2007 Accounts, previously circulated on 13<sup>th</sup> July 2008.
4. To consider applications for membership.  
None
5. To consider revisions of Association status.  
**Svenska Kroquetförbundet (SKF) (Sweden Croquet Association)**  
**Ratification of change of membership category from Observer to Associate Member.**
6. To consider applications for championships to be recognised.  
None
7. To consider resolutions **and amendments** for which due notice has been given.  
See attached documentation – Appendix D
8. To confirm, revise or remove any penalties imposed under Rule 206 or 207.  
None
9. To elect a President, members of the Committee and the Auditors as appropriate.  
To elect Auditor only. Current auditor: David Tomlin FCCA, Chartered Certified Accountant, 4 Glamorgan Road, Cheltenham, Glos. GL51 3JF, UK.
10. To transact any other business of the Federation.  
See attached documentation – Appendix E. See also Appendix F for 10.1 and Appendix G for 10.5

Brian Storey  
Secretary-General  
World Croquet Federation

## **APPENDIX A - Document 090512 – Agenda Item 1**

# **Minutes of the Council Meeting of the WCF held at 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 1<sup>st</sup> 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.

### **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:-

303.8.1 allow the overall results of the event to stand; or

303.8.2 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



## APPENDIX C - Document 090512 – Agenda Item 3

### World Croquet Federation

### Consolidated Income and Expenditure Account

Year ended 31 December 2007

	2007	2006
	£	£
Income		
<b>Annual subscriptions</b>	<b>4,770</b>	<b>4,620</b>
Licence fees	500	1,000
Sanction fees	-	-
Championship entry fees	1,155	3,960
Sponsorship	-	-
Sales	-	-
Bank interest	1,665	1,081
Bank interest - Friends	1,223	896
Other income - Friends	0	800
<b>Total Income</b>	<b>9,313</b>	<b>12,357</b>
	=====	=====
<b>Expenditure</b>		
Honoraria	(150)	750
General administration	226	84
Championship expenses	0	725
<b>Trophies</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>557</b>
<b>Pennants and flags</b>	<b>407</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Development Grants</b>	<b>2,853</b>	<b>250</b>
Independent examiner	290	275
Software and support	207	197
Website	162	144
Bank charges	206	139
Loss (profit) on exchange	(1,588)	675
<b>Total Expenditure</b>	<b>2,727</b>	<b>3,796</b>
	=====	=====
<b>Excess of Income over Expenditure transferred to Accumulated Fund</b>	<b>6,586</b>	<b>8,561</b>
	=====	=====

I approve the above Income and Expenditure Account and accompanying Balance Sheet and confirm that I have made available all relevant information for its preparation.

A Hope

Dated: 5 June 2008

In accordance with instructions given to us we have carried out an independent inspection of and prepared the above Income and Expenditure Account and accompanying Balance Sheet from information and explanations supplied to us by the World Croquet Federation.

David Tomlin FCCA  
Chartered Certified Accountant  
4 Glamorgan Road  
Cheltenham  
Glos. GL51 3JF

Dated: 5 June 2008

## World Croquet Federation

Consolidated Balance Sheet  
As at 31 December 2007

	Note	2007 £	2006 £
Fixed Assets		0	0
<b>Current assets</b>			
Stocks - medallions		-	-
Debtors - late subscriptions		-	-
Debtors - other items		0	251
Cash at bank		59,665	51,440
Cash at bank - "Friends" Australia	1	18,861	16,249
		-----	-----
<b>Total current assets</b>		<b>78,526</b>	<b>67,940</b>
		=====	=====
<b>Current Liabilities</b>			
Income prepaid for 2008		3,980	500
Expenses due for 2007		1,656	1,151
<b>Other creditors</b>		<b>290</b>	<b>275</b>
		-----	-----
<b>Total current liabilities</b>		<b>5,926</b>	<b>1,926</b>
		=====	=====
<b>Total Net Assets</b>		<b>72,600</b>	<b>67,940</b>
		=====	=====

### Accumulated Funds

	General £	Friends Australia £	Friends UK £	Total 2007 £	Total 2006 £
Members' funds b/f	44,450	16,249	5,315	66,014	57,453
Excess from Income & Expenditure account	3,775	2,612	199	6,586	8,561
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
<b>Members' funds carried forward</b>	<b>48,225</b>	<b>18,861</b>	<b>5,514</b>	<b>72,600</b>	<b>66,014</b>
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====

### 1) Accounting policies

**Basis of accounting:** These accounts have been prepared on the accruals basis under the historical cost convention.

**Change in basis:** There are no changes during the period under review.

## APPENDIX D - Document 090512 – Agenda Item 7

### To consider resolutions for which due notice has been given.

The following resolutions have been proposed by WCF Member Associations or the WCF Management Committee for consideration.

Note:

1. The proposals made by WCFMC, originally numbered 3 and 4 have been withdrawn. Proposals originally numbered 5 and 6 are now re-numbered 3 and 4 respectively.
2. The Australian Croquet Association has tabled amendments to the newly numbered proposals 3 and 4 and these are listed below the relevant original proposals

They are in order of date of receipt by WCF.

- 1. To consider the qualification position of players in parts of countries that become independent or, where two or more countries unite.**  
(13<sup>th</sup> October 2008)

Proposed by the WCF Management Committee:

Insert as a new paragraph in Statute 303.9:

*303.9 "If, as a result of a country or part of it becoming independent, or a country or part of it becoming incorporated into another country, or if two or more countries are united into a new country, or if a country is divided into more countries, a player of a member association who has already represented a country and whose citizenship was thus changed by decision of the state authorities, may apply to the World Croquet Federation to play for any one of the partitioned or united countries without a waiting period subject to his providing proof of his new citizenship. This particular choice may only be made once."*

### Rationale:

Over the last 20 years a considerable number of countries have split into two or more independent nations. Equally one or more nation states may join together in the future. If one occurs in the future, to a country where we have a WCF Member Association, the proposed Article above will address the issue to allow affected players a once only opportunity to change or decide their allegiance and qualification. This one time choice will not affect any future change due to other circumstances that currently exist elsewhere in the current Article 303.

**2. Anti-doping policy should be left to the WCF Member Associations. The anti-doping policy in force at a WCF event should be the policy of the host association. Consequently, the WCF should not join WADA.**

(10<sup>th</sup> March 2009)

Proposed by the Croquet Association (of England)

WCF General Policy:

**Rationale:**

**Background**

The question of whether the WCF should join the World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA) has been discussed at the last two WCF Council meetings, in 2005 and 2008. Differing views were expressed at both meetings, and on both occasions the meeting asked for more information to make a decision at the next meeting.

**WADA**

Individual Croquet Associations can choose to adopt the WADA code in their own domain. We believe that this has only been done in Australia, New Zealand, and Ireland. In at least one case, this has been done only in order to get Government funding. The World Governing Body of a sport can join WADA, currently at a cost of US\$5000 joining fee and US\$2000 per year.

**The CA position**

The CA has for several years had a regulation (P2a) forbidding the use of performance-enhancing drugs by players in calendar events. However, an exemption is permitted if the drugs are prescribed by a doctor for health reasons. The regulation did allow for drug testing to be carried out under the WADA code, but no tests have been carried out under CA auspices. A recent review decided that the CA will not carry out any drug testing, partly because of advice that it would be exposed to possible litigation if it did. Its tournament regulations will be changed accordingly, but the use of performance-enhancing drugs will still be banned. The CA also decided not to adopt the WADA code. We do not see any advantage in the WCF joining WADA, and do not wish any WCF anti-doping policy to take precedence over the CA's policy for events in the CA's domain.

## Reasoning

- There is currently no reason to suspect that doping is a problem in croquet, due to the non-athletic and amateur nature of the sport, and the lack of even anecdotal evidence otherwise (except perhaps beta-blockers - see below).
- The cost in terms of administrative time, player inconvenience, and cost of testing would be significant, and there is little or no gain to put against that cost.
- Given the age profile of croquet players, there is a reasonable probability that a significant number of players (including a significant proportion of those entering major events like the British Opens and World Championships) are taking substances banned under the WADA code, but that the reasons are wholly innocent (prescribed medications, health food supplements, etc.). Given the lack of any suspicion that they are gaining any performance advantage thereby (beyond maintaining their health), we do not wish to make it onerous for them to play in croquet events by requiring them to get Therapeutic Use Exemptions.
- It is reported that there are many components of vitamin and dietary supplements which are on the WADA banned list, but not listed on the packaging. A typical amateur competitor should not be expected to take the complicated (and possibly expensive) precautions necessary to avoid taking these substances unwittingly, especially if they are taking them for general health, and given that there is no suspicion that they would be getting a playing advantage from them.
- A positive result in a drugs test could result in litigation, which the CA would not have the resources to fight.
- For the reasons above, we do not believe that drug-testing is currently appropriate in croquet in the CA domain.
- The CA does not get Government funding, and has no prospect of getting any. Given that we do not wish to do testing, we see no benefit in us or the WCF joining WADA.

## Beta-blockers

There is some evidence from other sports (in particular pistol-shooting) that beta-blockers can provide some improvement to performance. There is also anecdotal evidence that some very shaky or nervous croquet players have seen some improvement when they started taking beta-blockers for health reasons. However these players were not at the top level either with or without beta-blockers. At the top level of croquet where one could conceive of doing any testing, there is no evidence that beta blockers would give any significant performance advantage. Furthermore, a heart specialist has expressed the opinion that beta blockers would be detrimental overall at the top level, because they would make it more difficult for a player to raise his game at critical moments over a long match. Overall, we consider that the issue of beta-blockers is not significant enough to change the views expressed above.

## Our Proposal

It seems that different National Associations have different requirements and expectations for anti-doping policy. We think these differences should be respected, so we propose:

*Anti-doping policy should be left to the WCF Member Associations. The anti-doping policy in force at a WCF event should be the policy of the host Association. Consequently, the WCF should not join WADA.*

This is the status quo, but we think there should be a resolution to this effect so everyone knows where they stand. Of course, the policy could be still reviewed in the future if circumstances change substantially.

### 3. World Team Championship (12<sup>th</sup> March 2009)

Proposed by The Croquet Association (of England) (CA).

Adopt the following changes to WCF Statutes in order to achieve the following aims:

- Establish the WCF World Team Championship Committee.
- Establish the principle that matters relating to the part of the WTC in which Great Britain, Australia, New Zealand and the USA participate are effectively controlled by those four countries.
- Ensure that the Statutes relating to the above matters cannot be changed without the approval of The (English) Croquet Association, Croquet Australia, New Zealand Croquet Council and the United States Croquet Association.

Insert as a new paragraph in Statute 106:

*“The WCF Association Croquet World Team Championship Committee shall comprise five members who will elect their own chairman. The (English) Croquet Association, Croquet Australia, the New Zealand Croquet Council and the United States Croquet Association will each appoint one member. The remaining Full Member Associations will elect the fifth member. Procedures for the election will be determined by the Management Committee. This Committee is responsible for making arrangements, including drawing up Regulations, for the holding of the MacRobertson Shield and other team events for countries not eligible to play in the MacRobertson Shield, all such events (including the MacRobertson Shield) being collectively called The WCF Association Croquet World Team Championship. Decisions of the committee will be made by simple majority, subject to the operation of Rule 302 in the circumstances specified therein.”*

Insert as a new paragraph in Statute 302:

*“The WCF Association Croquet World Team Championship Committee and the Management Committee shall be responsible for amending existing Regulations to apply to the operation of The WCF Association Croquet World Team Championship. In respect of any matters that relate to the participation of Australia, Great Britain, New Zealand and the United States of America in the MacRobertson Shield, including, but not limited to, the format of the event, the size and composition of teams, the format and length of matches, and the equipment to be used, changes to the Regulations can only take effect if proposed by the WCF Association Croquet World Team Championship Committee or the Management Committee and if ratified by each of The (English) Croquet Association, Croquet Australia, the New Zealand Croquet Council and the United States Croquet Association.”*

Insert as a new paragraph in Statute 210:

*“In respect of Rules [insert No's of new paragraphs in 106 and 302] and this paragraph of this Rule alterations will only take effect if ratified by The (English) Croquet Association, Croquet Australia, the New Zealand Croquet Council and the United States Croquet Association.”*

Consequential amendment:

In Statute 105.13 insert the words:

*“subject to Rules [insert No's of new paragraphs in 210 and 302] (see below)”* after “or” and before “amend”

WCF General Policy:

(B) That the WCF formally accepts the responsibility for organising the MacRobertson Shield and places that responsibility in the hands of the WCF Association Croquet World Team Championship Committee.

WCF General Policy:

(C) That the WCF Association Croquet World Team Championship Committee and the WCF Management Committee be mandated to make every effort to enable the first Association Croquet World Team Championship to take place in England in 2010 with countries not taking part in the MacRobertson Shield being able to take part in an event for teams of four players (the second tier) or in an event for teams of two players (the third tier).

## **Rationale:**

### **The Current Situation**

The MacRobertson Shield is currently recognised as the World AC Team Championship by the WCF. It is run by the CA, ACA, NZCC, and USCA rather than by the WCF. Any country can play in principle, but needs to have a sufficiently strong team of six players in order to do so. There is a strong feeling that the MacRobertson Shield has been extremely successful as it stands and should remain a competition for teams of six, for strong teams. There has also been a long-standing desire for there to be a World AC Team Championship in which all members of the WCF can play. Most members of the WCF are not able to produce a team of six players, let alone of the standard specified for the MacRobertson Shield. Croquet is too small a sport for there to be two competing World AC Team Championships. Recently, there have also been moves for the MacRobertson Shield to come under the auspices of the WCF, and this document is the CA's response to those moves.

### **Future Possibilities**

Four courses seem possible.

- **The MacRob could evolve into a full World Team Championship.**
- **The MacRob could lose its status as WCF World Team Championship and a rival event could be set up by the WCF.**
- **The MacRob could come under the auspices of the WCF without extending.**
- **The status quo could remain.**

The CA is strongly in favour of option 1. We believe it is important to retain teams of six for the MacRobertson Shield, as a smaller team is not so representative of a country's playing strength which would dilute the meaning of being "World Team Champions" Most countries cannot produce teams of six, so they will have to be allowed to enter smaller teams. As teams of different sizes cannot play each other, the obvious solution is to have a multi-tiered event. We believe that such an event would address all of the issues highlighted above, and is the way to go. A detailed explanation of how such a multi-tiered event might work was produced by Ian Burrige and widely circulated in 2008. It shows that the format is feasible, and there was positive feedback from several WCF member associations. The format described there is for a second tier with teams of four, and a third tier with teams of two. The three tiers should be played at approximately the same time, but would not have to be played in the same country. The number of teams in each tier would not be fixed rigidly, but would depend on the standard of the teams which can be raised. One advantage of this format is that it sets realistic targets for countries to achieve in their croquet development: being able to produce a team with two, four, or six players, at an appropriate level.

## **Response to Consultation**

The CA circulated a consultation document with a proposal on this topic in February 2009. We received email feedback from over a dozen WCF Member Associations, and also had telephone discussions of the proposal with the other MacRobertson Shield countries. The feedback we received was almost universally supportive. We are therefore proceeding with a motion.

## **Urgency**

The reason for proceeding so quickly is that the CA will host the MacRobertson Shield in August 2010, and this represents an excellent opportunity to hold the first occurrence of an extended World Team Championship in the same country, at the same time. (We are not yet in a position to guarantee to be able to hold it, but are certainly hopeful that we will.)

## **Our Proposal**

We are proposing that a WCF Committee be set up which will have the responsibility of setting up and running the extended World Team Championship. Our proposal also sets down the relationship between the MacRobertson Shield and the World Team Championship.

---

## **Proposed amendment by the Australian Croquet Association**

- 3.1 Proposed new paragraph in Statute 302: delete the second sentence.
- 3.2 Delete the proposed new paragraph in Statute 210.
- 3.3 Consequential amendment of Statute 105.13: amend "...No's of new paragraphs in 210 and..." to read "...number of new paragraph in..."

## **Rationale:**

1. The ACA intends to vote in favour of proposed resolutions 3 and 4 providing the amendments detailed below are carried. Without amendment, the motions, if carried, would introduce to the management of the WCF, for the first time, the concept of the veto. We consider this to be against the democratic principle that the will of the majority should prevail. It would curtail progress significantly and kill suggestions for improvements as soon as an opponent became obvious.
2. Within the WCF each of Australia, England, New Zealand and the United States has three votes, Egypt has two and the other six full members have one each. These numbers mean that the four members with three votes have significant control of everything that is done by the WCF.
3. Democratic principles fostered by the WCF and western democracies, lead by England many years ago, established that for efficient management and good government it is necessary for the will of the majority to prevail over the minority and that, after proper consideration, the minority should cease to oppose proposals supported by the majority. There are a few countries today where it is accepted that the minority has a right and duty to continue to oppose something which has been discussed and on which a vote has been taken. Those countries are not well governed.
4. The introduction of the veto into the processes of the WCF would deny democratic principles and cause the management and governance of the WCF to be less than best practice. One dissenting country should not have the power to frustrate the will of the majority.

#### 4. WCF Association Croquet Laws Committee (12<sup>th</sup> March 2009)

Proposed by The Croquet Association (of England) (CA).

Adopt the following changes to WCF Statutes in order to achieve the following aims:

- Establish a WCF Association Croquet Laws Committee along similar lines to the WCF GC Rules Committee and that both committees shall be required to consult widely and control the relevant refereeing regulations for WCF events (which could be adopted by national associations for domestic use).
- Establish the principle that changes proposed by either of those two committees need to be ratified by the CA, ACA, NZCC and USCA (and for GC the ECF).
- Establish the principle that the WCF controls the laws of AC and the rules of GC – by deleting the final sentence of Statute 301.2.
- Ensure that the Statutes relating to the above matters cannot be changed without the approval of The (English) Croquet Association, Croquet Australia, New Zealand Croquet Council and the United States Croquet Association, and, where relevant, the Egyptian Croquet Federation.

The proposed changes are shown in *red italics*. They are to take effect as soon as any necessary resolutions are passed by the national associations represented on the International Laws Committee to transfer authority from that to the WCF.

Insert as a new paragraph in Statute 106:

*“The WCF Association Croquet Laws Committee shall comprise five members who will elect their own chairman. The (English) Croquet Association, Croquet Australia, the New Zealand Croquet Council and the United States Croquet Association will each appoint one member. The remaining Full Member Associations will elect the fifth member. Procedures for the election will be determined by the Management Committee.”*

Insert as new paragraphs in Statute 210:

*“In respect of Rules [insert No. of new paragraph in 106], 301.2.1 and [insert No. of this paragraph], alterations will only take effect if ratified by The (English) Croquet Association, Croquet Australia, the New Zealand Croquet Council and the United States Croquet Association.”*

*“In respect of Rule [insert No. of paragraph in 106 relating to the GC Rules Committee], 301.2.2 and [insert No. of this paragraph] alterations will only take effect if ratified by The (English) Croquet Association, Croquet Australia, the Egyptian Croquet Federation, the New Zealand Croquet Council and the United States Croquet Association.”*

Delete Statute 301 and substitute:

#### **“301 THE GAMES**

(301.1) The Federation recognises all forms of croquet

(301.2) The Federation recognises that all relevant nations, *other committees specified in this Rule and the playing community* should be consulted on *both the principles and drafting of* any proposed changes to the Laws of *Association Croquet, Short Croquet, Two-ball Croquet, the Rules of Golf Croquet and Refereeing Regulations for WCF events* and that the following bodies should be responsible for proposing amendments to, or new editions of Laws and Rules and for issuing rulings *in relation to* them.

(301.2.1) For alterations to the Laws of Association Croquet, Short Croquet and Two-ball Croquet *and associated Refereeing Regulations for WCF events*: The *WCF Association*

*Croquet Laws Committee. Any proposed amendment or new edition can only take effect if ratified by each of The (English) Croquet Association, Croquet Australia, the New Zealand Croquet Council and the United States Croquet Association.*

(301.2.2) For alterations to the Rules of Golf Croquet *and associated Refereeing Regulations* for WCF events: The WCF Golf Croquet Rules Committee. *Any proposed amendment or new edition can only take effect if ratified by each of The (English) Croquet Association, Croquet Australia, the Egyptian Croquet Federation, the New Zealand Croquet Council and the United States Croquet Association.*

(301.2.3) For alterations to the Rules of American Six Wicket and Nine Wicket Croquet: The United States Croquet Association

*(301.2.4) Amendments to and new editions of the Laws and Rules, once ratified by the Full members set out in Rules 301.2.1 or 301.2.2 (if required and as appropriate), will be binding upon all member associations from a date within 12 months to be determined by them, unless and until they are subsequently altered."*

## **Rationale:**

### **Background**

Currently, the Rules of Golf Croquet are determined by a WCF sub-committee (GCRC), whereas the Association Croquet Laws are managed by the International Laws Committee (ILC), which is independent of the WCF. Refereeing Regulations are left as a matter for national associations.

Both committees have members appointed by the four large national associations, with, in the case of the GCRC, a member appointed by the Egyptian Croquet Federation and one elected by the other full member associations. However, the constitutions of the two committees appear to differ, in that the members of the ILC are clearly seen as representatives of their national associations, whereas the members of the GCRC are apparently expected to put national affinities aside once appointed.

Their processes also differ significantly. The ILC proceeds by consensus, because changes it proposes only come into effect if agreed by all four of the national associations represented on it. It also engages in public consultation, which is a requirement of at least the CA's Constitution, and maintains rulings and a commentary. The GCRC proceeds under the direction of the WCF Management Committee and is not required to consult or get the agreement of national associations, nor does it appear to issue rulings.

The differences can at least partly be seen as a result of the history and culture of the two games, but have resulted in the two codes having very different styles and substance, even on points which could be common without detriment to either game. Both committees have been criticised: the ILC for being directionless and dilatory (though there is also a view that it has violated the "Prichard Principle", that changes should only be made to cover situations likely to arise in practical play); the GCRC for rushing its work to meet artificial deadlines and for insufficient consultation.

The ACA proposed, without any prior consultation, motions at the last WCF Council that the laws/rules of both games should be controlled by WCF sub-committees consisting of elected individuals with no national affiliation, but these were either rejected or failed to find a seconder.

It has long been the position of the WCF that it should have more involvement in the stewardship of the Laws, the basic argument being that as the world governing body for croquet it is the natural custodian of the Laws of the game.

The CA International Committee and its Laws Committees agree that it is reasonable that WCF sub-committees should coordinate the law making process, but only if the interests of the national associations and playing community are preserved, in the case of AC, and extended to GC now that its rate of change has slowed. They also take the view that refereeing regulations, which are currently not standardised, should come under the same auspices, at least for WCF events if not more generally. The proposed committees should also have responsibility for translations of the laws.

---

### Proposed amendment by the Australian Croquet Association

- 4.1 Delete the proposed new paragraph in Statute 210.
- 4.2 Proposed new Statute 301: delete the second sentences in 301.2.1 and 301.2.2.
- 4.3 Also in proposed new Statute 301, in 301.2.4 delete the words: "once ratified by the Full members set out in Rules 301.2.1 or 301.2.2 (if required and as appropriate)"

### **Rationale:**

1. The ACA intends to vote in favour of proposed resolutions 3 and 4 providing the amendments detailed below are carried. Without amendment, the motions, if carried, would introduce to the management of the WCF, for the first time, the concept of the veto. We consider this to be against the democratic principle that the will of the majority should prevail. It would curtail progress significantly and kill suggestions for improvements as soon as an opponent became obvious.
2. Within the WCF each of Australia, England, New Zealand and the United States has three votes, Egypt has two and the other six full members have one each. These numbers mean that the four members with three votes have significant control of everything that is done by the WCF.
3. Democratic principles fostered by the WCF and western democracies, lead by England many years ago, established that for efficient management and good government it is necessary for the will of the majority to prevail over the minority and that, after proper consideration, the minority should cease to oppose proposals supported by the majority. There are a few countries today where it is accepted that the minority has a right and duty to continue to oppose something which has been discussed and on which a vote has been taken. Those countries are not well governed.
4. The introduction of the veto into the processes of the WCF would deny democratic principles and cause the management and governance of the WCF to be less than best practice. One dissenting country should not have the power to frustrate the will of the majority.

## **APPENDIX E - Document 090512 – Agenda Item 10**

The following are matters for discussion under Agenda Item 10. .

Dependent upon the outcome of these discussions, it may be necessary to turn some of them into proposals which will be dealt with later in 2009, by way of a postal vote.

### **1. The Effectiveness of the WCF Council**

The Croquet Association (of England) is concerned that the WCF Council is not as effective as it might be, and that the WCF Management Committee is resultantly not very accountable to the WCF Member Associations or to croquet players generally.  
**See Appendix F for full consultation document.**

### **2. The Effectiveness of the WCF Management Committee (WCFMC)**

Currently the WCFMC does not physically meet as a full committee. It has meetings at World Championships between those members of the committee who happen to be present and contributions by email from the remainder. WCFMC would like Member Associations to give their views on the payment of expenses (e.g. 75% of Air fare) to those WCFMC members who are not playing in a World Championship. This would enable the full committee to meet say, once per year.

### **3. Integrating the work of the International Laws Committee (ILC) for Association Croquet into the WCF organisation.**

The CA (of England) made proposals for the future integration, control and management of the ILC within the WCF organisation. The Australian Croquet Association has tabled amendments to those proposals

Member Associations will be asked for their wider view concerning this and related matters.

### **4. Creation of a new WCF World AC Team Championship and integration of the existing arrangements for the MacRobertson Shield series into it and the WCF organisation.**

For a long time the WCF and the four member associations have been in discussion about how to integrate the existing MacRobertson Shield International event into a wider "WCF World AC Team Championship". The CA (of England) proposal is to integrate the series into a wider competition involving all member associations based on tiers or divisions within the WCF organisation. The Australian Croquet Association has tabled amendments to those proposals

Member Associations will be asked for their wider view concerning this, the future development of such a Championship and related matters

### **5. The allocation of places for WCF Championships**

Recently the CA (of England) made draft proposals on the future allocations of places for WCF Championships, largely based on the ranking system for AC and GC.

Member Associations will be asked for their view concerning this and related matters.  
**See Appendix G for full consultation document.**

**APPENDIX F - Document 090512 – Agenda Item 10.1**  
(See Appendix E)

**Effectiveness of WCF Council**  
**Discussion Document**

By: The Croquet Association

**Background**

The Croquet Association is concerned that the WCF Council is not as effective as it might be, and that the WCF Management Committee is resultantly not very accountable to the WCF Member Associations or to croquet players generally.

**WCF Constitution**

The WCF's Constitution includes:

*(104.1) The Federation shall be managed by delegates of the Association assembled in General Meetings hereinafter referred to as "the Council".*

*(105.7) The [Management] Committee shall settle all urgent questions subject to confirmation at the next General Meeting and shall have general administrative powers to carry on the work of the Federation and to govern its financial affairs between General Meetings.*

Thus the Constitution implies that most decisions should be taken by the Council unless they are urgent, in which case they can be decided by the Management Committee (MC) but must later be ratified by the Council. The WCFMC Administration Regulations (for example 1.9, 1.15) give the impression that the WCFMC can make significant policy decisions for the WCF without reference to the Council, in apparent conflict with the WCF Constitution. In practice it seems that most decisions, even policy decisions, are made by the MC, and are not taken to the Council for ratification. Under statute (107.1), the MC decides the date and time of Council meetings, which only have to be every four years. Overall, the WCF Council does not hold the Management Committee to account very effectively. Although the WCFMC members are elected, the number of volunteers is so small that elections cannot be viewed as a practical means of accountability.

**Specific issues**

Important issues which perhaps could be or could have been referred to the Council include:

1. The future programme of Singles World Championships, including frequency and location.
2. The setting-up of the European Team Championship as an event for some but not all WCF members, and with a format combining AC and GC.
3. The decision to support the Egypt v Rest of the World GC match in 2008. (Admittedly this was at short notice.)
4. The adoption and content of the WCF Business plan.
5. Introduction of any Regulations which make requirements of the Member Associations.

## **Reasons**

There are perhaps two underlying reasons why the WCF Council plays a relatively marginal role.

- It meets very infrequently, for example not between 2005 and 2008, and decisions have to be made in a much shorter time-scale. By the time of the next WCF Council Meeting it may be too late to alter any decision made, so ratification is pointless.
- The WCF Council Meetings themselves can be quite short, and perhaps they are expected to be for rubber stamping decisions of the WCF Management Committee, rather than taking decisions and discussing policy issues.

## **Separation of responsibilities**

The WCF is now doing much more than it was when it was founded, and is looking to add to its responsibilities (and indeed the CA supports this). However, with responsibility comes the need for accountability, so that the member associations and croquet players more widely have the requisite level of trust that the WCF is doing the right thing and can be seen to be doing the right thing. In this age of electronic communication, we believe that the WCF Council can now play the role described in the constitution as stated above. It would be possible for the Council to meet at least once or maybe twice per year electronically (for example via conference call) in order to make decisions or ratify whatever other matters were more urgent. This would lead to a clear role for the Council: responsibility for making decisions on policy. It would leave the Management Committee to deal with general administrative matters as the constitution describes (essentially implementing the policy agreed by the Council). It may be that the WCF Full members should appoint a specific person to be their representative on the Council, rather than appoint delegates separately on each occasion. This would improve both continuity and communication between the Associations.

## **The Main Issues**

1. The CA suggests that the WCF Council should take a more active role in running the WCF, with meetings at least once or twice a year, including some electronic meetings if necessary.
2. The CA believes that the face-to-face WCF Council meetings, usually held at World Championships, should be scheduled during the day, so there is sufficient time for discussion and to properly fulfil the role required of it by the WCF Constitution. They should also be held on a day when the players (who are generally the delegates) will not be required to play. For example, one or two days before a World Championship would be better than in the middle.
3. We also had concerns about the way in which the 2008 Council meeting was run. We note that the WCF Statutes 900-921 cover the conduct of Council meetings adequately, if observed, except that they do not provide for someone to act as secretary of the meeting should the Secretary-General not be present, and in particular for someone to take minutes.

## **APPENDIX G - Document 090512 – Agenda Item 10.5**

(See Appendix E)

### **The allocation of places for WCF Championships**

By: The Croquet Association

#### **Background**

The Croquet Association has just completed a review of its international policy, and has decided to consult with the WCF and its other member associations on this and other issues. We hope that this consultation will result in agreement at the WCF Council meeting in May 2009, although we recognise that the time-scale is quite tight.

#### **The Current Situation**

The method of allocation of places to countries for World Championships is specified and implemented by the WCFMC. The regulations governing the allocation (WCF Sports Regulations Appendix B) are quite complicated, and there has not always been agreement as to what they mean. In the last two AC World Championships, the allocation has ended up with 16 and 14 wildcards being allocated by the WCFMC, which has meant that the actual allocation process apart from the wildcards has been largely irrelevant, and that all the borderline decisions have been made by the WCFMC, a committee which is not elected to play the role of a selection committee (even if it does take recommendations from national selection committees).

#### **Allocation Objectives**

We believe that each World Singles Championship should primarily be for the strongest available players, subject to each WCF Full and Associate Member being represented, and there being some places available to provide a stimulus for the growth of croquet in countries where it is not yet well established. We also recognise that there should be extra places awarded to the host nation, and that the current guarantee of six places for the five leading countries (GB, Australia, New Zealand, USA, and Egypt for Golf Croquet) is a reasonable recognition of the work they do for croquet generally. The allocation objectives as stated in the WCF Sports Regulations are broadly the same as these, but are less specific and allow or a lot of flexibility in interpretation, which we do not believe is helpful.

#### **Moving Forward**

We would like to move to a simpler and more transparent process for the allocation of places for World Championships. We believe that, in Association Croquet, the world rankings are well enough established to form the basis of an allocation process. The recent WCF Ranking Report found no evidence to support the assertion that the rankings are unfair to any country. Although rankings are not perfect as a measurement of playing strength, we believe that any problems associated with this would be outweighed by the extra simplicity and transparency of a rankings-based process. There would also be a number of wildcards which could be used, as at present, to cover any odd cases or apparent injustices. In Golf Croquet the rankings are not as well established, but a similar process should work, perhaps treating Egypt differently as their games are not all included in the rankings.

By: The Belgian Croquet Association – Allan Morris

On behalf of the Croquet Federation of Belgium I would like to point out that, as far as we are concerned, there are a few short-comings in the “Allocation for Singles World Championships” suggestion put forward by the CA.

1. It trivialises our national championships. This is the only event in which all of our top players have the opportunity to play head to head without having to travel to another country. It is also the only event held in this country which appears in the rankings. Up to now we have used this event to determine who represents Belgium in singles events.
2. It assumes that the rankings accurately reflect the eligibility and relative playing strengths of players who rarely – if ever – play in the same “pool” outside of the national championships. It is inevitable that in a country where there are limited opportunities to play in ranking events this will not be the case. To give Belgium as an example (go to <http://butedock.demon.co.uk/cgs/rank.php>, select 2008, min games=0, min grade=1 and Belgium)
  - Until today our top ranked player would have been ineligible to play for Belgium – he’s an expat Brit who lives in Uruguay. I’ve asked Chris Williams to fix this.
  - Our current top ranked player lost all his games in the national championship – the only ranking games he has played all year.
  - Our next ranked player – our national champion and unquestionably the best player in Belgium on current form – has never played a ranking game outside of our national championships. (He chose not to go to the world championships but will go to the European championships)
  - The next player has not been a paid-up member of our federation for some years. (We would prefer not to send someone who suddenly paid his dues in a championship year.)
  - The 5<sup>th</sup> player played 18 games last year and came 3<sup>rd</sup> in the championship.
  - The 6<sup>th</sup> player has not played a ranking game since 2007 and has never played in our championship.
  - The 7<sup>th</sup> player came 4<sup>th</sup> in our national championship – the only ranking games he played.
  - The 8<sup>th</sup> player has not played a ranking game since 2002 – but is still playing better than some ranked above him.
  - The 9<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> players have not played since 2001 and 2004 respectively and have never won a ranking game.
  - The 10<sup>th</sup> player has not played a ranking game since 2007.
  - The 12<sup>th</sup> player played 11 ranking games and came 2<sup>nd</sup> in the national championships.

If this has been tedious to read (and doesn’t get you any nearer a clear cut decision), imagine the tedium of having to justify selections for every event.

3. It assumes that the national selection committees do not do their best to select the best available players on current form.
4. Minor countries certainly do send players who take places which could be occupied by higher ranked players from other countries. I think that the benefits of this – a chance to exchange ideas and take back the experience of playing against elite players – outweigh the disadvantage of denying a place to the 70<sup>th</sup> or 80<sup>th</sup> player in the world. However, adopting the CA suggestion is not going to significantly change the make-up of the field. In fact, if that is the solution, I’m a bit puzzled as to what the problem was.

By: The Austrian Croquet Association – Leopold Walderdorff

1. For the single World Championships we think that each Associate Member should have one player to nominate. This player should be the reigning national champion. In most cases the champion is also the highest ranked player of the country but it does not have to.
2. In Austria we have the ruling that the champion qualifies for the international events (European or world championships).
3. Concerning the observer member I think it is very important to have these countries as well in the worlds. We have had this experience as an observer member. For the best players in our country - it is now definitely a target to play for their country (if holiday, business and finance allows it...).
4. To be able to play in the worlds is probably the main reason for an association to become an associate member or an observer member - just a member of the WCF!!
5. Concerning all the other places for the world championship the idea of the CA could be a base for discussion.
6. But always think about an example like alpine skiing:
7. Austria, Switzerland, US and other leading countries are only allowed to nominate 4 athletes! But these countries could select 10 - because their field of top athletes is so strong.... Even in this sport - where a lot of money is involved and it is professional, the leading countries do accept this rule....

By: The Italian Croquet Association – Andrea Pravettoni

1. The Italian Croquet Association will support the proposal of a ranking-based allocation method for the World Singles Championships.
2. We just would like to point out that in our case (and probably for other “minor” croquet Countries), our best ranked player may not always be the “best player at the moment” because of the difficulty in playing enough ranking matches over the year, and also he/she may not be available to travel to the World Championships venue.
3. Thus, we would like to keep the right to nominate our only one representative – leaving just the possible allocation of further places to Italy to the ranking-based system, or at least to present a list of available players on which the WCF can apply the ranking-based allocation.



**WCF COUNCIL MEETING**  
**12<sup>TH</sup> May 2009**

**Delegate List**

**QUORUM:**

WCF Statute 918. The quorum shall be at least one half of the affiliated Associations (Full members)

**FULL:**

Australia: Tony Hall

Canada:

Egypt: Amir Ramsis

England: Jonathan Kirby

Ireland:

Italy:

Japan: Koji Moriyama

New Zealand: Charles Jones

Scotland: James Hopgood

South Africa: Carole Jackson

USA: Rhys Thomas

**ASSOCIATE:**

Isle of Man: Kevin Wells

Spain: Jose Alvarez-Sala

Sweden: Anton Varnas

Wales: Chris Williams

**OBSERVER:**

Belgium: Allan Morris