

	WCF Proposal	England	Australia	New Zealand
	Any general comments:	The CA warmly welcomes the 10 year schedule and the consultation on it. We think this is a big step forward for the WCF (as is the consultation on decision making). We agree to almost everything in the document, and below comment on some of the specific numbered points.		
Summary box 0 – 10 Yr Schedule				
0.1	the 10 Year Schedule shown as Appendix A	Agreed, subject to comments in 0.2 and 0.4.	Agree	The Executive agreed that a 10yr schedule of events was a positive move, but that the calendar still appears crowded.
0.2	the 8 recognised event types shown in Appendix B and section 3 below	Perhaps the over 50s GC Worlds could be reconsidered. Might there be scope for a (linked) under 21 AC event instead?	Agree	The Executive agreed to support 0.2 and 0.3.
0.3	the approval requirement for any additional World Championships event types.	Agreed.	Agree	The Executive agreed to support 0.2 and 0.3.

	WCF Proposal	England	Australia	New Zealand
0.4	Comments are welcome the proposed frequency of each event type shown in the Appendices – several are shown as “2 or 4 years” – do you have a clear preference?	The CA thinks the proposed schedule probably has too many events. At least we think all the events shown as every 2 or 4 years should be restricted to every 4 years. Consideration should also be given to whether there should even be singles AC and GC Worlds every 2 years either. Perhaps every 2-3 years (taking care to avoid clashes) would be better, even if it means the schedule has to be planned more carefully every year or two. For example, if there is an AC Singles WC in 2013, it will be only about 7 months before the Mac and WTC, which seems too short a gap - many people might have to choose one or the other because of limited holiday time or the expense, which might devalue both events.	The big decision here is to accept that the MacRobertson Shield will be held on a 4 year schedule instead of a 3 1/2 year schedule. I believe that this is essential to achieve a sensible overall schedule and the apparent intention of the US to have it in the first half of the year in 2017 helps. Although the draft schedule shows Australia as having it in the second half of 2021 we should avoid such a severe impact on our national events by having that amended to show the first half of 2021 (which will force the 2021 WGCWC [& U21GC] to the second half of 2021). The reasons are the same as for conducting the WACWC in April/May 2012 (in season for Aust and NZ but out-of-season for England and the US). ACWC agree 2 years, GCWC agree 2 years, AC Teams agree 4 years, GC Teams agree 4 years, Womens GCWC should go out to 4 years to accommodate Womens ACWC at 4 years, U21 at 2 years may be too often, but OK if linked to the GCWC, O50 agree 4 years	The Executive wished to suggest that the Open GC and Open AC are also only held every 4 years. The only event to be held every 2 years is the Under 21 GC as there is only a limited time for players in this age group. The Over 50s should be scrapped, or have the age requirement changed, or held infrequently.
Summary box 1 – License Fees				
1.1	halving the license fees	We agree for singles event. For team events we are not so sure. There will be a lot of resistance to handing control of the Mac to the WCF if the main outcome is that we have to pay for the privilege of hosting it. The four Mac countries have shared the hosting costs of the Mac by taking it in turns, but have agreed that any additional team which played would pay its share as an entry fee.	Agree World Teams Championship: I do not expect that the WCF expects to collect a licence fee for the MacRobertson Shield. That should be confirmed by an amendment to the details in the table.	The Executive agreed to these proposals but wished to suggest that all events should be treated equally

	WCF Proposal	England	Australia	New Zealand
1.2	formalising the £0 license fee applicable to the Under 21 GCWC only	Agreed....providing U21 GC is generalised to just U21 (in case U21 AC events are held).	Agree	(see above)
1.3	running the July 2011 Under 21 GCWC on the above basis	Agreed	Agree	(see above)
Summary box 2 – Affordability				
2.1	the proposed halving of license fees is affordable and will allow WCF development activity to continue as hoped.	We agree that the changes are affordable for the WCF. Note however that with the current difficulties in raising sponsorship (likely to remain for the foreseeable future), the host of any World Championship expects to make a considerable financial loss. While the WCF does clearly need to get its money from somewhere, it can be a source of unpopularity of the WCF if the host association puts in a lot of effort and makes a significant loss, while the WCF appears to put in rather less effort and yet takes a profit. We do not believe this is good for the game, and does not encourage potential hosts to come forward. Most other tournaments are paid for by entry fees, and the WCF should consider raising entry fees to cover the basic costs, with sponsorship money going for the extras such as meals and receptions. If the host kept all the entry fees, the license fee could be higher again.	Agree	The Executive noted the comments made in 2.1

	WCF Proposal	England	Australia	New Zealand
2.2	Members are invited to give early input on whether they would like to see the balance of cost between host and entrant changed in the medium/ longer term, should increases later prove necessary.		If necessary to increase fees then the fees paid by or on behalf of entrants should be increased and the costs to hosts retained as low as possible.	-
Summary box 3 – Recognition and Naming				
3.1	the 8 specified World Championship event types confirmed as “recognised” by the WCF	Agreed, subject to comments on 0 above.	Agree	The Executive agreed to these proposals
3.2	license fee proposal, in the event that Tiers of a World Team Championship are split across several host Members	As above, we would probably be reluctant to agree to pay to host the Mac. Also, one tier of the WTC is just 4 teams of 4, one 4-lawn club played over one week. In that case, £250 seems too much. Would the WCF expect to take half the entry fees for team events as well? The 2010 WTC lower tiers were run on the basis that the costs were covered by the entry fees.	Agree	The Executive agreed to these proposals We didn't really discuss 3.2 as there wasn't much info in the paper. We are aware of some discussion about splitting the tiers of the AC WTC. NZ has already advised that it wishes to host all tiers of the AC WTC at the time of its hosting of the MacRob
3.3	express approval by the Members required before any additional World Championship event types may be “recognised” and added to the 10 Yr Schedule	Yes	Agree	The Executive agreed to these proposals
3.4	regularisation of event naming	Yes	Agree with standard names.	The Executive agreed to these proposals

	WCF Proposal	England	Australia	New Zealand
3.5	Your comments are welcome on whether we should restrict "world championship" naming solely to the 4 premier events and adopt some different form for the various restricted events.	The status quo is acceptable, and we cannot think of anything better.	The name "world championships" should be allowed for Womens, U21 and O50 events when modified by those words in exactly the same way as other sports.	In respect to 3.5, the Executive agreed to comment that they are all world championships so should be called as such
Summary box 4 – U21 Golf Croquet World Championship				
4.1	the cut-off age for an Under 21 event remains unchanged (Statute 306.1)	Yes, generalising GC to GC and AC where appropriate.	Agree	The Executive agreed to all proposals except 4.2
4.2	the WCF financial support to help stage this one event type only	Yes, generalising GC to GC and AC where appropriate.	Agree	The Executive thought that consistency across all the events should be maintained.
4.3	where possible, linking the U21 GC WC to the premier GCWC in the same country in consecutive weeks	Yes, generalising GC to GC and AC where appropriate.	Agree	The Executive agreed to all proposals except 4.2
4.4	proceed on the above basis for July 2011, while full re-drafting continues	Yes.	Agree	The Executive agreed to all proposals except 4.2
Summary box 5 – Doubles				
5.1	hosts may continue to arrange Doubles events alongside Singles World Championships as they see fit, rather than the WCF formally stage such Doubles events	Yes	Agree	The Executive agreed to respond with information about how SPARC funds elite sport in New Zealand, ie based on winning medals. Having doubles events increases the chances of our players to win medals and therefore be awarded financial grants.
Summary box 6 – Bid Process				

	WCF Proposal	England	Australia	New Zealand
6.1	an annual update to the 10 Year Schedule, early in each New Year	Yes, although we would like the Mac (top tier of the World Team Championship) to continue to rotate. More generally, we hope the WCF would act to ensure a reasonable geographic spread of events.	Agree	The Executive agreed to these proposals
6.2	iterative bid process, with expression of interest and preferred bidder stages		Agree	The Executive agreed to these proposals
6.3	an annual call for bids for events 3 years ahead		Agree	The Executive agreed to these proposals
Summary box 7 – Seeding and Draw				
7.1	get results from the top 3 Egyptian national events into the GC World Rankings from 2011 onwards	Yes	Yes	The Executive agreed to support 7.1
7.2	for 2011 only, use the interim WCF Seeding Committee process currently defined in the Sports Regulations	Yes	Agree	The Executive agreed to support 7.2
7.3	from 2012 onwards, drop the interim arrangements defined for GC events, and adopt the exact same seeding process for both AC and GC events	Yes	Agree	The Executive agreed to vote against 7.3. The Executive does not believe in seeding both the blocks and Knock-out by World Ranking.

	WCF Proposal	England	Australia	New Zealand
7.4	in the medium term, the MC will investigate a refinement to increase emphasis of block results in current seeding mechanism and report back	Yes	Noted. However we should introduce "Same family separation" as well as "Same country separation" in the Group stages. This is unlikely to affect most countries but the number of players in one Australian family means it could become important. It would be unfortunate for a player to be in the same group as his brother in a World Championship. It is noted that most countries failed to make this point, probably because they are unlikely to have this problem.	The Executive does not believe in seeding both the blocks and Knock-out by World Ranking.

	WCF Proposal	South Africa	USA		
	<p>Any general comments:</p>	<p>These are SACA's comments on the 10 Year Schedule of Events. We think that this is a very good initiative which will allow members to plan well ahead in terms of their possible entries and teams as well as considering the possibility of offering to host future events. I will go through each of your specific recommendations which you ask us to approve but first I have a general question as to whether, in addition to planning future tournaments, WCF has a vision for croquet into the future which could include such things as: a higher level of</p>	<p>The USCA recognizes the importance of developing a long range calendar of events and supports this effort by the WCF. We hope it will improve the relationship among the members and foster increased good will.</p> <p>USA Hosting Noting that we are on the schedule only for the 2017 MacRobertson Shield, the general feeling is that we would like to host at least one other event during the 10 year cycle, perhaps two. The GC WC and the U21 are possibilities, but issues of funding remain a concern.</p>		
Summary box 0 – 10 Yr Schedu					
0.1	the 10 Year Schedule shown as Appendix A	<p>In appendix A we believe the Golf Croquet World Team Championship should be every two years, while the Women's GC and Women's AC events should be every four years. As far as the Association World Team Championships are concerned, our feeling is that the tiers do not have to be held at the same time as the MacRobertson Shield. In addition it would make sense for the host country to be a likely participant in the tier in question.</p> <p>This is a somewhat different aspect of the Association World Teams, but we believe that at some stage in the future, the winner of tier 2 should be allowed to challenge the 4th placed MacRobertson Shield country and, if successful, should then be promoted to the top four group while the loser would be relegated to tier 2.</p>	<p>Overall, we think this is too many and dilutes the championship brand. We also regard the age and gender neutrality of croquet as a good thing, and part of our overall marketing of the game. When we create restricted world championships, we lose that neutrality and uniqueness in our sport.</p> <p>We recommend dropping the Over 50, based on demand and concerns cited above. We understand and accept the Women's GC WC as a way to promote the sport and include more women, but a majority of the IC doesn't think the same for AC. One USCA International Committee member—a female—said this: "Once you add two women's tournaments it really starts to look like we believe that women should have a separate tournament from the men."</p> <p>That said, we are not unanimous on the subject. Some believe Women's events</p>		
0.2	the 8 recognised event types shown in Appendix B and section 3 below			0.3	the approval requirement for any additional World Championships event types.

	WCF Proposal	South Africa	USA
0.4	Comments are welcome the proposed frequency of each event type shown in the Appendices – several are shown as “2 or 4 years” – do you have a clear preference?		The overall feeling among us is that 4 years is too long to wait between AC and GC world championships, and the U21, but about right for the WTC. We think a two year cycle for the unrestricted AC and GC events is reasonable.
Summary box 1 – License Fees			
1.1	halving the license fees	The proposals relating to licence and entry fees seem to be much fairer to potential hosts than in the past and so we would support these proposals.	We agree with the proposed schedule, but add that the MacRobertson Shield should remain license free.

	WCF Proposal	South Africa	USA
1.2	formalising the £0 license fee applicable to the Under 21 GCWC only	(see above)	
1.3	running the July 2011 Under 21 GCWC on the above basis	(see above)	
Summary box 2 – Affordability			
2.1	the proposed halving of license fees is affordable and will allow WCF development activity to continue as hoped.	-	

	WCF Proposal	South Africa	USA
2.2	Members are invited to give early input on whether they would like to see the balance of cost between host and entrant changed in the medium/ longer term, should increases later prove necessary.	The proposed balance of cost between host and entrant seems reasonable and therefore would not necessarily need to be changed.	
Summary box 3 – Recognition a			
3.1	the 8 specified World Championship event types confirmed as “recognised” by the WCF	We agree with the 8 specified World Championship event types and do not feel that “world championship” should be restricted solely to the four premier events.	(see comments in section 1 above)
3.2	license fee proposal, in the event that Tiers of a World Team Championship are split across several host Members		
3.3	express approval by the Members required before any additional World Championship event types may be “recognised” and added to the 10 Yr Schedule		
3.4	regularisation of event naming		

	WCF Proposal	South Africa	USA
3.5	Your comments are welcome on whether we should restrict "world championship" naming solely to the 4 premier events and adopt some different form for the various restricted events.		
Summary box 4 – U21 Golf Croquet			
4.1	the cut-off age for an Under 21 event remains unchanged (Statute 306.1)	We agree with the recommendations regarding the Under-21 Golf Croquet World Championship.	This is a non-issue for us and we are willing to go with the proposed December 31st date.
4.2	the WCF financial support to help stage this one event type only		
4.3	where possible, linking the U21 GC WC to the premier GCWC in the same country in consecutive weeks		
4.4	proceed on the above basis for July 2011, while full re-drafting continues		
Summary box 5 – Doubles			
5.1	hosts may continue to arrange Doubles events alongside Singles World Championships as they see fit, rather than the WCF formally stage such Doubles events	We agree that the hosts should stage doubles events as they see fit if they wish to do so alongside singles world championships.	
Summary box 6 – Bid Process			

	WCF Proposal	South Africa	USA
6.1	an annual update to the 10 Year Schedule, early in each New Year	We agree with your recommendations regarding the bid process.	
6.2	iterative bid process, with expression of interest and preferred bidder stages		
6.3	an annual call for bids for events 3 years ahead		
Summary box 7 – Seeding and draw			
7.1	get results from the top 3 Egyptian national events into the GC World Rankings from 2011 onwards	We agree with your recommendations regarding seeding and draw.	We have no issue with the use of world rankings to seed any block, round robin or initial knock-out ladder format (in the case where there are no blocks). However, when it comes to re-seeding after block play, we believe block results should be rewarded and the KO should be based on those results, not re-seeded based on world rankings. Our reasoning is that the rankings do not always reflect current form. We also don't buy the logic that the best (eg, top ranked) players should be given the best opportunity to win the event. Just because a player is ranked higher than another doesn't mean they are playing better in a particular event and deserve priority seeding based on past performance.
7.2	for 2011 only, use the interim WCF Seeding Committee process currently defined in the Sports Regulations		
7.3	from 2012 onwards, drop the interim arrangements defined for GC events, and adopt the exact same seeding process for both AC and GC events		

	WCF Proposal	South Africa	USA
7.4	in the medium term, the MC will investigate a refinement to increase emphasis of block results in current seeding mechanism and report back		In sum, if we're going to use blocks, they should count. We advocate using block results to seed the KO, with rankings for secondary sorting.