

Team survey from 2010 AC WTC Tiers 2.1, 2.2 and 3

	Ireland (2.1)	South Africa (2.1)	Wales (2.1)	Jersey (2.1)
1. Was the event format reasonable - could it be improved?	<p>I thought the format was good and well thought out, the playoffs making for a very exciting couple of rounds. However, the position the South African team was put in against Jersey in their last test was slightly unfair, being forced to play a "just in case" playoff before last match had finished due to time constraints.</p> <p>Yes it was reasonable. Perhaps a final playoff would add to the occasion. There was plenty of time and it would allow for 2.1 and 2.2 to be combined.</p>	<p>1. The event format was good</p>	<p>1 Yes</p>	<p>Apart from the time limits on games which were, quite simply, wrong (I'm sure Digger has explained in greater detail!).</p>
2. Were you happy with the way the winner was decided?	<p>Yes, it seemed very fair and rewarded the most consistent team.</p> <p>Perhaps a final playoff would add to the occasion. There was plenty of time and it would allow for 2.1 and 2.2 to be combined.</p>	<p>2. We were happy with the way in which the winner was decided</p>	<p>2 Yes</p>	<p>Yup</p>
3. Was the duration too long/ about right/ too short?	<p>Probably the right length, everyone seemed happy afterwards and the event didn't drag.</p> <p>About right but we could do with a couple more games.</p>	<p>3. The duration was about right</p>	<p>3 About Right</p>	<p>About right</p>
4. Were the playing conditions up to championship standard?	<p>YES Excellent !</p>	<p>4. Yes - the playing conditions were excellent</p>	<p>4 Yes</p>	<p>Yup</p>

5. Were the off-lawn facilities, catering and refreshments suitable?	Yes indeed! Excellent !	5. Off lawn facilities were suitable	5 Yes	Yup
6. What change could have improved the event for your team?	Better results... ???	6. We can think of no changes to improve the event	6 Promotion to Tier 1 for the winners of tier 2	See 1. (I actually gave a game/match away to Dave Walters which completely skewed the final result, due to the b-of-3 time limits. I simply couldn't be bothered and gave up!).
7. Would you enter a team in the event if it was held again? And would your decision be influenced by where the event was held?	I would, but my decision would be heavily influenced by where it was held. I don't think it would be feasible for a team event of this nature to take place far away from the countries where players representing the individual nations live. The event does not give enough games for people to make the sacrifice that is travelling to Aus/NZ (and to a lesser extent the USA) and people who would love to represent their country might find it impossible to do so. I'm a student and as such trips of that nature can't be undertaken lightly! Yes but certainly influenced by location. Purely as there are already heavy travel commitments for our senior players.	7. We would be keen to enter a team when the event is next held. Obviously this would be influenced to some extent by the venue.	7 Yes but this could be influenced by where the event was held - the further we have to travel the less likely we will be to enter a team	Good one. It wouldn't influence my personal decision but some of my team wouldn't bother to go to, for instance, New Zealand etc.
8. Do you prefer all the tiers to be held at the same time in the same country (along with the MacRobertson Shield, as in 2010), or could/ should the event be split with tiers being hosted separately and where possible by one of the participants in that tier?	I did like that the event was held in conjunction with the Mac but I think it won't be possible to do that again so easily. I think the latter scenario is the most realistic. At the same time yes as it was good to watch what was happening elsewhere but the other tiers might as well have been the far side of the world for all we saw of them bar the final dinner.	8. We do not believe that the tiers have to be held at the same time and in the same country as the MacRobertson Shield. In fact, it makes more sense for one of the teams involved in the tier to be hosting.	8 The tiers should be held separately to try to reduce travelling distances for the teams involved.	See 7

note: two replies were received from CAI, hence two paragraphs per cell

Spain (2.2)	Norway (3)	Belgium (3)	Sweden (3)	Czech Republic (3)
<p>Yes, we think it could perhaps be improved in various senses: a) with the same duration, perhaps more games could be played (many lawns were not used, with two players in each team waiting for the next turn); b) perhaps the format could be a little bit different: each player in each team could play against all other players in the match (not only one to one, with four single games in all, plus the double game); c) which is the sense of each tier after finishing the championship? The winner of the tier goes up (i.e. 2.2 promotes to 2.1; 2.1 promotes to 1) and the looser goes down (ie. 1 to 2.1; 2.1 to 2.2; 2.2 to 3)? If no, what happens?</p>	<p>The Norwegian team think all was very good. If the Championship will be held out of Europe and don't sure if Norway will have players to do so. We think it's good if the best players, play in the same aera and the final games be played the day after tiers 2 and 3 are finish. So it will be possible to see the best players.</p>	<p>Reasonable</p>	<p>Yes, very good. The format of splitting up meetings between nations in two parts was brilliant. It made the tournament undecided until the last round.</p>	<p>The event format in Sussex group was very well created, was clear and none of the Czech players had troubles with lack of information about the event or their matches. The only problem we had with the seed of player no. 2 and 3. The Czech ranking was generated reverse order compared to the world rankings. For the next time we would propose the national associations who will be responsible for the players seeds.</p>
<p>Yes</p>		<p>Yes, no worries</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>In our tier were 5 teams playing all each other and we were happy with it. We were glad to play with all teams in our tier and think the way how the winner was decided was probably chosen as the best.</p>
<p>About right</p>		<p>About right</p>	<p>About right</p>	<p>With regard to our funding was the duration about right.</p>
<p>Yes</p>		<p>Yes, Southwick is fine</p>	<p>Yes, definitely. Southwick is a good place to be.</p>	<p>The playing conditions in Sussex Country Croquet Club were on the championship level. John Low with his team put the level very high.</p>

Yes		Yes, Southwick is great	Perfect	The off-lawn facilities were excellent, catering and refreshment in accordance with English convention and hospitality
Perhaps if all the teams play in the same venue (more atmosphere and "croquet interchange"). Obviously, if so, large venues are needed (probably not easy).		Why was there the difference compared to higher tiers, that in tier 3 a team unable to field 4 players due to a late withdrawal of an injured player forfeited a game? We were able to play using the wife of one team member who lost all her singles but managed to co-win one doubles, but might have been better placed (with a better chance of sponsorship) if we'd been able to play a team of 3.	Nothing except our own skill at playing	The opportunity to play for the MacRobertson Shield in the future.
Yes, and Yes		Yes in Europe but not further afield unless we can find funding	We would like to, but I'm not sure we could manage a team if it is not in held in Europe.	We'll do everything for building a team for next Championship. However, the venue will certainly influence the final decision of individual players. That's why we would prefer the event in Europe.
Yes, in the same country and at the same time if possible (for us, obviously better if it is held in Europe).		No preference, unless it proves easier to raise sponsorship by appearing to play in the same main event (as in 2010)	Makes no real difference. If it's placed in England or another country in Europe, we will definitely send a team. If it's held at the other side of the world I think mustering a Swedish team would be difficult.	Given the above response we rather prefer event split with tiers being hosted separately and where possible by one of the participants in that tier. The event can be held at a different time.