

Decision-making in the WCF responses

(apologies for some formatting - reached the Excel limit of only displaying 1024 characters per cell! So some longer comments split into several rows)

		New Zealand	Australia	South Africa	England	Spain
General comments			<p>The Australian Croquet Association Executive Committee has considered your paper on the " WCF Decision Making Process". Our overall view is that we are not in agreement with the process outlined although having said that we understand and support the underlying aim of the paper to give transparency of the WCF decisions. Our main concern with the management process outlined is that it will ultimately shift the management of WCF matters from the Management Committee to the member countries. And will do so in such a way that it will tie up resources which are, in our case, already badly stretched.</p> <p>In our view the Management Committee is elected to manage the day to day affairs of the WCF as you recognise in your paper where you say:</p> <p>"It is anticipated that the bulk of matters dealt with by the MC will be Business as Usual or RfR. Council has elected the MC from within the croquet community to manage the WCF for them on a day-to-day basis and indeed this is what they are expected to do, without consulting with the Members on each and every little issue.</p>	<p>In general SACA supports the proposed new decision-making process, as it will allow for quicker decisions and for more involvement of members in the reaching of those decisions.</p>	<p>Overall the CA is very pleased with the Decision-making consultation document. It seems to embody many of the ideas that we had suggested over the last few years. We believe a model of discussion and decision making along the lines suggested will be better for the WCF. Given the small number and the slow speed of responses to this consultation and the previous one, it is probably fair to say that most WCF members are not currently set up to respond quickly, or at all, on WCF issues. However, we do believe that a model where WCF members have a realistic opportunity to be involved is better than the status quo, even if many members may choose not to use the opportunity on most issues.</p>	<p>The Spanish Croquet Association fully agree with this document.</p>

			<p>(continued) The MC will decide through its normal decision process which issues will be handled in each of the above 4 ways. With a shorter Council decision-making process, more MC proposals will be put to Council for consultation and approval.” In our view there needs to be some clarification of the extent to which more MC proposals will be put to council for consultation and approval. We consider that proposals should go through at least Cycles 1 & 2 within the MC or until the point has been reached that options are identified and the MC has voted resulting in a split vote. Then and only then should the approach suggested be adopted.</p> <p>An important aspect which must not be diluted is the present status of MC members who are not representatives of any country but are elected to the MC because of their knowledge and skills to perform a task primarily for the benefit of croquet. If this proposal is adopted this role could well, over time, be diluted to a point where the croquet input from MC members becomes secondary.</p>			
			<p>(continued) The ACA also has major concerns regarding the proposed 21 day turnaround cycle.</p> <p>We doubt that our organisation could possibly achieve and maintain that timeframe given the present workload on our Executive. Currently we are in the process of a major rewrite of our Constitution and the implementation of the outcome are expected to dominate our activities over the next year. If this proposal is adopted the ACA would opt for a central contact point but we would prefer a longer turn around so that there is adequate time for consultation .</p> <p>Turning to your paper our answers to your questions follow but are qualified by the above summary.</p>			
Summary box 1 – Decision making						

1.1	the email-based decision making process based on a number of 21 day cycles	The Executive agreed to support these recommendations.	We agree with the use of email but think 21 days is too few, as qualified above	We support the use of 21 day cycles for the decision-making process	It may be that the S-G needs to be flexible on the actual timings. For example, a Full Member may want to request a "time-out", to enable its higher decision making body time to vote on a contentious issue. It is also important that a record, equivalent to the minutes of Council meetings, is kept of the decisions taken by this process.	
1.2	formal decision-making being taken out of Council Meetings	The Executive agreed to support these recommendations.	This implies that there will no longer be formal Council Meetings even when the opportunity presents itself and in that regard we do not support this aspect.	Agreed	We agree that it is important that Council meetings should be opportunities for discussion rather than just occasions where delegates vote according to their instructions. It is important that Extraordinary General Meetings can be called, with the power to make decisions, if sufficient reason exists. Any General Meeting ought to be able to pass some sort of resolutions formulated at the meeting, for guidance of the MC and as a record of what has been agreed at the meeting, even if these should be formally ratified later, but we agree there should not be formal motions put to the meeting in the normal course of events.	
1.3	Observer Members all involved in the email discussion process but only Full Members may vote, exactly as at present	The Executive agreed to support these recommendations.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed	
1.4	Should Council be reformed as a Council of Delegates – do you have a clear preference?	The Executive agreed that the council should be a council of delegates	The MC performs – or should perform – this process, so we do not agree, at this time, to changing the inherent form of the Council. The Council currently comprises delegates from each country who, we hope, would always be briefed and would conform to the desires of their country's administration. We are happy to have a single point of contact, but not happy for that person to have the power to determine the response from their country.	We are happy for the council to still be called "Council" rather than "Council of Delegates" but support the proposal that each member country should have one person who is the nominated contributor to email discussions and decisions. This person should be the country president or his nominee. Obviously there will be internal procedures of consultation so that the nominated person has the support of his own committee.	We believe it would be good to have an individual nominated as the point of communication for each Member, but think that the Council should still be formally made up of member Associations, rather than individuals.	
Summary box 2 – Consultation						

2.1	a model for consultation that integrates with the decision-making process	The Executive agreed to support this recommendation	Agreed but qualified as outlined above.	We support your proposed model for consultation with members that integrates with the decision-making process.	We are happy with section 2 of the consultation.	
Summary box 3 – Structure of the WCF						
3.1	The Guiding Principles for how the WCF should be organised	The Executive agreed to support the recommendations	As stated above, we think the MC should perform the duties it is elected to do. We concur with the detail under “Guiding Principles” in the paper.		We agree the Guiding Principles	
3.2	Terms of Reference for Council, President, S-G, Treasurer and Management Committee.	The Executive agreed to support the recommendations	<p>The following detailed comments are offered:</p> <p>Terms of Reference for Council: In points 4 and 7 we consider the verb should be “receive” as there can be no resolution if the reports or accounts are not approved. We also think the MC should appoint the auditor (point 8) and appoint the Treasurer (point 16) because the Council is in no position to find suitable persons.</p> <p>Terms of Reference for the President: Suggest add “6. To dismiss the Secretary-General, Treasurer or other members of the Management Committee, if necessary.” No other person would ever be in a position to judge whether that is necessary and justified.</p> <p>Terms of Reference for the Treasurer: Point 5 should be amended to read “5. To prepare annual accounts and submit them to the auditor.”</p>	We approve of the structure, principles and various terms of reference as set out in the proposals. We would however suggest that in addition to the management committee’s terms of reference as listed, there should also be a paragraph relating to the marketing, development, public relations and publicity function. It could even be that one member of the management committee should be given a particular role in respect of these functions, although the committee as a whole should still retain the overall joint responsibility.	<p>The terms of reference could use a little more work in drafting. Some suggestions below:</p> <p>Council</p> <p>1. Better just "To set WCF policy." If the Council sets policy, it does not also need to approve it.</p> <p>2,3 These could be combined to just say "To amend or replace the Statutes and Regulations." (although these would normally be proposed by the MC, there is no need to restrict Council's terms of reference to exclude proposals by Members).</p> <p>6. "s and record of e-mail discussions and decisions" should be appended.</p> <p>7. add "and plan" after "budget" (to be consistent with MC 2)</p> <p>9. and 10. perhaps "To approve the Forward Schedule of events, including the International Sporting Calendar". The MC should not organize any event which Council has not approved as part of the Forward Schedule, whether it is a new event type or an existing one. So in fact the Council should explicitly approve every event, but normally it would do so just by approving the Forward Schedule as a whole. The MC can always ask Council to approve a new event.</p>	

		<p>(continued) Terms of Reference for the Management Committee: We suggest amending the preamble by deleting the sentence beginning 'In the new decision....'. Suggest amend to read "The MC shall settle urgent questions and carry out the work of the WCF and manage its financial affairs (Treasurer's responsibility) on a day-to-day basis, subject to the direction of Council on policy. (Delete the sentence starting "In the new decision making process..."). Its terms of reference are:" In point 3 the verb should be "supervise" instead of "manage" as the Treasurer manages the funds. In point 11 we would like "3 and preferably 4 years ahead" so that the WCF schedule of events is determined well before member countries need to draft their own schedules. We suggest point 14 is amended to read "To appoint a Secretary-General and Treasurer. And we would add "15. To appoint an auditor".</p> <p>Finally we would suggest that if we are out-voted and the proposed system is introduced, it should be done only on a trial basis over a period of, say, two years, so that the consequences can be judged before an irrevocable decision is reached.</p>		<p>(continued) 11. "resolutions" should be "motions". + "To require the MC to reconsider any decision it makes".</p> <p>Secretary-General: 3. append "and keeping a record of the decisions".</p> <p>MC: 6. There is no mention of how sub-committees are elected/appointed, or how they report back. 7. What is "striking off the rolls" if not expelling? 8 and 9. Could be combined and simplified to say "To prepare amendments to or replacements of the WCF Statues and Regulations, for approval by Council". 10.-12. Look a bit detailed compared with the earlier ones, and see comments for Council 9 and 10 above. 13. We are not clear what this means. Does it do more than duplicate 7?</p>	
--	--	---	--	---	--