

Minutes of WCF Council Meeting held at Roehampton on 23rd August 2010 at 10.00

1. Attendance and Apologies

Present: Charles Jones (Chair), Tony Hall (Australia), Rosemary Graham (Australia) from c11.30, Jeff Dawson (Eng), Ian Vincent (Eng), David Maugham (Eng), Aaron Westerby (NZ), Rhys Thomas (USA), Amir Ramsis (Egy), Bruce Rannie (Sco), Chris Williams (Wal), Liz Williams, Ian Burrige, Keith Aiton, Andrew Hope, David Openshaw, Chris Clarke, Stephen Mulliner (10.30 to c1.30)

Apologies: Steve Jones, Gordon Smith, Stephen Meatheringham

2. Confirmation of Agenda

A Consolidated Balance Sheet and P&L were tabled

3.1 Acceptance of Minutes from previous meeting

The minutes of the previous meeting were accepted (Hall/Thomas)

3.2 Matters arising

There were no matters arising

4.1 Presidents Report

Charles Jones presented his report as President which was accepted

4.2 Treasurer's Report

Andrew Hope presented a verbal report. He indicated that when he took over the WCF accounts 10 years ago, there was a need for an external auditor to improve discipline in presentation. He requested that Council authorise the MC to approve a new auditor once the new Treasurer had been appointed explaining that he now believed it was not so important that the auditor be non-croquet related. Council **approved** this request.

Andrew suggested that the new Auditor should not be a member of CA Council, but this did not find favour with the meeting.

The expenses incurred in running the 2010 WTC were explained.

Andrew commented on the 3 case scenarios that showed how the P&L would be affected by 50% and 100% reduction in entry fees received. He commented that whilst the WCF supported a reduction to 50%, it wished to maintain the principle of receiving some part of the entry fees.

Bruce Rannie requested that the total income be shown for each case and that entry fees reimbursed to hosts be shown as an item of expenditure. This

would more accurately reflect the turnover of the WCF. Stephen Mulliner disagreed, but the general view seemed to be that Bruce's suggestion had merit.

Chris Clarke suggested that the profit/loss from currency exchange should be separated from the main accounts.

It was noted that Licence Fees and subscriptions had not been increased for a decade and that this would be an area that the new Treasurer would need to consider.

It was noted that the £5000 for development grants was a fluid figure and may go up or down

The report was approved (Hope/Hall)

The approval of the budget was delayed until later in the meeting, after motion 5.1 had been decided.

4.3 WCF Hall of Fame Report

Rhys Thomas presented a verbal report. He outlined the history behind the Hall of Fame and explained that Archie Peck had been invited this year to join the existing voting members of John Prince, Neil Spooner and Prof. Bernard Neal.

The 2010 inductees were Prof. Bernard Neal, Col. Anthony Hall, Neil Spooner, Jerry Stark and Chris Clarke.

4.4 WCF MC Report

Chris Clarke presented the MC report. He explained the current timetable for WCF events up to 2014 and stated that it was the MC aim to produce a 10 year rolling calendar in order that events could be properly scheduled in what was becoming a very busy croquet world.

Chris asked Council as to their views on the holding of a new event – a WCF World Golf Croquet Teams Championships.

Tony Hall said that the ACA fully supported holding more GC events and that it viewed it as an excellent way to promote the sport.

Chris Williams voiced concern regarding the danger of having too many events, particularly from the non-international player's perspective. However, providing they were scheduled well in advance, did not object to the proposal.

Ian Vincent requested that the burden on hosts be borne in mind and said how important it was to schedule well in advance.

Stephen Mulliner expressed the personal view that he did not believe that it mattered whether all the top players were able to play in all events.

David Maugham backed Chris Williams emphasising the pressure that International events puts on the domestic UK calendar, citing the change in venue for the 2011 Opens as an example.

Liz Williams noted that it was England who currently hosted most of the European events.

Amir Ramsis was in favour of the event and also wanted to ensure that GC singles Worlds were held on a regular basis.

Ian Burrige opposed Stephen Mulliner's view and said that he felt it was important that top players competed in events in order for them to be meaningful but that a view needed to be taken with regard to whether or not scheduling should generally allow those playing both AC and GC to compete in all the major events of both codes or only one.

Rhys Thomas suggested that we should consider not just "World" events but "Open" events. This view was opposed by David Maugham and Tony Hall who said that the NZ /Aus/etc Open already filled that gap.

Bruce Rannie highlighted that it was not the WCF that ran the events and that we were bound by the willingness of hosts.

It was **agreed** that a WCF GC Teams event should be planned.

David Openshaw requested more information about an international calendar of events that specifically targeted foreign players. Chris Clarke **agreed** to try and produce a short list of events that targeted this type of player and to make it available on the Notts/ACA/US boards and the WCF website.

Chris then presented details of the current development work that the WCFMC was engaged in. Charles Jones explained that the MC saw three potential areas for development;

- a. Assisting existing associations to improve by offering items such as weekend coaching/refereeing courses etc.
- b. Assisting countries who have expressed an interest in starting croquet (e.g. Portugal/Qatar etc).
- c. "Missionary" development where we attempt to generate an interest in the sport within new countries.

The MC felt that it should limit our development activities to levels a. and b. – this was unanimously **agreed**.

Chris Clarke then explained that the MC had recently decided to appoint Development Officers (DO) to help promote the sport. It was accepted that the majority of development work in the immediate future would be in mainland Europe and Members were asked to consider names of individuals who might be willing to help in this area.

It was explained that the MC intended to hold 6 weekends during 2011 where a DO would visit a country to provide coaching/refereeing assistance. Their flights would be paid by the WCF, but the host country would be expected to provide food and lodging. Members were also asked as to how best they felt we could help the development of croquet in newer Members.

Tony Hall said that “Ambassadorial visits” had worked well.

Ian Burrige suggested that identifying individuals from mainland Europe and bringing them to the UK might work.

Chris Williams suggested John Evans as a possible DO.

Chris then asked Council for clarification over the amount that the MC should be able to spend, given that the budget was flexible and that there had been concern expressed by some parts of the MC over potentially spending 10% of our reserves.

The general view was that the purpose of the WCF having money was to help develop croquet worldwide. It was accepted that the WCF needed to keep reserves and that normally these would represent 2 to 3 times its annual turnover. It was also suggested that 25% of the remaining balance could be allocated annually to development. Tony Hall stated that the purpose of the “Friends Fund” was to provide a solid balance sheet and that as it now represented 2 to 3 times of annual turnover, could be used as our reserve.

Rhys Thomas noted the need to be seen to act prudently with any grants due to the financial issues within the US.

It was therefore **agreed** that the MC be allowed to spend up to £17500 without seeking further approval from Council (25% of 70k) on development grants during 2011, and that for future years this figure would be 25% of our non-reserve funds.

Tony Hall suggested that Members be updated “in broad brush strokes rather than fine detail” on development projects being supported by the MC.

A discussion was held regarding the cost of hosting events. It was noted that the costs of the hosting the lower Tiers of the WTC were £2000 for lawn and ball hire and £600 for trophies.

Chris Clarke indicated that the MC would be rewriting the Sports Regs to more accurately reflect current practice and remove some of the more financially onerous responsibilities for host nations.

4.5 Ranking Review Committee Report

The Ranking Review Committee tabled a report. They were thanked for their work so far.

Motions

5.1.1 CNZ proposed their amendment **"Replace "50%" of the entry fees to be paid to the Host Association with "100%"**" which was seconded by the USCA.

Tony Hall and Stephen Mulliner both spoke against the amendment.

David Openshaw explained that the WCF had always tried to help host nations mitigate against risk and cited the previous AC worlds in Florida as an example.

Charles Jones wondered why CNZ took all the entry fees for their domestic events, leaving the risk with the host clubs.

A vote was taken

For: NZ (3) USA (3); Total 6

Against: Eng (3) Aus (3) Egy (2) Sco (1); Total 9

The amendment was **defeated**.

5.1 Aus proposed their motion **"That the WCF contributes to the Host Country or Association conducting WCF events, 50% of the entry fees paid by players to participate in the event. Such payment to the Host Country or Association to be 50% of the total entry fees less the license fee."** seconded by England. .

The USA expressed a wish to split its 3 votes. There was a feeling at the meeting that this was inappropriate, but nothing concrete could be found in the Statutes

to cover this. It was agreed to cover this issue when the Statutes were rewritten and let them split their votes in the meantime.

For: Eng (3) Aus (3) USA (2) Egy (2) Sco (1); Total 11

Against: NZ (3) USA (1); Total 4

The motion was **carried** and takes effect from 1st January 2011

5.2 The MC proposed their motion "***That WCF Statute 214.2 be deleted and replaced with the following:-***

214.2 All Full Members and Associate Members shall have the right to send a representative to compete in any singles event licensed by the Federation as a World Championship.

214.3 All Full Members and Associate Members shall have the right to send a team to compete in any team event licensed by the Federation as a World Championship. For the purposes of this paragraph "team" includes a doubles pair.

214.4 If the conditions of the license for a team event licensed by the Federation as a World

Championship permit composite teams, i.e. teams representing more than one Member, then subject to 214.5 (below) the right under 214.3 will be considered to be fulfilled in respect of a Member represented by a composite team whether or not the Member has a representative playing in that team.

214.5 A composite team in a team event licensed by the Federation as a World Championship cannot represent a Member unless that Member has expressly agreed so to be represented and has so informed the Secretary-General in writing or by e-mail."

The ACA seconded the motion.

Keith Aiton spoke in favour of the motion, explaining the rationale.

Bruce Rannie spoke against the motion saying that given 5.3 this was "putting the cart before the horse". He believed that the change was being rushed through and the consequences had not been properly considered. He believed that there was time to achieve a well considered change at the July 2011 Council meeting.

The English delegates spoke against the motion saying that they believed it was "not a full solution" and saying that they failed to see the urgency of the motion. They commended the MC on their approach with regard to the China exemption and said that a similar approach would suffice in the short term.

The question then arose as to whether the WCF should be involved in any non-world based events. David Openshaw explained that the European Teams Champs was not solely for European teams. It had two aims;

- a. Encouraging European Teams
- b. The development of non-European teams such as South Africa and Canada who had both been invited to play.

England suggested that "arbitrary invitations undermined the rights of non-invited countries". England wanted improved wording and proposed that the meeting move onto the next agenda item. This was seconded by Scotland.

For : England (3) Sco (1); Total 4

Against : USA (3) NZ (3) Aus (3) Egy (2); Total 11

The motion was **defeated**

A vote was then taken on the original motion;

For : USA (3) Aus (3) NZ (3); Total 9

Against : England (3) Egypt (2) Scotland (1); Total 6

The motion required a 2/3 majority and was therefore **defeated**

5.3 The MC proposed that "***World Team Championships will be open to entries from individual WCF members only***"

This was seconded by Australia.

Bruce Rannie said that it was crazy to be voting on this motion which required a 50% majority when the previous one needed a 2/3 majority. He wanted issues such as this to be in the Statutes rather than the Regs.

Rhys Thomas explained that the USA were simply fed up with waiting and wanted a decision.

England strongly opposed the motion and explained that they were in the process of internal resolution which they expected to be finalised in January. They also expressed dissatisfaction with the amount of time they had been given since the end of the WTC to analyse its success.

David Maugham expressed a view that the motion may have unfortunate effects with regard to development of smaller nations who might want to join together for team events.

David Openshaw said that this motion would encourage the keener players in smaller nations to develop their weaker players rather than relying upon joint teams.

A vote was taken;

For: USA (3) Australia (3) Egypt (2); Total 8

Against: Eng (3) NZ (3) Sco (1); Total 7

The motion required a simple majority and was therefore **carried**.

5.4 The MC proposed that **""WCF Statute (306.2) which states;**

"A player may compete in a tournament, match or competition subject to a minimum age limit if he has attained the minimum age on the preceding 31 December. "

Be replaced with

""(306.2) A player may compete in a tournament, match or competition subject to a minimum age limit if he has attained the minimum age on the first day of the event""

This had already been discussed and approved via email. The motion was **carried** unanimously.

6. Appointment of Treasurer

Charles Jones explained that we had two candidates for the position of Treasurer and that they were both well qualified for the position. He said the MC had discussed which candidate to support and were recommending that Ian Burridge be appointed.

A vote was held after Ian had left the room (Stephen had left the meeting earlier).

Ian Burridge was appointed unanimously.

7. Discussion on Women's AC World Championships

The MC proposed **"That the WCFMC will wait for the results of an independent academic study to determine demand for a Women's Association Croquet World Championship before making any decisions regarding asking for bids for such an event."**

This was seconded by the USA.

The MC felt that its previous stance of simply announcing that it would hold a Womens AC World was incorrect and that whilst it was still in favour of the event, the views of the players affected and Council should be heard as well.

Rosemary Graham spoke eloquently against the motion. She explained that she had surveyed 32 players at the Australian Women's (which was oversubscribed) and that of the 24 who had responded, 23 were in favour of an event. She said that to delay the introduction of this event when the U21 and O50 had been introduced without delay could be seen as sexist.

Rhys Thomas said that USA was against this event but might regard a Women's Open as acceptable.

Rosemary Graham said that Women accounted for 50% of players and deserved a World Championship, not an Open event.

Tony Hall said Australia was strongly in favour of this event.

Aaron Westerby said CNZ strongly supported this event.

Jeff Dawson asked for details of the study which were supplied.

Liz Williams expressed a desire that even if the motion was defeated, the survey should still go ahead.

A vote was taken;

For: USA (3) Eng (3); Total 6

Against: Australia (3) NZ (3) Egy (2) Sco (1); Total 9

The motion was **defeated**.

The MC **agreed** to start the process of requesting bids for a Women's AC Worlds.

8. Discussion on the relationship, powers and duties of WCF Council, WCFMC, the WCF Presidency and WCF Secretariat.

Following a discussion paper, and subsequent Member responses, Council was offered a final opportunity to request changes it wished to see the MC make when rewriting Statutes.

Australia requested that both Treasurer and SG be appointed, voting positions on the MC.

England requested that both Treasurer and SG be elected, voting positions on the MC.

It was agreed that in practice, there was little difference between appointment by Council and election by Council.

It was also requested that both positions have 4 year lengths of tenure in line with other MC positions and with no restriction on the number of terms that can be served.

Chris Clarke offered to stand down in order that an election could occur, but this was not considered necessary.

It was suggested that the Treasurer and SG should have terms finishing 2 years apart to improve continuity. After some discussion, it was **agreed** that Chris Clarke would be due for election in Dec 2014 and Ian BurrIDGE in Dec 2012.

Keith Aiton requested comments on the "Guiding Principles".

It was agreed that in order to strengthen the position of Council, each country should have an email contact as well as correspondence going through the National office.

Ratification of Members

9.1 Denmark were ratified as Observer Members

9.2 The Isle of Man's change from Associate to Observer was ratified.

10. Any other Business

Australia proposed that Case 2 of the budget with modification to all World Championship entries fees to £8/day (except the U21 which is free) be approved. This was seconded by Scotland.

Approved unanimously.

Jeff Dawson requested that the MC review the 13 month rule

David Maugham reported from the Mac meeting that the 4GB had agreed to supra-majority voting (removing the previous veto system and changing to requiring 75% in favour) and that they wanted the WCF to administer the Mac. The 4GB had retained their veto in regard to the WCF being given a vote.

The next meeting was provisionally scheduled for 11.00 on Saturday 23rd July 2011 in London.

The meeting ended at 15.40