

**GC WC 30 July - 7 August 2022 – SCCC, England**

**WCF Event Player Survey**

40 players responded.

Question	Results	Summary of Comments
Was the pre-event organisation and information provided satisfactory?	Yes = 18 No = 2	There was no physical player briefing due to Covid but the pre-event information sent out was generally thought to be excellent. The players who qualified at Eastbourne reported lack of information and uncertainty as to what they needed to do. Some players didn't seem to know that format and block information was available on the Event website already and so asked for it to be available earlier than at the briefing.
Did you attend the player briefing? If so, was the information well-presented and useful? Was the scheduling of the briefing convenient?	Yes = 14 No = 9 Did not attend = 17	There was no physical briefing, so not sure how 14 people said they attended? On the whole, everyone thought the information sent out previously was good.
Were the official functions e.g .Opening and Closing Ceremonies, Tournament Dinner etc well organised and enjoyable?	Very good = 22 Good = 13 Satisfactory = 3	Generally, everyone thought the socials were very good.
Was your number of games each day too many, not enough or about right?	Too many = 1 Not enough = 8 About right = 30	Although most responded 'About Right' the comments suggested that many thought there was too much waiting around. There was general acknowledgement that the one venue was good, but the price paid for this was some waiting around.
Was the overall duration of the event too long, too short or about right?	Too long = 4 Too short = 0 About right = 36	Few comments, those that did respond were mixed. A slight preference for a shorter event, with less waiting around between games or rest days.
Was the event well-managed?	Yes = 38 No = 1	Several comments were made thanking Tim King and Mike Town for their time, as well as all the other volunteers. Some ideas suggested. Including: - not scheduling all games in advance each day but just the first 11, then ordering the rest of the games somehow, so that players had more idea when they might go on. - Pegged down games should go on at the end of each day, not the beginning. It was felt the players had an advantage when finishing their previous games gave them a long warm-up. - Player practicing between games needed to be enforced better. - Warmups were too long, the 5 minute limit should have been enforced.

Was the event well-referee'd?	Yes = 38 No = 2	Generally lots of positive comments that on the whole the refereeing was good. Also, thanks to the referees for volunteering their time. Quality of referee's varied, with comments that 1 or 2 seemed 'out of their depth' Referee's hammering in hoops was thought to be a poor use of their time.
Were the courts of suitable quality?	Yes = 37 No = 3	Generally everyone thought the lawns were great, and enjoyed the fast conditions and firm hoops. Some commented that the sand should have been put on a few days earlier.
Were the balls of suitable quality?	Yes = 36 No = 3	Some players did not like being asked to play with secondary colours. Some comments that old and new balls were mixed up.
Were the hoops well set?	Yes = 39 No = 1	Generally everyone thought the hoops were excellent
How would you rate the Sussex County Croquet Club venue overall, including facilities and catering?	Very good = 31 Good = 5 Satisfactory = 4	Generally excellent feedback on the facilities. Some comments that the gents toilets need upgrading (but we know this is already planned). The flexibility on food options were very popular and praised and those responsible thanked. Some requests for food later in the evening given how late play continued.
Publicity. How would you rate the publicity, such as the Event Website, Facebook page and the Live-Streaming?	Very good = 26 Good = 12 Satisfactory = 1	Livestreaming – many thanked Alison Maugham for her time and thought it was excellent. There were of course minor comments re how to improve, specifically more than one feed at a time, two camera's when possible, more top players commentating, and a request to set up a facility so people could stream from their phones.  Press – some thought more efforts to get local press and newspapers to the event would have been worthwhile.
If you played in 2019 and 2022 did you prefer the 2019 event (80 players, 4 venues) or the 2022 event (64 players, 1 venue)and why?		Almost all responses were a preference for one venue, ideally still with 80, but if only 64, the one venue was still preferred.
How would you rate the event overall?	Very good = 29 Good = 9 Satisfactory = 1 Poor = 1	Generally very good feedback from players with many thanking the organising committee and management team for a job well done.  Suggestions for improvement included: - A few commented that the main KO draw format is poor. Using the rankings to seed as suggested (as is done in AC), or at least changing the block based system so it is less

		<p>obvious who will play who. Players have a 50% chance of playing someone from their block in the second round. Players can work out who they might play and could lose their last game in the block to put themselves in a different place.</p>
--	--	---

- The club/host should nominate a live streaming director early (in the Event Bid).
- The WCF should publish guidance on live streaming.
- Players should get clearer guidance on practice before games (time, thrashing at hoops, etc) which should be gently enforced by referees.