

# CROQUET AUSTRALIA

*Minutes of the 60<sup>th</sup> Annual General Meeting  
Held at The Master Builders Association  
52 Parramatta Road, Forest Lodge NSW 2037  
On Monday 30 March 2009 at 10.00am*

## Present:

<b>President</b>	Max Murray
<b>Senior Vice President</b>	Stephen Meatheringham
<b>Vice President</b>	Bruce Fleming
<b>Immediate Past-President</b>	John Fransen
<b>Executive Director / Secretary</b>	Maree Skinner
<b>Treasurer</b>	Tony Hall

## Delegates:

<b>NSW</b>	Jacky McDonald	Geof McDonald
<b>SA</b>	Dean Paterson	Kevin Skinner
<b>QLD</b>	Elizabeth Fleming	Valda Wintzer
<b>WA</b>	Susan Sands	Helen Collins
<b>VIC</b>	Val Brown	George Latham
<b>TAS</b>	Rob McAdam	Pam Hamilton

**Apologies:** Nil

**Observers:** Anna Miller, Steve Jones, Jean Murray,  
**Scrutineers:** Legal Staff Master Builders Association  
NSW

## **Agenda Item 1 – Opening**

The President, Max Murray, welcomed the attendees to the meeting and asked the Delegates to introduce themselves. Max informed Council that John Barclay of Barclay Insurance brokers would address the meeting briefly just prior to the lunch break.

## **Agenda Item 2 – Roll Call**

The President, Senior Vice President, Vice President, Immediate Past-President, Treasurer, Executive Director / Secretary and all Delegates were present.

## **Agenda Item 3**

### Minutes of the Previous Meeting

Minutes of the 59th Annual General Meeting held at Sports House, Corner Caxton and Castlemaine Streets Milton QLD 4064 On Friday April 4<sup>th</sup> 2008 at 1.30pm.

### Council Meetings

Jacky McDonald stated that at the last Plenary Session it has been agreed that there would be more than one council meeting a year. Max Murray did not recall the discussion. Maree Skinner stated that the meeting had been recorded and if that had been mentioned it should be in the minutes. Jacky stated that she would bring it up later in the meeting.

*Secretarial note: The mention of a council meeting is in the minutes of the Plenary Session 2008 under the heading of "Other Business". At 5.1.2, the last sentence reads (quoting Liz Fleming):*

*"She also commented that a council meeting once a year may not be enough – suggest a video-conference once a year to supplement the AGM".*

### Motion

That the Minutes of the 59th Annual General Meeting held at Sports House, Corner Caxton and Castlemaine Streets Milton QLD 4064 On Friday April 4<sup>th</sup> 2008 at 1.30pm be accepted as a true record.

Moved	George Latham		
Seconded	Susan Sands		
Carried			

### Voting

Carried unanimously	<b>Yes</b>		
Queensland		Western Australia	
New South Wales		President	
Victoria		S/Vice President	
Tasmania		Treasurer	
South Australia		Vice President	

### Agenda Item 4

#### Business Arising from the Previous Minutes

Business arising from the Minutes of the previous Annual General Meeting.

#### 1. Annual Action Plan

The Executive has produced an updated Strategic Plan that addresses this issue. The Strategic Plan has been circulated to the states. Tony Hall explained that the Strategic Plan is the basis for the Budget.

## Agenda Item 5

### Correspondence

The Executive Director reported that correspondence had been dealt with during the year. Correspondence is available for perusal in electronic format upon request.

## Agenda Item 6 i.

### ACA President's Report and Executive Director's Report

The Reports were circulated to the states prior to the AGM.

President Max Murray spoke to his report:

- A first draft of the new Constitution has been produced and circulated to the Working Party. Need to expand the Working Party. Since then Max has purchased a copy of "Renton" and has realised that he needs to go back and amend the draft. He hopes to get a draft out to the States soon. The present draft makes a lot of operational changes. Matters like the Constitution would be better discussed at the additional meetings referred to by Jacky McDonald.
- Events Manager. Max recommends that a member of the Executive should never take on the role of Events Manager. It leaves no time for other things and as a consequence the progression of matters such as the Constitution have suffered. Executive has looked at alternatives. States to take a more active role in the management and running of the tournaments. States are generally well organised. Will look at events management training. SEAL has a Tournament Management Course. The money spent by Max in travelling to ACA Events would be better spent training tournament managers.

*Secretarial Note: The Events Management duties will be divided into two areas with the clerical functions (receipt of entry forms, payments) to be handled by the Executive Director and the remaining organisation for events will be handled by a new sub-committee to be known as the Events sub-committee. The sub-committee will be chaired by a member of the Executive Committee and will have two other members from the states.*

- Medal for Meritorious Service to Croquet. States will be asked for nominations.
- Jacky McDonald queried the Referee Accreditation. Max replied that some progress has been made but there is still a long way to go. Owen Edwards and Stephen Meatheringham have put a lot of work into the project.

Executive Director Maree Skinner gave a summary of her report.

### **Motion**

That the President and Executive Director Reports be accepted.

Moved	Kevin Skinner
Seconded	Val Brown
	<b>Carried</b>

### Voting

Carried unanimously	<b>Yes</b>		
Queensland		Western Australia	
New South Wales		President	
Victoria		S/Vice President	
Tasmania		Treasurer	
South Australia		Vice President	

**Agenda Item 6 ii.**

**Appointed Officers and Committee Reports**

Committee Reports have previously been circulated

**Motion**

That the Appointed Officers and Committee Reports be accepted.

Moved	Dean Paterson		
Seconded	Susan Sands		
	<b>Carried</b>		

Voting

Carried unanimously	<b>Yes</b>		
Queensland		Western Australia	
New South Wales		President	
Victoria		S/Vice President	
Tasmania		Treasurer	
South Australia		Vice President	

**Business arising from reports**

Nil.

**Agenda Item 6 iii.**

**State Reports**

State Reports have previously been circulated.

The Victorian Report had been inadvertently omitted from the Council Pack (but was emailed to states) and copies were provided to the Delegates.

Kevin Skinner commented that having a password to update the website as in Victoria was a good methodology.

**Motion**

That the State Reports be accepted.

Moved	Liz Fleming		
Seconded	Jacky McDonald		
	<b>Carried</b>		

Voting

Carried unanimously	<b>Yes</b>		
Queensland		Western Australia	
New South Wales		President	
Victoria		S/Vice President	
Tasmania		Treasurer	
South Australia		Vice President	

**Business arising from reports**

Nil.

## Agenda Item 7

### **Finance – including Fees, Levies and Honorariums**

The Treasurer addressed the meeting. He explained that the reason for splitting the Financial matters into two sections was to take into account the Notices of Motion of which several related to the Budget.

The net loss for the year was \$53,000. (Actual loss \$46,681 – the transfer of funds into the International Events Fund accounts for the difference).

**The Income and Expenditure Statement** shows the loss of \$53,000 – mainly due to the reduction in the value of the investments (reduced in value by nearly \$34,000). In fact the loss is increased due to an amount of interest not received of \$4,792 = total \$38,712. The Treasurer expects that when the investments recover the loss will be reversed.

**Balance Sheet.** International Events Fund is up from \$39,391 to \$45,837.28. Accumulated surplus has reduced from \$216,826 to \$170,146.69. Current assets: Esanda Investment is paying 6½%; Sandhurst Trustees Mortgage is up; MLC Balanced Fund has dropped significantly in value as did the Westpac Australian Properties Fund (prior to Global Financial Crisis). The Treasurer expects that those investments will recover in due course, in fact the properties fund appears to be recovering already – slightly.

**Note 2 in relation to the Budget.** The magazine deficit has reduced from \$9,000 to \$2,000. Tony gave credit to Carolyn Ribone (Editor) and Judy Evans (Subscriptions Manager). Judy has been sending out reminders regarding subscriptions. The Executive decided to increase subscriptions from \$35 pa to \$37 pa.

**International Events Fund.** In relation to the Trans-Tasman Test, a lot of the expenditure appears in 2008 although the event was held in 2009 (reimbursement of air fares etc).

**Trading Account.** In 2008 we produced new issues of the AC Laws Book and the GC Rules Book. Gross profit for trading went from about \$300 to nearly \$5000.

**Schedule of Entry Fees and Prizes.** The intention of this Schedule is to ensure that we don't make a loss on events, but in the last 10 years we have made significant losses. The 2009 Schedule is derived to ensure that the losses do not continue. Changes: entry fees for players wishing to play in plate events only will be 50% of the entry fee (to reflect the amount of play) and entry fees for full-time students under the age of 25 will be one half of the full fee.

Jacky McDonald asked if there is a withdrawal at last minute and someone is put into the tournament in their place, how much does the replacement player pay? The Treasurer responded that the full entry fee is due (although exceptions have been made).

The Schedule of Entry fees and Prizes is presented by the Executive for your approval.

Val Brown queried the policy regarding withdrawal of players prior to the draw. The players are entitled to a refund less a small amount for administration fees.

### **Treasurer's Report.**

In the past we have relied on about \$20,000 return from investments to bolster the income. This year there is no return. Due to the loss of \$3,000 on events (mainly due to Event Manager's Expenses), decisions to change events management have been made by the Executive. Every event except the President's Eights should be cost neutral.

The Budget will not be approved until after the Notices of Motion have been dealt with. The Treasurer explained that he has produced two drafts of the budget.

Draft 1: reflects the current basis. Problem: that the proposed increase of \$1 in affiliation fees would leave us with a significant deficit. Therefore the Treasurer is requesting an increase in affiliation fees of another \$2 per year and for 2010 another \$1 on top of that. The VCA's proposal for \$3 per member to be added to the International Events Fund will be addressed later in the meeting.

Almost all financial transactions are now done by EFT. Tony thanked Maree Skinner and Judy Evans who receive and bank cheques.

The Treasurer spoke about the reports he produces in relation to transfers of funds to the Treasurer's Account. He thanked the Executive for their quick responses to his emails and to Stephen Meatheringham as a co-signatory.

The Investment Policy is on the ACA Website. It is the third page that is frequently amended in response to the finances of the organisation.

The Treasurer thanked the Auditor for finalising the books expeditiously. MYOB has proven most helpful.

The Treasurer also mentioned that he is looking for a suitable 'understudy' to train and eventually take on the position of Treasurer (no need for the person to be Canberra-based as the work is all done by email).

With reference to the **Schedule of Fees Payments and Honoraria**, Tony pointed out that the ACA now requires Tax Invoices for all accommodation claims including accommodation for Council meetings. This will allow the ACA to claim the GST.

Asset Allocation (Investment Policy) as at 3 February, Tony pointed out that we needed to redeem some investments.

The Treasurer made reference to the Motions proposed by the ACA regarding amendments to Clause 7 of the handbook in regard to late payments to the ACA. At the present time there is only one outstanding invoice for the states. Prompt payment is much appreciated.

**Summary of ACA membership.** NSW increased membership by 84. WA increased membership by 125. QLD increased membership by 90 and Tasmania increased membership by 45.

Jacky McDonald queried the prize money in Schedule of Entry Fees and Prizes. Jacky believes we are paying too much, particularly in light of the current financial situation. Tony thought the references to prizes for Z and Y winners were errors on his part (reverting to the past) and requested that Council allow the new Executive to review the prize money. Geof McDonald commented that \$1,000 prize money for the winner was too much when the ACA is asking for an increase in fees from all players. Stephen Meatheringham responded that the events are self-funding (players fund the prizes). The entry fees should cover all expenses and therefore reducing the prize money would not provide a saving.

Discussion followed regarding the \$1,000 prize. The Treasurer stated that the Schedule should read: Winner \$1,000, 2<sup>nd</sup> \$500, 3<sup>rd</sup> \$300, 4<sup>th</sup> \$150, 5<sup>th</sup> \$100, 6<sup>th</sup> \$50. Tony stated that the host state has the possibility to obtain sponsorship using the name of Australian Championships therefore affording States the opportunity to make a profit on the events.

Pam Hamilton inquired as to the A B Morrison Award. Tony responded that it has been presented at the Open Championships.

**Motion**

Tony moved that the Financial Accounts for 2008 be accepted.

Moved	Tony Hall		
Seconded	Susan Sands		
	<b>Carried</b>		

Voting

Carried unanimously	<b>Yes</b>		
Queensland		Western Australia	
New South Wales		President	
Victoria		S/Vice President	
Tasmania		Treasurer	
South Australia		Vice President	

**Agenda Item 8**

**Golf Croquet Coaching Manual**

States have a copy of the latest edition of Bill Lawson's Manual. Tony Hall commented that this is the first time that anyone has categorised and analysed tactical options. Tony has used earlier versions of the manual to teach players (some high level players) and it has been superb. Tony believes it will sell very well – and have world-wide appeal. Bill Lawson has stated that he is not seeking to have copyright and is agreeable for the ACA to have copyright and market the Manual.

There was discussion regarding the manual. There were differences of opinion about some items in the manual. George Latham said that the Director of Golf Croquet in Victoria recommends the Manual highly. George said that the Manual was sent out to states for comment. He said we need to get it up and running now and make it compatible with AC Coaching. Tony stated that he had looked upon the manual as another publication, the author decided what should go in it and we shouldn't be trying to change what an author has written to meet the requirements of everybody else. We don't have much out there and it would be a good idea to get this published for people to read. This is a publication that the ACA endorses. The ACA can use this publication as a basis to write a Syllabus for Golf Croquet Coaching. This publication is not an accreditation for Golf Croquet – it will be a tool for the development of a GC Coaching Course.

**Motion**

ACA will promote and sell the Manual as any other publication.

Moved	Dean Paterson		
Seconded	Pam Hamilton		
	<b>Carried</b>		

Voting

Carried unanimously	<b>Yes</b>		
Queensland		Western Australia	
New South Wales		President	
Victoria		S/Vice President	
Tasmania		Treasurer	
South Australia		Vice President	

Kevin Skinner suggested that the ACA write a letter to Bill Lawson to thank him for his efforts in producing the publication.

**Action:** ED to write to Bill Lawson.

*Secretarial Note: Bill Lawson has advised that he does not want his coaching manual sold separately as it is a publication for the training of coaches. He has written a GC Handbook for players that covers the same material. The Handbook will be offered for sale through the ACA.*

## **Agenda Item 9**

### **ACA Review of Constitution**

Already addressed in President's Report

## **Agenda Item 10**

### **ACA Magazine**

Bruce Fleming reported that in 2007 the Magazine lost \$9,000. In 2008 the loss had reduced to \$2,000 due to an increase in subscribers and a reduction in costs. The Annual Subscription has increased to \$37. We require 540 subscribers to break even; currently there are 494 subscribers. Projected loss for 2009 is approximately \$1,700.

Correspondents are still required in Vic and WA . Please contact Carolyn Ribone (magazine editor). ACA is also seeking an advertising manager and would like someone to come forward.

Kevin Skinner commented that the turnaround was extraordinary and those involved are to be congratulated. Max commented that the turnaround is largely due to the reminder letters that have been issued. In addition, the style of the magazine has changed from a highly technical publication to one with shorter articles and more appeal to a wide range of people.

## **Agenda Item 11**

### **ACA Tournament Expenses and Claims**

In November 2008 the Treasurer produced a spreadsheet with all aspects of Tournament expenses described. The auditors produced an explanation through the accounts in December. The largest loss is from the GC Open Singles and Interstate Shield (loss of \$2,500) and is largely due to having the Events Manager attend the event. There was a loss of \$910 on the Gold Medal, Men's and Women's Singles and Interstate Cup. The loss of \$397 on the Eights was anticipated. There was also a loss of \$108 on the Open Championships, and a small profit on Gateball and the National Handicaps. We are fairly close to being cost neutral on each of the events.

The ACA has produced a Tournament Expenses Estimate or Claim Form. The form will be sent to all states and will be used in future for all ACA Events. States must use this form when making a bid and claiming hosting expenses.

**Action:** ED to send form to states.

Liz Fleming reported that CAQ is preparing a Tournament Pack and will be accrediting their Tournament Managers. Suggest that ACA produce a Tournament pack inclusive of all forms necessary. NSW has a similar system.

## Agenda Item 12

### Format for GC Teams Event

Tony Hall prepared a response to SA's Motion and realised only a couple of days ago that he should have prepared a paper covering both 4 x 4 and 3 x 3 formats.

Tony has prepared a paper on a 4 x 4 format for the recent Executive Meeting and at that meeting undertook to also prepare a paper on a 3 x 3 format.

Tony will produce a paper to be circulated to states as soon as possible to enable implementation in 2009.

Tony asked if anyone had any objection to him preparing a paper for the states. There were no objections.

Tony mentioned that states should consider:

- Top GC Players want a 4 x 4 format;
- This will cost states money;
- Smaller states may not have sufficient players of a suitable standard.

## Agenda Item 13

### Notices of Motion

#### 13a Motions for Amendments to ACA Handbook

##### Submitted by Executive

It is moved that the following amendment be made to the ACA Handbook

##### **Amendments to clause 7 of the ACA Handbook:**

1. Clause 7.7.1 delete "of members" and insert "are to".

**Rationale:** The existing wording is ungrammatical and probably resulted from an uncorrected typo. The word "members" is used incorrectly.

2. Add a new sub-paragraph:  
"7.11 Invoices for payments due to the Association which are unpaid for more than thirty days after the due date may attract interest at the rate of ten percent per annum or other rate determined by the Executive and displayed on the invoice."

**Rationale:** The ability to charge for late payments should be explicit.

**Discussion** re whether the charging of interest on late payments was legal and whether there would be a discount for early payment of invoices (from CAQ Treasurer).

##### **Amendment to Condition 58.4.4 of the ACA Handbook**

3. Delete 'Tournament Referee' in Condition 58.4.4 of the ACA Handbook.

**Rationale:** By Law 28.5.7 supersedes the condition.

Moved	Tony Hall		
Seconded	Liz Fleming		
	<b>Carried</b>		

Voting

Carried unanimously	<b>Yes</b>		
Queensland		Western Australia	
New South Wales		President	
Victoria		S/Vice President	
Tasmania		Treasurer	
South Australia		Vice President	

**13b New South Wales has submitted the following Notice of Motion**

**Motion**

That the ACA drop the use of the Block Performance Rating system to break tie-breaks within a block.

**Background**

The ACA was dissatisfied with the use of Net Points to determine tie-breaks within a block and especially in determining the best (n) place getters across blocks. The ACA commissioned Louis Nel to devise a different method.

Full details of the Block Performance rating system can be found at: <http://www.croquet-australia.com.au/Governance/Documents/BPR%20-%20080519.pdf>. To determine a tie-break within a block is very simple; the lower ranked player within a tie-break will always proceed.

**Rationale**

The Block Performance Rating (BPR) system to break tie-breaks within a block should be dropped for the following reasons:

1. It is generally regarded that two players within 50 grade points of each other are fairly equal. The BPR system does not consider this fact as only a 0.0001 grade point difference will award the tie-break to the lower ranked player.
2. The BPR system does not take into account performance within the current event. Net points is not always the best indicator of how a player is performing but it does at least show some regard to performance. If the higher ranked player has +40 net points and the lower ranked player has -2 net points the lower ranked player proceeds to the knockout under the BPR system.
3. The BPR system relies on the World Rankings. The World Rankings are not always accurate for several reasons:
  - a. A player is new to the ranking system and therefore there is not enough data to determine their true position.
  - b. Results from past competitions have not been submitted.
  - c. Rapid improvers are slow to be recognised.
4. The BPR system was not devised to break tie-breaks within a block. This was confirmed by Louis Nel (author of the BPR) in an email to the Nottingham email list Wednesday, 4<sup>th</sup> June 2008. An excerpt from the email:

*“The method under discussion was not designed in the first place to break ties within a block. Indeed, in that respect one can by-pass it entirely and simply go with the player in the tie who entered with the lowest grade (understandably disliked by some.). It is mainly intended for use where places for the KO are allocated for the entire field of players regardless of the blocks in which they played. That was its main purpose.”*

## **Executive Response:**

### **Background**

Croquet NSW submitted a motion to the 2009 ACA AGM regarding the currently used tie-breaking method for Association Croquet national tournaments.

The Block Performance Rating (BPR) method is used by the ACA to resolve ties within, and between, blocks in order to determine players progressing to the knockout phases of national Association Croquet tournaments.

The previous method, net points, had been disliked by players for a number of reasons including the fact that it would cause players to be less inclined to complete peels on their opponent (for example, TPO's and POP'ing). This was a point which some believed could hold back Australian players from being able to fully explore tactics required for top-level international play.

### **Outcome**

The ACA Executive, however, are aware that there exists some unease among a number of players over the BPR method. Executive members were asked to consider available options. They were identified as:

1. Increase the length of tournaments to allow an extra day to resolve possible tied situations – not acceptable to players or officials.
2. Decrease the number of entries accepted to allow one of the current days to be used for tie-breaking purposes – not acceptable to players and not in the best interests of our sport.
3. Employ a tie-breaking method.

Option 3 is considered the only acceptable option by the ACA Executive. Furthermore, the Executive decided that the BPR should be reconsidered. Executive members and the ACA Tournament Committee were asked to consider whether the BPR was the most appropriate method to use as a tie-breaker. It was decided that it was not.

### **A New Tie-Breaking Method**

The Tournament Committee proposed a return to wins and net points. The ACA Executive accepted this. The following will be used to determine which players move from the block to knock-out phase of a tournament. This will apply both within and across blocks.

*Ties within a block will be resolved before across blocks.*

*Players to proceed will be:*

1. *Those who have lost least games.*
2. *If there is a tie on games, those with the largest net points.*
3. *If there is a tie on games and net points in a block*
  - a. *between two players, the player to progress is the winner of the game between them; or*
  - b. *between more than two players, those to progress are the winners of the most games between the players in the tied position.*
  - c. *If there is still a tie, a tie-break of such form as the Tournament Manager deems fit may be imposed.*
4. *If there is a tie on games and net points across blocks a tie-break of such form as the Tournament Manager deems fit may be imposed.*

### **Summary**

It will be noted that we have returned to more or less the starting point. Those players who objected to net points will still have their same objections.

In conclusion we may take a short quote from Nel's email referred to above and that is: *"... the perennial and essentially unsolvable tie-breaking problem – unsolvable in the sense that no method will ever be found that is satisfactory to all."*

In light of the fact that we are in agreement, we invited Croquet NSW to withdraw the Motion.

### **The Motion has been withdrawn**

### **13c The Victorian Croquet Association has submitted the following Notices of Motion**

#### **Motion 1**

“That ACA introduce an annual levy on all affiliated players of \$3.00 (for example) to establish an International Events Fund”.

Rationale: Securing sponsorship for ongoing international events in Australia is and will be difficult. International events are run by the states for ACA because ACA has no playing venue or sufficient funds to assist states in running these events. This difficulty can be met by ACA levying all affiliated players in Australia to build an International Events Hosting Fund that will adequately support state associations who host these events.

#### **Executive Response**

The ACA Executive supports the motion in principle. However, we would like to discuss the matter with the States.

#### **Discussion**

SA does not support the motion.

NSW does not support the motion due to the funds (\$45,830.28) already in the International Events Fund. NSW Council feels we are spending too much on the elite players.

QLD agrees in principle with the motion. Agree that sponsorship is very difficult to find. However calling this an International Fund and trying to promote it is a hard sell. (Maybe a simpler option is to increase the levy).

John Fransen queries what QLD had in mind for the levy increase. QLD didn't mind the \$3 increase. John asked if \$3 was sufficient. Vast majority of members have nothing to do with international events. International label makes an increase hard to sell.

WA supports the increase but suggests an increased levy rather than a separate fund.

Tasmania does not support the motion, the vast majority of members have nothing to do with or know anything about croquet at international level.

Tony responded to NSW. The \$45,000 in the International Events Fund builds-up over a 3 year period to support the MacRobertson Shield and then is severely depleted for expenditure related to the event. The next MacRob is in England and it will be costly. Tony has produced a summary of now to 2010 for the International Events Fund. It clearly demonstrates the pattern of build-up and decrease.

Tony discussed the additional funds that are actually available following an increase (due to GST). For example an additional \$3 per member will result in a total of approximately \$20,000 – the figure needed to host the WCF Women's GC Championship. We have an obligation to occasionally run a World Championship. The last one we held was in 1997. We should pull our weight in the international community.

Kevin Skinner commented that there appeared to be general agreement in principle – need to educate croquet players about the ACA and international events.

Geof McDonald queried whether the International Fund was exclusive to the MacRobertson Shield. Tony clarified that the Trans-Tasman Tests and the World Championships were all funded by the International Events Fund, but the MacRobertson Shield is the most expensive event.

Discussion followed to clarify the Motion. Should this be a separate fund and not a part of the International Events Fund? Victoria agreed that the motion relates to hosting international events - suggest should be called an International Events Hosting Fund.

Liz Fleming asked how likely would it be for other states to host international events apart from Victoria? Val Brown replied that Victoria doesn't want to host all the events – it costs a lot of money. Liz responded that it appears that we agree in principle that we need the funds but how do we sell this within the states?

Kevin Skinner said it seems that the States have misinterpreted the motion. Changes need to be made to the motion. It should be deferred and brought back before the ACA properly worded.

Liz Fleming replied that we must discuss the motion now and it cannot be deferred. Council must instruct the ACA in how to conduct the business between Council Meetings. George Latham responded that neither the WCF or the ACA has enough funds to help any state in hosting these events. Increase the levies and give the ACA more funds to supplement the hosting of events.

There was then discussion generated by Dean Paterson with regard to whether amendments to the motion are possible or whether the matter should go back to the states. Clause 126 in the ACA Handbook allows amendments to motions.

Rob McAdam asked how the ACA allocates international events to the states. If the ACA calls for bids then ask states how much they need to host the event. Suggested a one-off levy based on that bid to assist the state with the winning bid to run the event.

Kevin Skinner suggested a motion that the Victorian Motion lapse and be re-presented as a motion that establishes a fund that is clearly to be used for the hosting of international events in Australia.

John Fransen commented that puts the fund back 12 months. We can't afford to do that. We could ask Victoria to amend their motion to exclude the words 'international events'.

The Treasurer commented that it would be easy to establish a hosting fund.

Jacky McDonald commented "that \$3 there and a \$2 increase in the Levy did not go down well in NSW. This is an increase of \$5 overall".

John Fransen responded with regard to the costs of running the sport. We are obliged by the Australian Sports Commission to run the ACA as a professional body and it needs to be funded. We have had to change the position of Secretary to that of a salaried Executive Director and that needs to be funded. The ACA cannot continue to run at a loss. The only way to raise the money is to levy the players. If this is not done the ACA will collapse.

Val Brown proposed an amendment to the motion to change the words 'International Events Fund' to read an 'Events Hosting Fund'.

The rationale is to allow for the hosting of national and international events.

**Amended Motion:**

That ACA introduce an annual levy on all affiliated players of \$3.00 to establish an Events Hosting Fund.

Moved	George Latham
Seconded	Kevin Skinner
<b>Carried</b>	

Voting

Carried unanimously	No		
Queensland	Yes	Western Australia	Yes
New South Wales	No	President	Yes
Victoria	Yes	S/Vice President	Yes
Tasmania	No	Treasurer	Yes
South Australia	Yes	Vice President	Yes

**The Amended Motion was then put to the meeting, moved Victoria, seconded SA, and carried. Tasmania and NSW were not in favour of the Amended Motion.**

**Motion 2**

“That ACA actively seek a change in the status of referees to Supervising Referees.”

Rationale: Referees on call are often ignored and will not waste the time and expense of travel and accommodation. They also feel it is unfair that faults are missed by the player and the adversary as a result of a referee not being called.

If players see referees being ignored it will be harder to recruit referees. Without sufficient referees, players progressing from beginners to competent players are in danger of not receiving coaching on the Laws.

**Executive Response:**

Other countries manage very well at the level of Australian Championship events by using the services of referees who are playing in the event. The Executive preference is to have, at the most, only one referee at each venue.

However that does not necessarily apply for the National Handicap events, both AC and GC and the Open GC Singles, where we need non-playing referees. This year because there were a number of players who were referees the National AC Handicaps managed very well without independent referees, but that may not always be the case. So it would be acceptable for independent referees to be appointed as Supervising Referees. Both the National GC Handicaps and the Open GC Singles would like independent referees in charge of each game, but they can manage with Referees on Call. It is impossible for a referee to be an effective Supervising Referee for two GC matches at once, which is why there is no provision in the GC Tournament Regulations for Supervising Referees.

**Discussion:**

There was discussion regarding the status of referees. A referee on call may intervene if they observe a breach in the rules of the game. Problem: supervising two games at once particularly with GC. QLD is in favour of Supervising Referees. There was a query regarding whether states have enough referees to be able to have Supervising Referees? It was raised whether we want a referee on call who has the ability to intervene if necessary? There was clarification that a supervising referee is not a referee in charge. Define the motion – resolved to discuss only the Victorian Motion at this point. The objective of the Victorian motion was clarified.

There was a suggestion that this is not the practice at world championships and we should follow the world-wide practices. The proposal is all right at state level but not for national championships. From a Treasurer’s point of view the ACA does not want to have to pay for a large number of referees at ACA Events. Adjust the refereeing requirements to the requirements of the individual events.

There was disagreement and examples given where intervention could have rectified a situation where there was an injustice.

There was discussion regarding the powers devolved to referees under section 7(c) of the Croquet Australia Tournament Regulations.

Tony Hall suggested that if we wish to change the status of referees we should approach the WCF and should not act unilaterally.

Dean Paterson made the comment that players can and should adapt to different levels of refereeing.

Discussion then followed regarding amending the motion. Tony said that the powers of spectator referees were different in every country and this could lead to them being required to intervene in some countries and forbidden from doing so in others. The duties of referees need to be standardised internationally.

There was comment regarding the cost of having extra referees and the ability of states to find enough referees. Will players accept paying an increase in entry fees to pay for extra referees?

**Amended Motion:**

That ACA change the status of on-call referees to allow them to intervene where appropriate.

Moved	George Latham		
Seconded	Jacky McDonald		
	<b>Carried</b>		

Voting

Carried unanimously	<b>No</b>		
Queensland	Yes	Western Australia	Yes
New South Wales	Yes	President	Yes
Victoria	Yes	S/Vice President	Yes
Tasmania	Yes	Treasurer	No
South Australia	Yes	Vice President	Yes

**The Amended Motion was then put to the meeting, moved Victoria, seconded SA, and carried.**

**Secretarial Note: This resolution is now under consideration by the Laws Committee to determine how best to proceed.**

**13d The South Australian Croquet Association has submitted the following Notices of Motion**

**Motion 1**

**"That referees in all ACA events be appointed as Supervising Referees."**

RATIONALE:

1. We consider it unfair to other players in the event if a referee, who is aware that the Laws of the game are being contravened, is unable to do anything about it because he has not been called onto the court by one of the players, and so has to allow the striker to continue playing and win the game by contravening the Laws. It can also be unfair to those who have to play one of the players of the game in a later event, when their handicaps may have been affected by the result of the game played in contravention of the Laws.

2. While the ideal is to have a Referee in Charge of every game, that is usually impractical. We believe that Supervising Referees (SRs) are the next best thing. It is true, as some argue, that a SR may miss an error committed by a player and pick up one committed by his opponent. So could a Referee in Charge. We believe it is better to have as many errors and irregularities as possible discovered and corrected during the game, since it means that games are played more closely to the requirements of the Laws.

3. In SA and Victoria all referees have been appointed as SRs in state events for some time now, and there have been no reported problems. We see it as much fairer than the Appointment of Referees on Call who are unable to intervene (unless called by a player) when they see a player contravening the Laws, as is currently the case in WCF events. We see no reason why we should change to an inferior and less fair system of refereeing.
4. If we want spectators to accept croquet as a serious competitive sport, rather than an inconsequential social pastime, then we cannot afford to continue with a system where players are asked to referee their own games in major events and a referee cannot take action to correct irregularities unless requested to do so by the players.
5. While we believe that most players are honest, in Australian national events a player will often know little about some of the opponents, and should not be expected to rely on this supposition of honesty to any greater extent than is necessary.
6. There have been no Regulations written which provide clearly for the WCF system of refereeing, stating when a Referee in Charge can, and cannot, intervene in a game situation. We believe that such Regulations, if indeed they are feasible, would have to be too complicated to be acceptable for use in Australian events, or else would have to leave many possible situations inadequately covered as the current WCF regulations do.
7. The most obvious type of unfairness that results from the WCF system occurs when a Referee in Charge - and usually most of the spectators other than the striker's opponent who had temporarily left the court-side - is aware that the striker is playing a break with the wrong ball, or has omitted a hoop from his break, usually inadvertently. The ignoring of such an error by a referee who is not permitted to draw attention to it is quite likely to mean that the game will be won unfairly by a player who may possibly win a prize or qualify for the finals ahead of other players who played according to the rules.
8. Under the WCF Referee-on-Call system the referee is unable to correct such an error, even if the striker calls him to watch a difficult hoop-running attempt, and again plays the wrong ball while the referee is on the court watching the stroke! The referee is expected to pass the stroke as legal, although he knows it was an error in contravention of the laws. Some referees see that as being required to act dishonestly.
9. We believe that most players who unknowingly commit such an error would prefer to have the error pointed out and corrected so that they would have a chance to win the game fairly, rather than be told after the game that they had won the game unfairly. In fact, it seems that the only ones who would not want the referee to have the power to point out and correct such an error are those who are hoping to get away with winning games unfairly.
10. Many referees consider the WCF system to be demeaning to their position and qualifications as trained and qualified referees. They see little point in becoming qualified as referees if they will be required to watch players contravening the Laws and can do nothing about it. For this reason many referees are refusing to accept appointment as referees, and it is becoming almost impossible to find sufficient referees to handle ACA events played in some states.
11. The WCF system also frequently uses out-players from other games to watch and adjudicate on strokes played by players who may well be their main rivals. Again, while most players can be relied upon to referee such situations fairly, we believe that players should not be put in such situations. It looks bad to spectators and would not be countenanced in other serious competitive sports.

FOR ALL THESE REASONS we are dissatisfied with the trend in recent years in major events to move towards the appointment of Referees in Charge with severely limited powers. and we move that in all ACA events the policy should be to appoint Supervising Referees who if necessary may need to be appointed to more than one game on more than one court.

We also suggest that the ACA should consider moving at international level that our system of appointing SRs should be adopted for international events such as the World Championships and the MacRobertson Shield.

**Executive Response:**

Please see the response to the similar notice of Motion from the Victorian Croquet Association.

**SA withdrew the Motion.**

**Motion 2**

**Golf Croquet Interstate Teams**

**1."That teams of four men and four women make up future state golf croquet teams, with two players playing singles and the other two playing doubles in any one match."**

Rationale: ACA and state associations have a duty of care towards their players. In most cases teams comprise players who are 70+ years old and not particularly fit. An inter-state team competition can mean playing 3 x BO 3 time unlimited games a day for five consecutive days this is over nine hours a day of constant play (unlike association croquet matches where there are long rest periods when breaks are being played). Inter-state team golf croquet competition places huge physical and mental demands on players over a long period of time, sometimes when they are of an age when they are least able to cope with it. I do not believe that ACA will agree to this as some states want to restrict team sizes to two. However I do not want a SA player to drop dead on the court before the rule is changed, so if the above proposal is rejected we should request that state teams may have up to four men and four women in their teams.

**2. SACA recommends to ACA "that consideration be given to hosting the National Championships and Interstate Competition at Cairnlea every year and ACA charges all states an entry fee (say \$2000) and distributes this between states in the form of a travel grant to assist with the cost of sending teams to Victoria".**

For example ,a \$2000 entry fee would provide \$12000 for distribution. This could be allocated as follows:-

WA \$4000, QLD \$3000, SA, NSW, TAS, \$1650 ea. VIC \$0. It would then be up to individual states if they wished to add any further support to their teams.

**Executive Response:**

This motion consists of two distinct parts, the first being about the numbers in teams and the second about centralising the competition and funding teams travel.

**Numbers.**

As stated in the rationale, we have a duty of care to players. Golf Croquet requires players to be on their feet for the duration of the matches. In the two competitions already held it was apparent that three best-of-three matches in one day may be too much to require. Consultation with other countries indicates that even the best players (including Egyptians) find more than two best-of-three matches or six games in one day to be too arduous.

However, some States may find the cost of funding eight players too much.

The compromise is to allow up to four men and four women in each team, and this is recommended.

**Discussion:**

Tony said this motion presumes that the format won't change. He then stated 'I have agreed to put out a paper suggesting that the format does change'. Jacky McDonald then

commented that the Executive had already agreed with 'up to four players'. Tony agreed that the Executive is happy with up to four players and this fits in with the existing format, however, if the format were to change then other things might change too. Max inquired as to why the format would need to change and suggested we leave the current format as is. Tony responded that the problem with the current format is that you would have people who would only be playing a doubles match each day which might be unproductive personally to those people. That's why he believes he has better proposals. Max clarified that the present format is based on 2 x 2.. Max then asked for clarification of the format. Tony responded that he believes that ultimately in 10 years time we'll be playing a 4 x 4 format for sure. In the meantime, if you don't want to jump to that straight away then this year it would be possible to either continue with the 2 x 2 format but allowing up to four players or go to a 3 x 3 format which is an interim position and that's what he will be putting into the paper which he can put out to the states pretty rapidly because he has already written it. Max stated that we need to sort out what will be happening this year. The motion really is that teams of 4 x 4 play – we are suggesting that teams of **up to** 4 x 4 be allowed, states can choose to send 3 x 3, 4 x 4 or 2 x 2. It's their choice. As it stands now states can send up to 4 players. There was a query from floor: "So you can play 2 in singles and 2 in the doubles?" The President confirmed the statement.

Discussion then took place to refine the motion.

**Amended Motion**

That Teams of up to four men and four women make up future state Golf Croquet teams, with two players playing singles and two playing doubles in any one match.

Moved	Jacky McDonald
Seconded	Liz Fleming
	<b>Carried</b>

Voting

Carried unanimously	<b>Yes</b>		
Queensland		Western Australia	
New South Wales		President	
Victoria		S/Vice President	
Tasmania		Treasurer	
South Australia		Vice President	

**The Amended Motion was then put to the meeting, moved SA, seconded QLD, and carried.**

**Funding**

The proposal is to hold the WCF Interstate Shield at Cairnlea every year and charge an additional entry fee which would be distributed to States according to their travel costs.

Before further discussion, we need to know whether this is acceptable to the VCA.

If acceptable to the VCA, we would like to hear from States about their preferences. To enable a reasonable distribution of funds (using estimates based on experience with the Eights) an amount of about \$260 per player would be needed. Assuming only six players in each team that is an additional \$1560. The existing entry fee is \$330 per team, so the total entry fee would be \$1890. If there were eight players travelling the total comes to \$2410. As it is impossible to know in advance how many would be in the teams, a compromise is \$2150.

We would also like to know whether States agree, as we do, that the Open Singles Golf Croquet Championship should continue to be held immediately before the Shield and in the same location.

**Discussion:**

VCA does not want to hold the event every year. A comment was made that this is not a proper motion. It was agreed to take a vote as it was put as a motion.

Moved	Dean Paterson		
Seconded	Kevin Skinner		
		<b>Defeated</b>	

Voting

Carried unanimously	<b>No</b>		
Queensland	No	Western Australia	No
New South Wales	No	President	No
Victoria	No	S/Vice President	No
Tasmania	No	Treasurer	No
South Australia	Yes	Vice President	No

**13e The Croquet Association of Queensland has submitted the following Notices of Motion together with a discussion paper**

The paper from QLD is attached.

**Executive Position**

**“Review of AHS and Format of AHS Card”**

Stephen Meatheringham  
21 January 2009

These comments below are written in my role as National Handicapper.

I find it strange that the Queensland handicapping hierarchy have not been in communication with me during the past year, and have not taken part in discussions via an email group which I set up specifically to improve communication between the ACA and the States on handicapping issues. I have had email discussions with all other states at some time or another. The points raised in the Notices of Motion could in all probability have been dealt with simply and not come to the ACA AGM. I note, however, that I have had extensive conversations with Mr John Byers in his role as he reviewed the Queensland Handicapping Trial.

I must also say that a number of comments in the 7 points from CAQ and their attached Report indicate to me that the author has a less than complete understanding of handicapping principles and what a handicapping system is meant to achieve. As an example, a comment in the Report says “multiple bisques at level 5-9 should result in a win” (last sentence on the first page of the Report). This is a very general and misleading comment.

**1) A review of the format, layout and font size of the AHS card for Association Croquet be undertaken**

This was already under way. Comments from Queensland and other states have been taken on board in the review and incorporated where practical. A revised card has been sent to state handicappers for feedback and further enhancements made. This will be released for use as soon as practical.

**2) An improved detailed explanation of how to use the Trigger Points be written and printed on the card**

I am not sure why people cannot understand that a handicap changes when they reach a trigger point that corresponds to a handicap different to one they are currently on. This has been clarified on the card.

It would appear that perhaps states have not been assisting their tournament and club handicappers in the education process. To assist in this process I have written a 2-page Fact Sheet which I would hope will be distributed by states to their clubs (and put up on notice boards), included in the ACA Magazine and made freely available on the ACA web site. A draft of this document has been circulated to state handicappers for comment. It will be released for use as soon as practical.

### **3) Change to layout of table to show total range of handicap for each level (overlapping boxes)**

I am not sure why this is not part of point 2) as raised by CAQ?

The suggested alteration would confuse people more.  
A better explanation in the card and on the Fact Sheet is more appropriate and has been done.

### **4) Reinstate odd number levels**

The current bisque-based handicapping system used in handicap play is known to be very non-linear. For example, one bisque to a person on a handicap of 0 means very much more than perhaps 8-10 bisques to a person on a handicap of 18 or 20.

Newer and higher-handicapped players do not have the skills required to reproduce strokes with the reliability and accuracy of lower handicapped players. They cannot do this for their handicap to be specified more exactly than 2 bisques.

It is not appropriate for the CAQ rationale to say "at this early stage of player development" – some players on handicaps of 12 and above have been playing for years and that is their level of play they have achieved. They should not be on lower handicaps. That would hinder rather than help them win games. The idea of a handicapping system is to permit two players of different skill levels to compete equally. If a player has too few bisques then they will have less chance of winning a game.

The ACA have followed the English CA in the allocation of handicaps at increments of 2 from 12 and above. The English CA have much more experience over many years in handicap play and handicapping than Australia as they play substantially more handicap matches than we do.

I could turn the question around 180° and note that people have in the past suggested expanding the lowest handicaps into ¼ bisque increments as it is considered that the use of ½ a bisque under the current laws gives too much to the higher handicapped player. (That would require modification to the laws and how a ¼ bisque could be employed.)

### **5) Reduce loss rate by ½ at Div 3 and 4 Levels**

I remind people that Divisions are arbitrary methods employed by states and clubs to separate players into silos. They are not part of the Croquet system in general nor part of the handicapping system.

This has been brought up before by Queensland. In an effort to bring this matter to a close the CAQ asked Mr John Byers last year to coordinate a trial of such a system. The results were much as I and others had suggested to the ACA and Queensland that they would be.

Such a change to the operation of the National handicapping system is mathematically inconsistent with, and contrary to, the principals of the Automatic Handicap System. This

change would not only affect the players involved directly but have a flow-on effect to the overall operation and integrity of the system.

Consider a player who is on the "correct" handicap such that they would win 50% of their handicap matches. If they only lose ½ as many index points in their losses they will slowly improve in handicap as they have a net surplus of index points even though their skill level is not improving. Not only that but those who they play against (in Division 1 and 2) will start to receive more index points than they should by defeating a player on a handicap which is in fact too low. Such a change will slowly move everyone to lower and lower handicaps.

Higher handicappers should be encouraged to play handicap play as the use of bisques permits them to make breaks, and hence, gain more skills and understanding of the game. As it levels the playing field a wide range of handicaps can compete on an equal basis against each other.

**6) Adjust card and issue policy to reflect a highest handicap of 20**

In the current review of the card information printed now goes as high as a handicap of 20 (and has been extended to -3 at the other end). Players on handicaps of 22 and 24 are not part of the AHS in Australia and those handicaps are reserved purely for club use. There was no need for it to be on the card.

**7) Ad hoc committee investigates and review player ability and movement at the lower levels of Div 1 & Div 2**

The card does not create a roadblock.

The CAQ paper notes that "a study of the player cards available at this level indicates a reluctance to compete in handicap games"? I fail to see how this first part can imply the second.

If reply I suggest a number of reasons why lower handicapped players play less handicap tournaments:

- Virtually no national championships or international play in other sports are played under handicap conditions. It is the same with croquet. Players at the "top" level want to play against their peers to determine who has the best skills and is the best player. Handicap play does not give you that as it levels the playing field.
- Many of the tactics required for handicap play are quite different to those for ordinary/advanced play.
- Players simply do not have time (or money) to play every single tournament (advanced and handicap) on offer.

(End of Response)

**Discussion:**

Liz Fleming addressed the motion. There were two handicap cards in QLD. CAQ conducted a trial that upheld the use of the AHS card but concluded there was need for review. Stephen Meatheringham has issued a new AHS card and fact sheet. Liz requested on-going review of the AHS system. Stephen thanked CAQ for conducting the trial. He is liaising with John Byers.

The motions from QLD are to be treated as one motion.

Moved	Liz Fleming		
Seconded	Jacky McDonald		
		<b>Defeated</b>	

Voting

Carried unanimously	<b>No</b>		
Queensland	No	Western Australia	No
New South Wales	No	President	No
Victoria	No	S/Vice President	No
Tasmania	No	Treasurer	No
South Australia	Yes (to parts 1 & 2)	Vice President	No

**Action:**

ACA to write a formal letter to CAQ thanking them for conducting the trial and for their co-operation with regard to the AHS.

**Agenda Item 14**

**Finances**

A. Receipt of Financial Accounts for 2008

**Motion:**

That the Financial Accounts for 2008 be accepted

Moved	Tony Hall		
Seconded	Rob McAdam		
	<b>Carried</b>		

Voting

Carried unanimously	<b>Yes</b>		
Queensland		Western Australia	
New South Wales		President	
Victoria		S/Vice President	
Tasmania		Treasurer	
South Australia		Vice President	

B. Receipt of the Schedule of entry Fees and Prizes for ACA Events 2009

C. Receipt of the Treasurer's Report

D. Approval of the 2009 Budget and the Schedule of Fees, Payments and Honoraria 2009.

**Discussion:**

The Treasurer amended the Schedule of Fees, Payments and Honoraria (remove references to draft) to accord with the Motion regarding the Hosting Events Levy and the agreement to increase the Affiliation Fee for 2009. The amended rates per affiliated player are:

Affiliation Fee for 2009	\$7.40
Affiliation Fee for 2010	\$8.50
International Fund Levy for 2009 (approved last year)	\$4.35
Hosting Events Fund Levy for 2009	\$3.00
International Fund Levy for 2010	\$4.50
Hosting Events Fund Levy for 2010	\$3.00

Tax Invoices will be required for payment of the Accommodation for the Council Meeting (Reimbursement will be made by EFT if bank details are supplied).

**Budget:**

The Treasurer summarised Budget Draft 1 – this is the original Budget without the proposed increases in fees and the Events Hosting Levy.

Draft 2 is the Budget for 2009 based on agreement reached by Council. Even with the increases there will be a budgeted deficit of \$26,000 in general funds in 2009. The NDR will not be running the proposed seminar therefore the deficit will reflect the non-expenditure (\$5,000 expected expenditure now). Expected deficit approximately \$20,000.

There was further discussion regarding bids and estimates in relation to the Budget.

**Motion:**

That the Draft 2009 Budget (draft 2) and the amended Schedule of Fees, Payments and Honoraria 2009 -be approved.

Moved	Tony Hall		
Seconded	Rob McAdam		
	<b>Carried</b>		

Voting

Carried unanimously	No		
Queensland	Yes	Western Australia	Yes
New South Wales	No	President	Yes
Victoria	Yes	S/Vice President	Yes
Tasmania	Yes	Treasurer	Yes
South Australia	Yes	Vice President	Yes

**Agenda Item 15**

**Players Meeting Recommendations**

Players recommendations from 2008 for discussion:

**Discussion:**

Plate Final – Players have requested that 2 people from each block go into the finals of the plate (quarter finals). As per the recent Men’s and Women’s Singles.

**Agenda Item 16**

**Australian Croquet Championship arrangements for 2009 and 2010**

A Calendar of Events was supplied for discussion. Amend to include the Women’s GC Singles 2009.

Jacky McDonald raised the matter of parity for GC. A paper has been produced to address this issue. Jacky summarised the proposal to equate AC and GC Events. Need to have state preferences for event formats to allow for planning for event hosting.

The Review of Events carried out by the working party chaired by Bruce Fleming (with Jacky McDonald and Shane Davis), will be released to the states for comment after the AGM. ACA will also call for bids for states to host events.

Liz Fleming raised the issue of parity for Gateball. Small number of Gateball players in Australia who are affiliated. Gateball is autonomous - ACA has little input.

*Secretarial Note: the Australian Croquet Association is the peak Gateball body in Australia. Operating under the business name Gateball Australia (formerly Australian Gateball Promotions), the ACA is a member of the World Gateball Union, and is responsible, among other things, for hosting a biennial Australian Gateball Championships and maintaining rules and referees procedures. Most of the activity is conducted by the National Gateball Director - currently Gilon Smith - an ACA appointed position responsible to the ACA. The Gateball National Director conducts most of his duties with a relative level of autonomy, but he does consult regularly with the ACA Ed/Honorary Secretary and the Treasurer. All gateball income and expenses comes through the ACA accounts.*

*Gateball players in Australia are members of their local croquet club. Some club members solely play gateball, but all pay affiliation fees through their club to the ACA through their State Association."*

## **Agenda Item 17**

### **ACA Appointments**

No appointments are required to be made by Council.

<b>Events Manager</b>	See page 3
<b>National Coaching Director</b>	John Riches
<b>National Director of Refereeing</b>	Owen Edwards
<b>National Director Gateball</b>	Gilon Smith
<b>Magazine Editor</b>	Carolyn Ribone
<b>Magazine Subscriptions Manager</b>	Judith Evans
<b>National Director Golf Croquet</b>	Christine Pont
<b>Equipment Officer</b>	Shirley Hallinan
<b>Librarian/Archivist</b>	To be appointed
<b>Insurance Officer</b>	Bruce Fleming
<b>National Handicapper</b>	Stephen Meatheringham
<b>Member Protection Information Officer</b>	Maree Skinner
<b>National Schools Coaching Director</b>	Vacant
<b>Aus Rep on International Laws Com</b>	Max Hooper
<b>Aust Rep WCF GC Rules Com</b>	Tony Hall

## **Agenda Item 18**

### **Elections**

Max Murray thanked Stephen Meatheringham for his significant contribution to the Executive Committee over the past three years.

### **Executive Committee**

The following nominations were received within the requisite constitutional timeframes.

<b>President</b>	Max Murray (NSW), Bruce Mitchell (QLD)
<b>Treasurer</b>	Tony Hall (NSW)
<b>Snr Vice President</b>	Steve Jones (QLD), Bruce Mitchell (QLD)
<b>Vice President</b>	Bruce Fleming (QLD), Anna Miller (VIC)
<b>Honorary Secretary/ Executive Director</b>	Maree Skinner (SA)

**Accordingly the nominated officers for the positions of Treasurer and Honorary Secretary/Executive Director are duly elected.**

**A secret ballot was conducted for the positions where more than one candidate has nominated. Two Lawyers from the MBA acted as scrutineers. The results of the Elections are as follows:**

**Elected**

<b>Name</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Position</b>
<b>Tony Hall</b>	<b>NSW</b>	<b>Treasurer</b>
<b>Maree Skinner</b>	<b>SA</b>	<b>Hon Secretary/Exec Director</b>
<b>Max Murray</b>	<b>NSW</b>	<b>President</b>
<b>Steve Jones</b>	<b>QLD</b>	<b>Snr Vice-President</b>
<b>Anna Miller</b>	<b>VIC</b>	<b>Vice President</b>

**Selection Committee – 3 positions**

**Nominations**

Nominations received within the constitutional timeframe:

Anna Miller (VIC)  
 Trevor Bassett (VIC)  
 The remaining position be nominated from the floor.

Martin Clarke (WA); Harley Watts (SA) and Geof McDonald (NSW) were nominated and seconded.

**Elected**

<b>Name</b>	<b>State</b>
<b>Anna Miller</b>	<b>VIC</b>
<b>Trevor Bassett</b>	<b>VIC</b>
<b>Martin Clarke</b>	<b>WA</b>

**Laws Committee – 3 positions**

Nominations received within the constitutional timeframe:

Nell Hass (QLD)  
 George Karoly (VIC)  
 Ken Hopkins (VIC)

**Elected**

<b>Name</b>	<b>State</b>
<b>Nell Hass</b>	<b>QLD</b>
<b>George Karoly</b>	<b>VIC</b>
<b>Ken Hopkins</b>	<b>VIC</b>

**Other Business**

Geof McDonald enquired as to who assisted the Selectors in the selection of the Under-21 GC nominations to the WCF. Stephen Meatheringham responded that Tony Hall and Kevin Beard had been asked to assist

The ACA or the Chair of the Selection Committee will call for nominations from states for a more permanent arrangement regarding forthcoming Golf Croquet selections to be put in place. The Constitutional Review will take into account the need for GC Selectors.

Discussion took place regarding the Selection Committee.

Jacky McDonald stated that there should be regular council meetings and in her view the AGM is not a Council Meeting. She moved that Council meetings be held. Liz Fleming replied there was no necessity for a motion as the constitution provides for it. Susan Sands suggested that we have a Council meeting to coincide with the GC Championships at the VCA in August/September.

Liz and Jacky requested that a timetable and date be set for a meeting.

Max Murray said the Executive would take the suggestion on board and mentioned the cost considerations and the difficulty in getting people together for extra meetings.

*Secretarial Note: It is the Executive view that the AGM is a Council Meeting and the Constitution states that Council must meet at least once a year. An email has been sent to all State Presidents advising of the additional costs and requesting that they notify the ACA if they wish to have an extra council meeting as suggested.*

Max Murray thanked the Delegates and outgoing executive members for their contribution.

**The meeting was closed at 2.59pm**