

Player's raised the following issues:

(a) **Format**

- we really liked playing in larger blocks, since this enabled playing against a wider range of people rather than just the same small block several times
- it was noted that the GC Men's in August 2013 remained bo3, but Anne Quinn explained that this depended on actual entries
- we discussed the creeping maximum number of games/day – was 6, then 7 and now being asked to play up to 8/day to get through the schedule. No clear outcome - opinion was divided whether we need to play this many/day to “toughen up” or whether it just discouraged entry by older players, and led to poor quality games? There was a push to leave it to the Tournament Committee in light of entries, and then to the TM in terms of what was required to complete the tournament in the actual weather conditions. This could include holding over games that aren't crucial to determining who goes into the knockout.
- We did agree that it would be better to start Plate games earlier (using a Swiss or Egyptian?)

(b) **Cost**

- Jim Clement, as ACA Treasurer, felt that prize money should be revisited, both to reduce entry fees but also to reimburse referees a bit more.
- we noted that food & accommodation far outweighed entry fees re the cost to play in a tournament, and that it was fairer if venues rotated around to avoid the same people having to travel. However this requires States to bid for tournaments, and many were reluctant to do so (hence the ACA Program is seldom finalised more than 12 months ahead while arms are twisted). The Eire Cup & ISS do rotate, and VCC remains the default for the rest. Both the President's Eights use VCC because it is the cheapest venue to minimise travel costs for all participants
- we felt the real problems are lack of entries, and lack of sponsorship/grants. Fixing these would reinforce each other, and provide flexibility re funding extras. Neil White (ACA President) noted the Strategic Plan Working Party (SPWP) was addressing this, and players should take it up with their State reps.

(c) **Referees**

- Jim Clement made reference to the reimbursement paid by Croquet Victoria to referees for VCA events.
- Jim Clement noted that ACA was not in a position to pay referees, other than \$7.00 per day for lunch.
- Tony Hall noted that no-one overseas pays referees either – if we did so, it would have to only be 2 referees/tournament to contain the cost and entry fees would still have to increase
- we felt sympathetic, but that in the end maybe it has to be a case that players play, referees referee, and TMs manage tournaments – each honing their speciality?
- discussion shifted to other ways to look after referees (and other officials). We suggested asking referees what they want – hold a separate referees meeting?
- we noted last year's point that there should be meaningful feedback to each referee after the event as part of “quality control”, This however raised options for feedback from players, not just from the TR eg “referee of the tournament”, or rating the referee for each game on a 1-3 scale? There was concern that this may be too judgemental, and that the best referees are unobtrusive (it's the bad ones you notice, both re their decisions or when they just chat together and don't follow play).

- we felt it was important to acknowledge every referee, since they had made the effort to come to the event. Certificate? Free entry to an event?

(d) Certificates

- most players don't like the prize certificates. Brian Reither hates them because they are hard to produce in a hurry.

(e) Event Organisation

- there was a call for training people on how to run an ACA Event, and then help re running each event. The goal would be to avoid "re-inventing the wheel", and demystifying ACA and its events. This could also help reduce what is often too much gap between ACA/TM and the necessary people required on the ground to run a successful event.
- there doesn't seem to be any evaluation after the event, to learn from what worked and what didn't, and so improve future events. This should include 360° feedback (ie both back to ACA and its Committees re their support for the event, and back to the organising team for that event).
- it was also noted that there had been no publicity re this event, which feeds into lack of grants/sponsorship
- Neil White undertook to discuss the above at ACA Executive.