

Minutes of Players Meeting held on Friday 28/11/08
Australian Open Championships – Nov 2008 – VCC Melbourne

Chairperson – Kevin Beard

Minute Taker – Trevor Bassett

Attendees – There were around 20 people present (sorry names were not taken).

Agenda Items and Recommendations:

1. BPR – The players are not happy with the new BPR method used to determine finishing places within a block or to determine which players will progress to the final stages of a given event because it has nothing to do with the actual tournament being played but rather past performances. The motion put forward was – we would like ACA to abandon the BRP method and to explore other options, eg. play off (time permitting), net points, who beat who (to determine block splits), etc. This motion was carried.
2. Seeding Rights – As discussed at last year's players meeting, it is believed that players should enter the final 32 draw based on where you finish within your block as opposed to where you were ranked going into the event. Last year it was suggested that players that finished within the top 2 places should become the top 16 players based on rankings.
The first motion put was – we like the principle that you go into the 32 draw based on block results. This motion was carried.
The second motion was – the block winners will become the top 8 seeds, the runner-ups become the next 8 seeds, etc (as opposed to last year where we suggested top 2 in block become top 16 seeds). This motion was carried.
3. Places 1-32 – This year people were exiting the event from as early as Thursday evening. To avoid this happening in the future, a motion was put that – there be some formal event that would allow all players to continue playing until at least Sat evening. This motion was carried.
A motion was then moved that - this formal process be block play for those that get knocked out in the same round, ie. first round Y losers go into a block of 8, second round Y losers and first round Z losers go into blocks of 4. This should ensure that all still have games until Sat evening. This motion was carried.
4. Hoop setting – A lengthy discussion was again had about hoop setting. In the end no formal motion was moved but it was made clear that although there is a tolerance of $\pm 1/32^{\text{nd}}$ everyone should be targeting a hoop width of $3 \frac{11}{16}^{\text{th}}$ with as little tolerance from this as physical possible. Given this, there should also be no issue with resetting hoops during games, ie. when another game is just starting.
5. Player responsibility – To assist the few that continually do the majority of the work around the venue, a motion was put that – the tournament manager should explain to all players what is expected of them and when at the very start of the tournament, eg. players are required to dress courts in the morning, remove hoops, pipes, etc, at the conclusion of play each day (or each second day for lawn mowing), leave room neat and tidy with all chairs back in their places, etc. This motion was carried.

6. Block sizes – A motion was put that the tournament committee ensure that block sizes fit evenly into the final stages to avoid taking the best 2nd or 6th place getters, ie. 4 blocks for doubles and 8 blocks for singles, almost regardless of the total entry figures. The vote on this motion was split and therefore the motion was not carried.
7. Order of play in blocks – A motion was put to change the current order of play within the block rounds so that the lower ranked players were not playing all of the top ranked players on the first day. The vote was again split and therefore this motion was not carried.
8. Plate blocks – It was noted that 3 people from the one original block ended up in the same plate block which is not desirable. Although no formal motion was put forward, it was noted that the management need to take more care when doing the plate draw. It was also noted that players need to be more patient so as not to rush the management and that players need to take more responsibility for themselves and actually bring these issues to managements attention as soon as possible so that a resolution can hopefully be made.
9. Lawn speed – It was noted that the lawn speed was much slower than desired and often quite variable. A motion was put that – ACA request the home state to keep lawns consistent and preferably quicker, ie. to the maximum speed consistent with the long term survival of the grass. This motion was carried.
10. Dinner – The players were extremely disappointed with the quality of the dinner particularly for the price. It was discussed that the dinner had more like a BBQ feel with players still in their whites, at the same venue, in an informal setting, which is fine except the price was more appropriate for a meal at a nice venue that everyone gets dressed up for. One suggestion was to book a table at the Italian Club down the road and let everyone order and pay for their own meals. A motion was put that – the dinner needs to be better value for money, ie. either less formal (like this was) but with a lower price tag or more formal with a similar price tag to this year. This motion was carried.
11. Formal ACA response – Although some of the suggestions/recommendations put forward at past players meeting have been put in place, it was noted that there is a severe lack of communication between ACA and the players with regards to which suggestions/recommendations are being considered and/or accepted or declined. A motion was put forward that – ACA email all players that participated in the event with detail about whether they have accepted or declined the various recommendations with reasons why they were declined if applicable, this response should also be posted on the ACA website for all non-participants to see. This motion was carried.