

EGM meeting 22nd August 2023

Proposals voted on

1) Proposals for South Alicante **Summer** League - Appendix D (3) be amended to:

(a) That the SIDE consist of 5 teams of 3 players each playing with 2 bowls and be for the 2024 season as a trial.

Reasoning:

Summer leagues usually start mid end of March and depending on entries can finish end of June beginning of July. Players can be put off playing in the summer due to the heat. If the format was to be reduced to 2 wood triples the game would (a) only take approx 2 hours (b) would encourage/develop playing with 2 bowls.

Hopefully being a trial for one season it will be accepted and who knows might be preferred and proposed and accepted for the future.

Proposed San Luis Bowls Club Seconded San Miguel Bowls Club

Votes in Favour **5**

Votes against **5**

Bob Donnelly casting vote Against the proposal (**Bobs rational is if the members cannot vote in favour in his mind the item should remain unchanged**)

Motion Denied

A discussion was held in relation to the motion around the Result sheet and the expected timings of the reporting. It was explained that penalties for late reporting would be removed as part of this motion being passed. But the hope was that results would be sent in from the greens immediately after the game had been completed. Concerns were raised ref errors in the document, however this in theory could happen now in the old E-mail system. But the expectation is that both Captains check the result sheet to ensure it is correct before they sign it and therefore it is agreed before it is photographed and sent to the relevant co-ordinator.

2) 6.1 Result Sheet: system used worldwide in bowls to complete 1 Result sheet at the venue, agreed and signed by both captains. Then simply take a photo and send to the coordinator. We understand the coordinator still needs to check but results should be easier to send and tables should arrive quicker. 3 of the 4 NEW coordinators have used this system previously.

Votes in favour **14**

Votes against **nil**

Motion Carried.

Further items to be discussed ahead of Voting at EGM on 10th October

The following item is the one eluded to in the apology from Kevin in the Secretaries report section. As this is a proposal for a new competition there is no 6month block on having a vote and the vote will take place on 10th October at the EGM

Further proposal to introduce a Friday Summer league consisting of 5 teams of 3 players each playing 2 bowls. Match Committee to include new appendix “F” to outline the C.O.P. prior to entries being accepted. This to be a trial for 2023 / 2024 if successful this league format could become an annual event

Proposed P Bonsor
Seconded D Morrison

An explanation of the work carried out by the match committee was given at this point by Peter Bonsor who explained how the committee decided upon the changes they had proposed. Alan Campbell from SAN Miguel noted that there were 45 separate issues he had with the work carried out so far. there followed a debate within the room on each of the following items. The delegates can now return to their clubs to debate the issues before the vote in October. Counter proposals will be welcomed before 14th September to allow them to be circulated before the next meeting in accordance with the LLB constitution. Alan asked for more time to share his members views with members from other clubs. Kevin did not feel this was appropriate and the timings listed above will stand.

In regards to item 4.1 the argument for the change is that the system is widely used in other countries and it is accepted that playing for an overall shots win is the way to go and will ensure bowlers remain interested until the last rink is finished as they will be monitoring the overall aggregate score. Members of the Match Committee talked about their experiences using such systems in the UK and how they felt it would increase the engagement and excitement through until the final bowl is delivered. Rink points are still important and the 2 points gained rewards the individual rink performance. The overall shots win will greatly reward the team overall.

The counter argument is that it overly rewards the shots aggregate win and the reward for the shots victory is too great. People who are part of a team that win four rinks but lose on shots because one rink has carried the aggregate for the other team will be dis incentivised. Another view was that teams could make one (super rink) in an attempt to win the aggregate. The benefits or pitfalls of rotational selection was also touched upon in relation to this topic (if your in you win causes issues when coming to the end of games). The current system is not broke so why fix it the system has served us well from the start of the league and is allowed by the rules of the game. A compromise of awarding 4 points for the shots win was also floated. When canvassed on this change the Quesada membership were unanimous to a man in voting against the proposal.

4.1 Points for the overall shots: Currently the side that scores the most shots is awarded 2 Points (But does not win?). Check the scenario below.

Side A Wins on 4 Rinks +15
Side B Wins on 1 Rink +16

Current Match result **Side A 8 Points** Side B 4 Points LOSING even though they WON!! This format of scoring can ultimately result in a side winning more games than any other side but not Winning the league!!

Clearly unfair and contrary to Law 27.1

(Law 27.5 does cover our current structure but is rarely used in leagues, it is more suited to Tournaments and Galas)

There was a discussion regarding the rule book over this point.

Gail read out Law 27.1 and 27.5. The Law states:

27.1 In tournament games or games in a series, victory will be awarded to the player, team or side that, when the tournament or series of games finishes and in line with the Conditions of Play, has:

27.1.1 the highest number of games won; or

27.1.2 the highest net total of shots.

27.5 The Controlling Body has the power to include in its Conditions of Play regulations for deciding the winners of tournament games and games in a series which are different from those mentioned in laws 27.1, 27.2, 27.3 and 27.4

It was agreed that our leagues are games in a series and Gail therefore explained that the current scoring system does not contravene any laws.

The Match committee agreed that the system did not contravene the laws of the game but feel as the total shots system is used in Countries such as Australia and the UK we should look to implement this in Spain.

It is the Match committees opinion that a fairer result would be if the overall shots are worth enough to win. So, 8 points as suggested (in the 5 rink competitions), now the result would be

Side A 8 Points **Side B 10 Points** side A deserved a good 8 points but Side B WON!!

This style of play promotes ALL players to encourage each other, can provide a more tactical game and builds "Team Spirit" While rewarding the team that wins the most games "surely that's what it should be"

In regard to item 7.6 player shortages the Match committee is trying to remove the punitive penalties from the rules of the game in Spain. One area where this is an issue is in relation to teams playing short. It was acknowledged that the system could be abused but all of the match co-ordinators would be scrutinising the instances when the moving of players from one squad to another took place and abuse would be clamped down on. Further controls can be introduced such as only allowing players to sub for a higher team rather than a lower team amongst others. It is suggested that up to three players from one team can help another team within the club should they be struggling to field a team. A massive benefit from this proposal is that three players from the opposition team do not miss out on a game of bowls. To Counter the you can only substitute up argument Ray Robson from Country bowls stated that we are never sure which squad will be hit by shortages. People can become ill suffer bereavements and need to go back to UK etc with little or no notice so any team within any club could benefit from using a sub at any given time, rather than having to play a game short.

Steve Hindle from Monte Mar is concerned this will favour bigger teams with more members to choose from he feels as Monte Mar is a small club and they only enter one team per league there is no benefit to them from this change issue for smaller clubs when events come upon them and they lose multiple players to the event (Monte Mar example Birthday Party) no cover elsewhere to draw from. (A further change in the COP is to allow teams to contact opponents and by mutual agreement move fixtures forward which would eradicate the party issue this will be voted on at future meetings)

7.6 Player Shortages (THE BIG ONE) Most clubs have in the past been unable to field a full side resulting in penalty points. The penalties are a part of the problem but more importantly is the fact that the non-defaulting team also has 3 players who "Miss out on a game." In our current climate we think our COP's should allow maximum participation not impose restrictions. Whilst we fully understand this COP could be "Abused" we intend to keep a close eye on its usage and alert clubs of any concerns. In our experience it is usually the lower ranked teams that have ample "spares" and therefore we foresee that mostly it will be these players who will benefit by filling gaps in the higher divisions, not the other way round, whereby top ranked players are consistently playing in the lower divisions.

Item 7.7 is linked to 7.6. The match committee feel that a successful implementation of 7.6 will have the potential to stop 7.7 from happening because clubs can move spare players from one squad to another to eradicate temporary shortages. And therefore, any team that still ends up laying short ie defaults should not be in a position where they can still win the game

Again the counter argument is that the players from the defaulting team will be disincentivised and could say "what is the point in playing we cannot win overall" An example is a team defaults but wins all rinks played will get 8 points. If item 4.1 is introduced the non defaulting team would get 10 points without winning a game and therefore secure overall victory. There was also a discussion around the wording regarding the paying of rink fees for a defaulting rink. Depending on the owners involved some teams would charge for the defaulting rink others would not.

7.7 Playing a team short, whilst we hope with the inclusion of **7.6** this should become a rarity, but if it does occur then the defaulting team "by definition" CANNOT WIN (They defaulted). They can however attempt to gain as many rink points as possible. The defaulting team will not be further penalised.

Discussions took place regarding transfer sheets and the use of them as covered in **2.4** It was raised by Gail that the LLB could not dictate to clubs who they were going to accept. This could happen if the club the player is leaving refuses to issue a clearance form upon their departure and the LLB then refused to sanction them joining a new club until the form is received. This could result in players not being able to join other clubs therefore reducing the number of players in the league.

Pete Bonsor accepted that perhaps this section of the document needed re-wording. Clubs are able to block a move for any reason including petty squabbles. Clubs should be able to do their own due diligence and if after asking for a transfer form to be issued and it is not forthcoming, make up their own mind re the incoming person.