

Tournament Review 2024

Submissions:

Plimmerton

Interclub from Ian Hartley

I believe this is the best "Bowls Competition" that we have. The different grades mean that teams are generally playing in an even competition.

This season the centre had some grades split into 2 divisions, with playoffs for winners and promotion in the same tournament with different rules for each outcome. A complete shamble.

WE had 42 teams in the 7's grades and Div.4. was split into 2 divisions with only 9 rounds. this meant that everybody did not play each team twice.

This could have been avoided with 5 divisions, Div.1. with 10 teams and Div's 2 to 5 with 8 teams.

Automatic promotion with 2 up and 2 down.

Playoffs would not be required except for Div.1. winners.

20 clubs played in the 7's grades and only 1 club did not have an interclub team this season.

Every club should have the opportunity to have 2 teams in the 7's grades if viable.

There should not be more than 10 teams in each grade unless the season is extended.

Clubs with less than 3 teams should not be relegated out of the lowest 7's grade unless not viable.

Clubs should not have more than 1 team in each grade except the lowest grade where numbers require more teams.

From Committee

1. Open Gender tournaments

Plimmerton Bowling Club would like to make a submission regarding the recent introduction of **Open Gender tournaments. We realise this was voted on at the last review however we feel there have been some unforeseen consequences which necessitate looking at this issue again.**

We understand the desire of Bowls Wellington to be inclusive, but we feel the introduction of Open Gender tournaments will lead to a decline in the number of women entering these tournaments with a subsequent decline in the financial ability for Bowls Wellington to provide for all its bowlers. We therefore ask for this Open Gender decision to be re-examined for the following reasons -

- **Development 2-4-2/pairs Open Gender-** there was 1 mixed team in the ¼ finals, **no all-women teams** progressed beyond the round of 16.

- **Easter Open Gender pairs** there were **only all-men teams** from the ¼ finals on. **No all-women teams** progressed beyond the round of 16.

RESULT - No all-women teams have progressed to the semifinals in either Open Gender tournaments.

We are sure that Bowls Wellington does not want to leave us with the perception that it is acceptable for Open Gender trophies to be awarded to men-only teams. A Centre Title is hard fought for and hard won and this will limit the opportunities for women to gain them.

Anecdotally a large number of women have already decided to vote with their feet and not enter tournaments which are Open Gender as they feel they are at a great disadvantage and the results of these 2 tournaments prove they are correct.

Submission - We submit that the Development 2-4-2/pairs and the Easter Pairs revert to being individually either Men or Women tournaments due to the unfair consequences on women.

If Open Gender tournaments are still to be offered, there should be the additional option of Women's / Men's / Mixed tournaments being reintroduced as in previous years to at least give all players a choice.

2. Qualifying standards - needing to win outright.

We also have concerns around the conditions in some tournaments for **only section winners** to qualify post-section. In most tournaments winning 2 games out of 3 enables teams to qualify.

For example - one team entered the Over60's Pairs tournament and after paying \$25 each played only one game in their section in which one team had withdrawn. They lost that game. The winner of the first game then beat another team who decided there was no point in playing their second game so they too only played one game. This was possibly an unintended consequence of a team withdrawing but nevertheless it set a bad precedent and has meant those players choosing not to enter a tournament with such a format again. (The game was at Silverstream)

It seems a brutal way to treat players and I'm sure Bowls Wellington wouldn't want to suggest that the tournament is more of a money-making venture than giving players a good experience.

Submission - We submit that the system for only section winners to qualify post-section be abandoned in favour of teams winning at least 2 out of 3 games being able to qualify. This makes it fairer on all participants in each division.

With thanks,

Phillipa Christie - President, Plimmerton Bowling Club

Interclub from Rohan Cuff

Con forwarded me your thoughts and feedback and asked me to include my response from a Selector / Players viewpoint. Please find below a few thoughts / comments for consideration:

- Div 4 – Not a fan of 2 sections as difficult to ensure sections are even. Also felt Plimmerton ended up with tough end of stick as their 2nd round excluded game was against one of the weakest teams, whom we had beaten 23-0 in the first round (This impacted our total points). Then in the playoff, I didn't believe it was fair that the 2nd qualifier was selected by points scored in section play. Plimmerton and Khandallah should have played off for that spot, given Johnsonville couldn't be promoted.
- Div 4 – I appreciate the difficulty with changes each year to the number of teams entered. I don't believe any club should be able to have 2 or more teams in the same division, even if it is the last (Didn't happen this year but Wainui had 2 teams in Div 4 last year). I think you would be better to have all of Div 4 in one section and potentially not play everyone. Then to ensure fairness, in the playoff weekend, the top 4 teams playoff for winner with 1 playing 4 and 2 playing 3. If one or more of the winner of this first round can't be promoted, then the losers from the first round play-off for promotion. If 3 or more of the teams in the playoff have teams in Div 3 then 1 or no teams will be promoted, i.e. you have to finish in Top 4 to be considered for promotion.
- 2 Up – 2 Down Promotion Relegation. I am a fan of automatic promotion relegation but believe it should only be one team that goes up / down in each division to maintain strength of each division. I don't believe it serves any purpose with teams being promoted, only to get thumped and then relegated the following season. To this end, I also believe Teams need to finish top 4 as a minimum for promotion, and if their are not 10 teams within their section, they need to finish in top 40%.
- New Divisional Concept – I appreciate that Bowls Wn is trying to provide greater opportunities for clubs to be promoted and potentially play first division. Consideration should be given to creating 2 streams of Divisions, i.e. One stream for clubs Top Teams and the 2nd Stream for Clubs 2nd and subsequent Teams. I would change the Divisions to eight in each Division and you would probably only need a max of 3 Divisions in each Section. In the 2nd stream section Divisions, I would then allow a club to have multiple teams in each Division, so the stronger clubs don't just clean up each division due to the strength of their players and they also get to play tougher competition week on week. Promotion / Relegation for each Section / Division could still work on automatic one up and one down. This then removes the need for playoffs to work out promotion / Relegation.
- Mens Eights & Quad Combo – I wouldn't be too precious as to number of Teams or breaking up into sections. I would do the same as I suggested for Div4 if more than 10 team entries. Play a round robin where you play 9 of the teams in the section. Then at the end of section play, top 4 play off to find a winner of the Grade / Division.
- I favoured more single headers, especially at the start of the season, as this gave selectors a better opportunity to try different players and combinations without having to commit for 2 games. Typically for double headers you leave the team the same as they normally have to travel for at least one of their games. Single headers, especially at start of season when weather is more unsettled, means any cancellation only requires make-up of one round. It also gives you the ability to change a later single header round into a double header to make up for cancellation. I have mixed feelings re clubs making local call on cancellation / postponement as makes communication challenging and difficult to co-ordinate but understand that weather may be different club by club and some games can still be progressed.

Im sure others will have different feedback but welcomed the opportunity for comment.

I have also heard that the Centre is considering Interclub being a similar format to Australia where the team consists of 3 teams of Fours. I appreciate that this may need to be done Nationally to maintain the pathway for National Interclub Champs, however I believe this would

be a good positive move and assist more players being given the opportunity to compete at higher interclub levels. It would certainly test the depth of clubs but think its easier at times to create fours than find singles or pairs players for each of the divisional teams. It would also mean you don't have to arrange Markers, which appears to have been a challenge for some clubs throughout the season and sometime results in Markers that aren't really suitable to the task.

Happy to provide further feedback or comment if you require further detail as to any of these comments.

Thanks for all your help this season and we appreciate all the work you do to support the game.

Johnsonville

Interclub Grant Wakefield

Grant would like to think a review of the Interclub set up might look at changing some of the 7's to, perhaps, eights? I think he sees this happening with the Men's 2nd, 3rd, and 4th divisions.

- Players prefer to play not mark.
- The 'oldies' don't like volunteering to come out in all sorts of weather.
- as a result the Selectors and Managers have great difficulty in chasing and getting markers.

To address this:-

- Do away with the singles in the divisions below Div 1.
- Introduce a second Pairs combination to Div 2,3 and 4 meaning more bowls for more players.

Johnsonville Committee

Easter 2-4-2 back to four days play

This was submitted by a member and endorsed by the JBC Executive.

I too would like to make a submission on the conditions of play for Easter 2/4/2 Tournament.

After approaching Sue Way at Easter Tournament, she advised that first I must go to club and if the club agree then to forward to Bowls Wellington.

My submission is that the Centre look at returning to the old format of 4 out of 6 over 2 days of qualifying.

When people enter the Easter tournament they enter to play bowls over the Easter break, they have a choice of going away for Easter, stay at home and play no bowls or stay at home and play bowls. Current format means that after 1 game you could be in post section. The old format of 4 out of 6 meant that going into day 2 with only one win you still had a chance to qualify. With 2 wins you still have to get another 2 and this also makes it more challenging. It also meant that you got at least two days of bowls. Those that qualified continued and played day 3 and 4.

Having surveyed quite a few players I could not find one that disagreed to this format.

My submission is that the Easter 2/4/2 return to 2 days of qualifying 4 out of 6.

C of C finals weekend.

This was submitted by two of our members and is endorsed by the JBC Executive

Finals weekend

It sounds ideal but in reality, I don't think it really works as there is little benefit to the growth of the game or to players.

Several reasons for this.

If you can't play for this one weekend, then if your club does permit you to play in the club championships, and you win you can't play in any champion of champion event and miss out on the chance to win potentially 5 Wellington events and 5 NZ titles. As a club member there isn't much point in joining a club and playing for a season if for some reason for that one weekend you can't play. The finals weekend is so late in the season as well, when most greens are closed so no chance for good preparation beforehand.

Interclub

I propose that consideration is given to altering interclub so that the format is the same as those in the NZ finals. That would mean singles 21 shots, Pairs 18 ends and Fours 15 ends.

To me it just makes sense to play this competition in the same format as the finals series.

I also propose that we revert back to the split round robin format for the finals. This system was used successfully for many years and only changed a couple of years ago due to inclement weather.

Interclub finals day should be about finding the best club on the day to represent Wellington at the NZ Finals and I believe a playoff amongst the top 4 clubs is the fairest way of achieving this.

Phil Todd

Johnsonville Bowling Club

Lyall Bay

Junior Singles

Thanks for your letter of March 13, inviting comments from Clubs for the Tournament Review Committee.

The Lyall Bay Club wants to request that, in future years, the Junior Singles Champion of Champions event be NOT played on the same days as the Champion of Champions Finals. With the increasingly high calibre of Junior Bowlers, there is a likelihood of a clash of events with Junior Bowlers being involved in other CoC finals. This is undesirable.

Victoria

Pennants Rhys Barlow

1. As the Convenor for midweek pennants for the mens team at Victoria BC, could I say on a positive note that spreading the pennants season into the new year to enable players to keep playing Wednesday bowls in the better weather in Feb and March should be continued.

2. The encouragement and support given to new bowlers to enter Centre events is to be applauded. Well done to the management for this initiative.

Rhys Barlow
VBC

Interclub and Traditional Tournaments Lou Newman

TOURNAMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE

SUBMISSIONS FROM L NEWMAN ON BEHALF OF VICTORIA BC

1 Interclub finals day should revert to a scattered draw.

Because its fairer

Players prefer it

It keeps players and supporters at the host club. To support that club and the team.

Currently half the people leave after game 1

Creates a better atmosphere

2 Traditional centre tournaments should not be open gender. Have new tournaments for open gender if there is a demand for them.

No women reached the quarters of the Easter pairs.

3 All centre tournaments should be played on natural greens unless exceptional circumstances dictate otherwise.

Hutt

1: Number of wins needed to qualify for post section when play is disrupted by weather

Background: When the Centre Open Fours were played this season rain caused some greens to close but not all those being used. The number of wins needed to qualify was reduced to one at some venues but not all. This included one venue where the weather had not interrupted play. Many players then felt that the conditions had become unfair as some teams needed two wins and some needed only one.

Bowls Wellington Conditions of Play: We are aware that conditions number 8 and 16 state that the Tournament Manager has the right to make amendments to the programme.

Justification for our Recommendation: Any perception that conditions of play become unfair to some teams and not others is potentially damaging to our sport. Being seen as unfair can cause players to give up bowls, to discontinue playing in centre events or to cause discord

between officials and players and between players themselves. Our Club wishes such possibilities to be strenuously avoided by being fair to all and being seen to be fair to all.

Recommendation: The Hutt Bowling Club recommends that the conditions of play for Centre events be changed slightly so that if three rounds cannot be completed at some venues due to adverse weather and the number of wins needed to qualify has to be reduced, the number should be reduced for all teams at all venues.

2: Recompense for clubs hosting Centre events

Background: When players enter centre events they pay an entry fee. This money goes to Bowls Wellington and some goes as prizes. Clubs do not receive anything but do incur costs for preparing greens, electricity etc. Clubs also have to provide volunteers for various tasks needed to run the tournament.

Justification: It is a commonly held opinion that clubs will make some money out of these events by opening their bar, selling lunches and raffle tickets. However, this is often not the case. Fewer people stay drinking in the bar after games finish because of the risks of drink driving. Particularly when it is a women's tournament very little money is taken over the bar. Often clubs do not sell lunches now because they cannot get volunteers to do the work required.

Recommendation: The Hutt Bowling Club recommends that a small proportion of the entry fees paid by players and the funds coming from sponsors is given to clubs to assist them with the costs they incur on behalf of the Centre when hosting a Centre event.

Desmond Darby

Re: Clubs hosting Bowls Wellington and Bowls NZ events

Clubs presently provide:

- Greens – mown, rolled, chalked, and score-boards
- Entry of Team, Green, and Rink specifications on scorecards
- Markers for Singles
- Car-parking, varying from ample to none
- Tea/coffee

Clubs sometimes, but not always, provide:

- A host to welcome players, providing H&S advice, and introducing the Umpire(s)
- Info to Umpire(s) about where Club measuring equipment is kept (most Umpires now provide all their own measuring equipment at their own expense)
- Recorders to report results to tournament HQ
- Lunches for purchase

Clubs rarely provide:

- A Member readily placed (on the green) to ensure compliance with BW rules re smoking/alcohol – this absence makes meaningless the recent BW statement on the Club's responsibility for this, leaving the Umpire as the only person other players can and do appeal to, and who has to deal with almost invariable ensuing unpleasantness
- An all-day supervisor, to assist the Umpire with weather-stoppage decisions

Clubs never provide:

- Umpiring, which the Umpires Association doesn't always achieve across all venues, despite offering training for new Umpires

Changes sought

- 1) That, in choosing venues for events, BW (resp Bowls NZ) give preference to Clubs that:
 - a) provide good greens
 - b) provide a Host to welcome Teams and introduce the Umpire(s)
 - c) provide an all-day supervisor who is able to
 - i) be on hand (on the green) to ensure compliance with smoking/alcohol
 - ii) assist the Umpire with weather-stoppage decisions
 - d) have 1 or 2 umpiring Members willing to serve at their own and nearby Clubs.
- 2) That in return for the foregoing services and an incentive to offer them, recognising also the costs of maintaining car parking and complimentary tea/coffee for players, Clubs receive financial compensation from BW (resp Bowls NZ) at some agreed level.
- 3) That, to fund the compensation to the 50% of Clubs that host events, BW increase the levy on all Clubs and/or the tournament entry fee. This would eliminate the subsidy that members of Clubs not hosting events receive from costs carried by Clubs that do host events.

Yours sincerely

Desmond Darby (Naenae BC 2015/16 - 2017/18; Hutt BC (2018/19 - present)

Umpire Badge #4834

15 April 2024

Miramar

1. Open Gender competitions.

The concept was new but disappointing the ladies did not feature in the post section process. The men play a more aggressive game and in conversation some men do not like playing the ladies and the ladies seemed intimidated by the thought of playing the men.

The trophies presented have been donated to Bowls Wellington since the beginning of time for specific competitions so if these Open Gender competitions are to continue then new trophies should be presented. History is a major area of our game and must be retained. Often grandchildren come to a club and ask to see the trophy their grandad won.

2. Over 60's new events were good with a greater variety, but trophies need to match these competitions.
3. Promoting the game and competition and interest in bowls in a community allocation of events could be spread over a weekend (especially Saturday) to both Hutt Valley, Wellington, Porirua so that Clubs can encourage their communities to come and

observe the game and met members of the club and have a better understanding of bowls. The concept of white and the senior citizens is still seen by the community as who the bowls are played for.

4. Any Regional or National finals to have an umpire appointed to the game/s. The pathway is an important event for clubs. A date and time set, venue named and umpire to officiate appointed. Once date set it cannot be changed or diverted unless to an appropriate venue due to weather.
5. Twilight Bowls3Five – consider retaining and promoting the 1-5 Year section as this season most 1- 5 Year teams played as individuals or as a team in the Open Grade. teams. A Junior would gain more information Clubs could use more players in a non-threatening event and provide a manager to guide inexperienced players in a friendly, fun event.

Miramar Bowling Club Execuitve

Massey Ave

Paul Freeman

Green Superintendent

Massey Ave Bowling Club

1. **Season Scheduling.**

All Wellington Bowls event dates to be advised early to clubs.

This will enable clubs to confirm green availability and to include dates in their club hand books.

2. **Remuneration for Green Use**

Wellington Bowls to provide some remuneration to clubs who provide greens for centre events.

With the escalating costs of maintaining greens, it is now time that there is a remuneration to clubs for hosting Wellington Bowls events.

Jenny Kempthorne

Match Convenor

Massey Avenue Bowling Club

Green Allocations:

Green Allocations to be advised (as in previous years) no later than the end of July. This allows Clubs the ability to complete their programme for the season and in time to get their Club books printed before the Season begins.

Club Remuneration:

A nominal amount to Clubs hosting Bowls Wellington Events for Green preparation, (maybe add up to \$5.00 to entries for green fees) and for kitchen costs. (Tea Coffee & Sugar)

Anne Robinson

Interclub

The Interclub format was changed this year to predominantly only one game a day. However, there were a couple of exceptions where two games were played.

I would far prefer it, if the previous format of 2 games a day is brought back next year. But that the venue is the same for both games, as it is for the Women's Pennants.

I understand that this change was made for a few reasons;

- to cater for older bowlers who thought two games a day was a bit much for them
- to cater to small clubs who were missing out on bar takings on Saturdays
- to allow smaller clubs to run championship games on Saturday afternoons

From my perspective, as a member of Naenae Bowling Club's Match Committee, it gave our club considerably less time to run our championship games. When only one interclub game was played, it meant that we could only hold one round of championship play, as play could not start until at least 1pm. Whereas, when we had an entire day, three rounds could be played. As a result, we had many juggling issues and changes to our program scheduling this year and two events have had to be cancelled.

I think it is hugely unfair to promote two teams that finished 4th and 5th in the Women's 2nd division to the 1st division.

What incentive is there for the first three place getters? They are being penalised due to the fact that their clubs already have teams in the division.

Teams that have been beaten by the three top teams leap frog them into Div 1!

Should the first division not consist of the best bowlers in the Centre.

I believe it is very unfair and just plain wrong!

In addition, Naenae bowling members lost a number of playing days from their calendar due to either Bowls Wellington or Bowls NZ taking over our facilities.

Examples:

- Kittyhawk Under 21 Singles 20-22 January 2024
- Trans-Tasman series 2-4 February 2024
- Masters Representative 4-5 March 2024
- National Intercentre Champs 14-17 March 2024
- National Bowls 3Five Champs 3-5 May 2024
- Bowls Wellington CoC Finals 11-12 May 2024

Open Gender Events

There have been a number of Open gender Centre events held this year.

I know that I am not alone in not liking this format. I think these events are unfair and disadvantage women bowlers. I am primarily meaning pairs like the Development 2-4-2 and the Easter 2-4-2. But I see that over 60 singles is also an Open gender event. To that end, I did not enter the Easter Pairs and or the >60 singles.

What is the rationale for this change? What is it that you are hoping to achieve? Is it more money for the coffers perhaps? (I doubt you have doubled the number of prizes in each event.)

I think if you analyse the results for the 2-4-2 events, you will see that no women made it past the quarter finals. We are yet to see what will transpire in the >60 singles.

Brady Amer

Interclub Playoff

Kia Ora, this submission is in regard to our current top 4 playoff day in Division 1. Up until a few years ago it was a scattered draw. A decision was made a couple years ago to change to a semi final and final format due to the weather on the day. This then just ended up being the change.

I feel the Semi Final and Final format is not the right way of doing things. It gives the home team little to no advantage due to the nature of a 1 game knockout. We all have bad and good games. Generally the scattered draw favours the better teams as it gives them more time to get back to their expected form. The shorter formats generally suit the weaker teams as anyone can have one of those games that far exceeds their expected play. We are all capable of playing all the shots, especially at the Division 1 level. However we all have games where we don't miss and are in the zone.

Although I'd be in favour of a move back to the scattered draw I'd like to put forward another format which is similar to the Aussie Bowls Premier League.

Proposal would be the following:

Round 1 is 2 games

1st vs 2nd winner gets bye to the final and the loser plays winner of 3rd vs 4th.

Round 2 1 game

Semi Final- 3rd vs 4th winner vs loser of 1st vs 2nd

Round 3 1 game

Final

This format gives teams who finished 1st or 2nd in the round robin 2 chances. The team the wins the round robin not only gets home advantage but also two chances. 2nd also gets two chances. It rewards 1st and 2nd for their efforts in the round robin.

It also rewards teams in 3rd and 4th as if one were to make the final they would be on the green all day. It just takes one of these two teams to get hot to really mix it up with the top 2 seeds.

This is another format that I feel brings a fresh new take to the best interclub in New Zealand. The scattered draw is also a great option. I feel the common theme for most bowlers is the current system just doesn't work for the competition.

Rangatahi Bowlers

Kia Ora, last season we saw the introduction of Rangatahi Bowlers. This allowed bowlers who are a member of a club to get free entry into centre events. This was a welcome introduction and effectively brought back the old "Jacgals" system. The purpose of the Jacgals was to allow young bowlers who play at different clubs to play together in centre events. I believe the last Jacgals team to win a centre event was in 2013 with Lachlan Gordon and Seamus Curtain who won the Men's Open Pairs.

My proposal that I want to put in for review is to raise the age of a Rangatahi Bowler from 18

to 21. Last year this was put forward to consider however there was a feeling that putting together a 21 year old bowler and a 15 year old bowler would not be safe. I feel that it would be safe if certain safeguards are put in place.

Reasons For The Change:

1. On the entry form itself it should state that an Under 18 bowler who is entered under Rangatahi Bowlers shall have a parent/ guardian present on each day of the event. This is to ensure the young person have proper supervision throughout the bowling Event

2. Bowling clubs and umpires have a duty of care for everyone that enters these premises for any event or social gathering. I believe clubs that have a young bowler present should keep an extra eye out for that player. If this is formalised or just a conversation with the umpire/ club on the day that would be up to Bowls Wellington.

3. The extension allows young players who play at a club where they don't have any other young ones the option to play with another young bowler at another club. Although we have more young people playing for clubs than ever before there are still cases of young players not being picked up in teams within their club. This extension increases accessibility for young people to play in Bowls Wellington events.

This change to me is obvious but of course I'm biased. We have made major strides in the youth game over the last few years and this is just one of those small changes that will encourage more youth to play centre events.

Upper Hutt

1/ Lower grade Interclub Playoff's

Whilst we understand the thinking behind these play-offs, our members felt that having both a semi-final and final was unnecessary. If these are to be played in future, just a final should suffice. When these were played, our [and no doubt other clubs] were trying to get Club Championships that had been postponed from earlier dates, due to inclement weather, completed and losing a full day at the beginning of March was not helpful - at least if only a final, we could have played club champs in the afternoon.

2/ Interclub Dates

Final day of Interclub round robin was 17 February - all clubs were requested to play all outstanding fixtures, due to bad weather earlier in season, by that date. This involved our club having to play matches throughout the week, in some cases affecting members work commitments. We understand that there were at least 2 fixtures that Bowls Wellington agreed could be played later than that date. One involved our Ladies Interclub team who were prepared to play earlier than 17 February. If clubs were unable to play by the specified date, then they should have been defaulted.

3/ Prize Money for Wellington events

We submit that all Bowls Wellington events should pay a minimum of 60% of entry fees as prize-money. Whilst we accept that there are administrative [and possibly other costs] involved in staging these events, in some cases the prize distribution appears very low against entry fees received [i.e. Over 60's Fours].