

South West Federation of Croquet Clubs AGM Agenda

Date	Sunday 23 rd November 2025
Time	10.00 – 1.00 Please note that we have received over 30 proposals. We have streamlined how these will be presented as far as possible but it will still be a long meeting – please be prepared for this. We will schedule regular comfort breaks.
Venue	Zoom – link will be sent to delegates a couple of days before the meeting

Agenda

1. Welcome and introductions
2. Apologies
3. Confirm the meeting is quorate
4. Zoom polling: rehearsal
5. Minutes of last meeting – <https://www.swfcroquet.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/12/007-agm-2024-draft-minutes.pdf>
6. Matters arising
7. Chair's report – to be circulated
8. Treasurer's report – to be circulated – 2024 report: https://www.swfcroquet.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/12/Treasurer-AGM-Report-November_2024.pdf
 - a. Notification of fees 2026
9. Appointment of Independent Examiner
10. League Secretary's report – to be circulated
11. Short Croquet Team Tournaments report – to be circulated
12. Regional Coaching Officer's report - to be circulated
13. Development Officer report – to be circulated
14. Handicapping report
15. Welfare report
16. Report from CqE Trustee
17. Comfort break
18. Volunteer of the Year award – nominations and winner
19. Election of Committee and Officers – see below
20. Proposals – details below
21. Other agenda items – these must be notified in advance
22. Date of next AGM
23. Open mic – time allowing

Proposal	That the following nominations for Committee be approved <i>en masse</i>		
Post	Name	Proposer	Second
Chair	Linda Shaw	Andy Bailey Secretary, Bristol	Erica Malaiperuman Secretary, Nailsea
League Secretary	Gill Wheeler	Ian Wills Chairman, Kington Langley	Margaret Murray Secretary, Kington Langley
Secretary	No candidate		
Treasurer	Pauline McAllister	Roger Baddeley Treasurer, Nailsea	James Doulton Chair, Weston super Mare
Handicapping Officer	David Green	Ray Virr Chair, Budleigh Salterton	Brigit Andrews Secretary, Budleigh Salterton
Development Officer	No Candidate		
Safeguarding Officer	Chris Ham	Martin French Secretary, Bude	Helen North Treasurer, Bude
Committee member	Stephen Custance-Baker	Beverley Tapper Secretary, Taunton Deane	Andy Bennett Chairman, Taunton Deane
Committee Member	Andru Blewett	Chris Austin Chair, St Agnes	Ruth Allistone Treasurer, St Agnes

Proposals

Many thanks are owed to the SWF Committee and to all the clubs who took the time to think about these issues, to formulate them and to respond to our requests to consider modifying them.

The numbers used refer to the order of receipt, not to the order of presentation, which will be as set out here. They have been grouped according to topic.

Delegates should ensure they are familiar with these – questions or clarifications may be submitted before the meeting – this should help keep the discussion running more freely and they will be reflected at the meeting

This will not be easy so please

- raise your hand if you have a point to make or question to ask, and wait to be called
- make your point courteously and succinctly

When referring to on-line documents. Please use the pdf version for the correct numbering system.

Thank you.

Links to key documents

Constitution https://www.swfcroquet.org.uk/	AC League Rules https://www.swfcroquet.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/12/2025_SWF_Association_Croquet_League_Rules.pdf
GC League Rules https://www.swfcroquet.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/12/2025_SWF_Golf_Croquet_League_Rules.pdf	SC League Rules https://www.swfcroquet.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/12/2025_SWF_Short_Croquet_League_Rules.pdf

A quick guide to the Constitutional and League proposals

Section 1 Decision making	Section 4 Refreshments
Section 2: General tidying up of wording	Section 5 – relating to AC Leagues
Section 3: Proposals that affect all Rules	Section 6 – relating to GC Leagues

Section 1 Decision making

Number C1	Proposed by SWF Committee
Summary of proposal	To clarify what constitutes a majority vote at a General meeting
Number P35	Proposed by SWF Committee
Summary of proposal	That the process of agreeing changes to League Rules is improved

Section 2: General tidying up of wording

Number C2	Proposed by SWF Committee
Summary of proposal	To correct inconsistencies in the Constitution relating to numbering structures
Number P20	Proposed by Bristol CC
Summary of proposal	That terminology be amended to reflect that used by CqE
Number P21	Proposed by Bristol CC
Summary of proposal	Extend guidance on Alternative Venues to include all matches
Number P24	Proposed by Bristol CC
Summary of proposal	Strike the mention of stoppages from the SWF Rules.
Number P29	Proposed by Bristol CC
Summary of proposal	Improve consistency of wording re play-offs
Number P31	Proposed by Bristol CC
Summary of proposal	Remove reference to a National Handicapper's powers
Number P27	Proposed by Bristol CC
Summary of proposal	Consistent terminology re League for Advanced Play
Number P23	Proposed by Bristol CC
Summary of proposal	That terminology be amended to reflect that used by CqE
Number P2	Proposed by SWF Committee
Summary of proposal	That the Short Croquet League Rules be amended to simplify access to information about the conversion of handicaps

Section 3: Proposals that affect all Rules

Number P1	Proposed by SWF Committee
Summary of proposal	That League Rules concerning re-arrangement of fixtures be amended

Number P14	Proposed by Cheltenham CC
Summary of proposal	To provide guidelines for abandoning a fixture in the event of extreme hot weather
Number P32	Proposed by SWF Committee
Summary of proposal	To provide guidance when a match is abandoned for reasons other than the condition of the courts

Number P5	Proposed by SWF Committee
Summary of proposal	To enable two clubs to enter joint teams into Leagues

Number P33	Proposed by SWF
Summary of proposal	To state the action to be taken if it is discovered a player is playing off a handicap lower than they should

Number P30	Proposed by Bristol CC
Summary of proposal	Relax deadlines for intra-club League matches

Section 4 Refreshments

Number 17	Proposed by Bristol CC
Summary of proposal	Remove reference to Refreshments in Appendix Alternative Play-Off Venues

Number 22	Proposed by Bristol CC
Summary of proposal	Provision of Basic Refreshments at Matches

Number 18	Proposed by Bristol CC
Summary of proposal	Host clubs should provide simple refreshments

Number 19	Proposed by Bristol CC
Summary of proposal	SWF should pay Host Clubs Costs

Number 25	Proposed by Bristol CC
Summary of proposal	That the terms 'home' and 'Host' be used consistently

Number P10	Proposed by Budleigh Salterton CC
Summary of proposal	SWF to review handicapping guidance to clubs

Section 5 – relating to AC Leagues

Number P3	Proposed by SWF Committee
Summary of proposal	Rationalize the Handicap Bisque Base between B League and Intermediate

Number P9	Proposed by Kington Langley CC
Summary of proposal	To change the pairing of opponents for the Federation League as set out below

Number P12	Proposed by Bath CC
Summary of proposal	To reduce to 12 the highest handicap eligible for Federation League – there would be no exceptions to this

Number P4	Proposed by SWF Committee
Summary of proposal	That the Short Croquet (Restricted) League becomes a High Handicap Short Croquet League

Section 6 – relating to GC Leagues

Number P8	Proposed by Taunton Deane CC
Summary of proposal	The SWF Golf Croquet Handicap and High Handicap Leagues should revert to the use of Extra Strokes in preference to Advantage GC, starting in 2026.

Number P11	Proposed by Bath CC
Summary of proposal	That the SWF consider adding a GC 10+ level play league

Number P7 and P16	Proposed by Bude CC
Summary of proposal	Reduce the number of rounds by 1, and so encourage play to be untimed apart from in truly exceptional circumstances.

P7 and P16	Proposed by Bude CC
Summary of proposal	To move the current mid-range GC Handicap and Level Play (5+) leagues to a level play league combining the CqE B-level and C-level bands

Number P28	Proposed by Bristol CC
Summary of proposal	Shorter playing day (for less able players)

Number P26	Proposed by Bristol CC
Summary of proposal	Player Participation Limitation – drop restriction below

Section 1: Decision Making

Number C1	Proposed by SWF Committee
Summary of proposal	To clarify what constitutes a majority vote at a General meeting
Rationale The current wording in the following sections is ambiguous <i>7.7: A Proposal to a General Meeting may be passed by a simple majority of those present and entitled to vote.</i> <i>10: If at any General Meeting a Resolution for the dissolution of the SWF shall be voted for by at least two-thirds of those present and entitled to vote</i> <i>12: No provision of this Constitution shall be amended, save by a Resolution voted for by at least two-thirds of those present and entitled to vote at a General Meeting</i> It is not clear if 'simple majority' includes or discounts abstentions, nor whether 'those present and entitled to vote' takes account of those who are carrying more than one vote. Bearing in mind that the meeting must be quorate anyway, <i>i.e. "one-third of the Delegates and The Committee entitled to vote" (that is one third of the total membership + SWF Committee).</i> Proposed re-wording 7.7: A Proposal to a General Meeting may be passed by a simple majority of the votes cast. 10. If at any General Meeting a Resolution for the dissolution of the SWF is proposed, a majority of at least two-thirds of the total votes cast at the General Meeting is required to carry the motion. 12. No provision of this Constitution shall be amended, save by a Resolution at any General Meeting. A majority of at least two-thirds of the total votes cast at the General Meeting is required to carry the motion. https://www.swfcroquet.org.uk/constitution/	

Number P35	Proposed by SWF Committee
Summary of proposal	That the process of agreeing changes to League Rules is improved
Rationale Rule 16 states that changes to League Rules may only be made at a General Meeting. Over the years there have been several examples of AGMs which have endeavoured to do this. The ensuing discussions are difficult to manage (both face-to-face and Zoom) in a way that ensures all views are expressed, any amendments made and understood and voted on, and that everyone understands what the proposal actually is. It is unlikely that satisfactory decisions are made in this way. This may be exacerbated for some delegates who have already been instructed how to vote by their clubs, so the discussion is immaterial to them. The 35 proposals originally submitted to this AGM served to bring this into sharp relief! With the co-operation of several of the clubs involved – particularly Bath, Bristol, Bude and East Dorset – we have been able to rationalise this to some extent but we are still faced with a very long and complex agenda.	

To avoid this again, we suggest that such decision making becomes a process and not an event and that

- the AGM is the place where the general 'direction of travel' is agreed
 - clubs would be asked to provide feedback and suggestions for each League – perhaps as proposals, perhaps as discussion points
 - this would mean that club delegates might be taking on a broader role of representing their club rather than voting as they had been instructed to do
 - a way forward is proposed and voted on e.g. a new League will be established or handicap ranges will be modified
- a working group is established which is authorised to develop any necessary Rules or changes to be in place within an agreed timescale
- these are reviewed by clubs who give feedback
- the working group reviews these and, with expert support, finalises the wording

Current wording: 16 These rules are subject to amendment at any General Meeting of the Federation by simple majority of those delegates present and eligible to vote.

Proposed re-wording

16 These rules may be changed by a simple majority of the votes cast at a General Meeting. A working group may be authorised to compose the exact wording in consultation with members as set out in the accompanying guidance.

Consider

If this is agreed, it could have immediate effect

Section 2: General tidying up of wording

The Committee view is that the proposals in this section have no impact on the meaning or intent of the Constitution or Rules and can hopefully be agreed with minimal discussion.

At the meeting, delegates will be asked to vote *en masse* for these but if any are identified as needing individual discussion, that will be done.

Number C2	Proposed by SWF Committee
Summary of proposal	To correct inconsistencies in the Constitution relating to numbering structures
Rationale It has been drawn to our attention that numbering and referencing is inconsistent and we have received an offer to rectify this. This will not affect the meaning of any clauses Proposal That David Harrison-Wood be invited to undertake this	

Number P20	Proposed by Bristol CC
Summary of proposal	That terminology be amended to reflect that used by CqE
Rationale The league rules say: "Where a charge is made by the alternative venue for court and ball hire, the standard 'Base Rate' as defined by Croquet England shall apply, and that charge shall be paid by the requesting team." Croquet England renamed this some years ago (to reflect what is actually being hired) to "Court and Equipment Hire" https://www.croquet.org.uk/?p=ca/schemes/fees Proposed wording change Court and Equipment Hire Name: update the wording in all league rules from "court and ball hire" to "Court and Equipment Hire" so searches for the current fees are easier.	

Number P21	Proposed by Bristol CC
Summary of proposal	Extend guidance on Alternative Venues to include all matches
Rationale <u>Part 1</u> In all SWF League Rules there is an appendix "Alternative Play-Off Venue" There is no need to restrict this to play-offs, as it could apply to any fixture. Proposed new wording: Replace the heading with "Alternative Match Venue" <u>Part 2</u> The rules say: "If the play-off teams are based more than two hours apart by road (according to Google Maps on a normal traffic day), the visiting team may request that the match be played at an alternative venue somewhere between the two locations."	

There is no need for this prescriptive restriction because the "home" team must agree to a venue change. Also, the home team might prefer to play at another venue, for example, if their lawns are busy on the day agreed to play the fixture.

Also, as the teams must agree to the change, there is no need to restrict the alternative venue to be between the two clubs.

Proposed new wording: Replace this with: "Either team may request that the match be played at an alternative venue."

Part 3

The League Rules then say

"If the 'Home' team accedes to the request, the 'Away' team shall become responsible for identifying a suitable venue and making all the arrangements with that venue. The venue chosen should be as near as possible equidistant from the 'Home' and 'Away' clubs, but preferably closer to the 'Home' club."

Home and away teams need not be identified, nor should the distances be enshrined here. The "home" team may even prefer to play at the "away" team's club - the League Rules should not suggest that this is in any way undesirable.

Opposed new wording: Replace this with:

"If the other team accedes to the request, the requesting team shall become responsible for identifying a suitable venue and making all the arrangements with that venue, subject to the other team agreeing to the final choice of venue."

Number P24	Proposed by Bristol CC
Summary of proposal	Strike the mention of stoppages from the SWF Rules.
Rationale The AC League Rules state: "8. Time limits a. Advanced, Federation and Intermediate Leagues. 2) Time taken for stoppages (for tea, coffee, etc.) shall be added to extend the time limit." There is no equivalent clause for 'B' League, nor GC, nor SC. Note: the SWF GC League Rules have a section "Regulations" that has "Clock-stopping", which is not affected by this proposal. Proposed changes: Given that suspension of time is covered in the Rules and Laws, there is no need for this in the SWF League Rules. https://www.croquet.org.uk/?Service=gcRules#rule:19.4 https://www.croquet.org.uk/?service=acLaws#law:61.4	

Number P29	Proposed by Bristol CC
Summary of proposal	Improve consistency of wording re play-offs
Rationale The League Rules state:	

"Where a player has played for a Handicap League team in at least half of the team's matches during the season and the team qualifies for the play-offs, that player shall be allowed to participate if the player's handicap is not more than one step outside the range for that league."

Elsewhere, play-offs and finals are separate things. This clause should apply to finals too.

Proposed re-wording Replace "qualifies for the play-offs" with "qualifies for a play-off or final"

Number P31	Proposed by Bristol CC
Summary of proposal	Remove reference to a National Handicapper's powers
Rationale Our governing body, Croquet England, is responsible for setting the handicapping system. The SWF league rules should not attempt to subvert this. If there is an issue with CqE-appointed handicappers behaving incorrectly, this must be taken up with the CqE Handicapping Committee. Proposed change Strike: "A National handicapper, being a member of a team, may not alter the handicap of a member of the opposition without that player's consent." Affects: AC 4h & GC 4i	

Number P27	Proposed by Bristol CC
Summary of proposal	Consistent terminology re League for Advanced Play
Rationale The AC Rules say "League for Advanced Play (herein referred to as the 'Advanced League')" – but it isn't. Proposed change Replace all subsequent 'League for Advanced Play' with 'Advanced League' or drop the above parenthetical clause and do the reverse.	

Number P23	Proposed by Bristol CC
Summary of proposal	That terminology be amended to reflect that used by CqE
Rationale <u>Part 1</u> The terminology used in League Rules is not consistent with that used by CqE Proposed changes - Replace the statement of which Laws/Rules apply in each of the League Rules with: Games shall, subject to the authorised variations in Croquet England's Tournament Regulations section "Approved Laws/Rules Variations" and international or Croquet England rulings, be played under the latest edition of one of the following sets of Laws or Rules: - for Association Croquet, the current Laws of Association Croquet as published by Croquet England, together with any official rulings; or - for Golf Croquet, the current Rules of Golf Croquet as published by Croquet England, together with any official rulings.	

- Note that the above text is taken from the CqE Tournament Regulations.
- In all cases, reference to the Laws/Rules should also say: "together with any official rulings".
- References to "WCF Rules of Golf Croquet" should be to "The Rules of Golf Croquet as published by Croquet England", our governing body, whose Rules (and Rulings) apply to all other Calendar Fixtures in England.

Part 2

In addition, Croquet England, from time to time, authorizes experiments, but, as they are enacted via the Tournament Regulations, they do not actually apply to SWF fixtures.

Additionally, the GC Rules incorrectly state "The WCF GC Rules specify that all players and referees have the responsibility of forestalling play" – this is not true – it is in the CqE Regulations for Tournaments, not the Rules. **Amend this**

It is the Tournament Regulations that grant referees permission to use video to support refereeing. The same applies to improved handicaps for doubles advantage play (Golf Croquet). As well as the remedy for Playing Out of Sequence in Alternate Stroke Doubles and allowing each pair to choose for themselves whether to play AS or regular doubles.

Number P2	Proposed by SWF Committee
Summary of proposal	That the Short Croquet League Rules be amended to simplify access to information about the conversion of handicaps
Rationale The AC to SC conversion in our SC Rules Appendix 2 is out of date. The new Croquet England conversion has been used in most matches. (I think the SWF committee circulated the new table before the season started). Amend to read: Short Croquet Rules Appendix 2 needs the table of AC to SC conversion updated to reflect the latest in formation from Croquet England. Also add a hyperlink to the Croquet England web page https://www.croquet.org.uk/?p=games/association/handicapping/short	

Section 3: Proposals that affect all Rules

Number P1	Proposed by SWF Committee
Summary of proposal	That League Rules concerning re-arrangement of fixtures be amended
Rationale • In 2025, most teams were able to rearrange matches that had been cancelled or postponed due to problems of getting a team, weather, or other circumstances. However, there were a few occasions when the club that was able to play, refused to rearrange under any circumstances. • SWF Association and Golf Croquet League Rules. Section 3 (d) Fixture Dates currently reads: ◦ When the list has been distributed, a fixture date may be changed only in exceptional circumstances, with the agreement of both clubs and subject to immediate notification to the League Secretary. • Amend to read ◦ When the list has been distributed, a fixture date may be changed only in exceptional circumstances, with the agreement of both clubs and subject to immediate notification to the League Secretary. Should a request be made by one club to re-arrange the date within the first half of the season (i.e. before 30 June), the other club must agree to a re-arrangement with an alternative date.	

Number P14	Proposed by Cheltenham CC
Summary of proposal	To provide guidelines for abandoning a fixture in the event of extreme hot weather
Rationale The Officers and Committee of Cheltenham Croquet Club propose a change to the SWF Rules regarding the abandonment of league matches, to apply only when a Government Heat Health Alert is in place covering the time and venue of a match. Climate change is predicted to result in hotter summers in the UK. On 19 July 2022, the UK recorded a summer temperature in excess of 40C for the first time. In 2025, temperatures well in excess of 30C have been seen on several occasions across the south of England. In December 2024, the UK Health Security Agency published new guidance. The Government now issues Heat Health Alerts highlighting risks to health during periods of high summer temperatures. These emphasize the elevated risk to those aged over 65 and those with pre-existing health conditions. As such, they are immediately relevant to many who play competitive croquet in SWF-affiliated clubs. Croquet England advises that the Health and Safety at Work Act applies to sports clubs. This imposes a responsibility on officers and committees of croquet clubs to take proportionate measures to assess and mitigate known risks. The current SWF rules could have the perverse effect of rewarding teams who resist the abandonment of a match and seek to continue play in hot summer conditions, irrespective of actual or potential impacts on the health and wellbeing of those involved in the match. The proposed rule change is intended to address this, allowing either of the team captains, or an	

officer of the host club, to terminate a match without penalty in order to protect the wellbeing of participants, when a Government Heat Health Alert applies.

BACKGROUND TO PROPOSED CHANGE:

On two occasions during the period of high daytime temperatures, the captain of one of our league teams was concerned about the effect of the heat on several of the team's members. After discussion with the visiting team's captain and bearing in mind the home captain's responsibilities for the health and safety of the players, as set out in the Club's hot weather advice, he decided to withdraw his team from the lawns. The opponents' captain did not wish to do likewise, and the home team conceded the last few games to be played. A similar situation occurred a week later.

The aim of the amendment to paragraph 11 b. (5) is to clarify the position in such circumstances when captains disagree on whether in high temperatures the match should continue.

Proposed new wording

Appendix 5

Hot weather match abandonment

1. When there is a Government Heat Health Alert in force covering the venue for the match for some or all the expected time that the match will be underway, there is a presumption that the match will not go ahead and paragraph 11 b (5) of the rules shall not apply.
2. A match should only go ahead with the agreement of both team captains and one officer of the venue club and when appropriate measures are in place to mitigate the elevated risk to the players.
3. Should the match go ahead, the team captains and other officials shall monitor the condition of the players and others involved in the match. Should any one team captain, venue club officer or involved official require the match to be abandoned, all play shall cease immediately.
4. If a match once organized does not go ahead because of paragraph 1 above, the team captains shall employ reasonable endeavours to find an alternative date, and/or venue. If this is not possible, the match shall be called a draw.
5. When a match, once started, is abandoned, and more than 50% of the intended games have been completed, the accumulated results of completed games shall constitute the result of the match. If less than 50% of intended games are completed the match shall be treated as if it was not played and paragraph 4 above will be followed.
6. No player shall be put under pressure to commence or to continue play if, in their opinion or that of either captain, they are experiencing difficulties with the conditions.
7. The principal aim is to protect the health and wellbeing of everyone involved in the sport of croquet in hot weather, in line with the prevailing UK Health and Safety legislation

Please consider the following points

- See proposal P32 below

Number P32	Proposed by SWF Committee
Summary of proposal	To provide guidance when a match is abandoned for reasons other than the condition of the courts
Rationale The hot weather this season has highlighted the possibility of matches being abandoned for a variety of reasons. We consider that a detailed set of rules covering every possibility is not possible. Team captains and players should be sensitive to the conditions and the well-being of all and make their decision on these considerations only.	

Proposed new clause

11.3 Abandoned for other reasons

A match may need to be abandoned for reasons relating to the health, safety or welfare of players. In such circumstances See proposal P14 team captains should jointly make the decision, bearing in mind their H&S responsibilities and giving priority to the welfare of their players. Subsequently, and as soon as possible, arrangements to complete the match at a later date if this is necessary and feasible should be made and the League Secretary consulted.

Please consider the following points

- See proposal P14 above

Number P5	Proposed by SWF Committee
Summary of proposal	To enable two clubs to enter joint teams into Leagues
Rationale Some clubs, particularly smaller ones, are unable to enter Leagues due to insufficient members being able or eligible to play. This proposal will encourage wider participation and strengthen the viability of some of the more vulnerable Leagues e.g. B League Reference to Rule 4b in the conditions set out below ensures that a player who happen to be a member of both clubs mut play for one club only in this League throughout the season <i>4B:In any given league, no player shall play for more than one team, or for more than one club, during a season, except as specified below.</i> Proposed new clause Joint Teams Two clubs may agree to enter a joint team subject to the following conditions • At least one player from each club must play in each match. • The entry must specify the 'Captain' and 'Home venue' • The standard fee must be paid to the SWFC Treasurer (clubs should agree to split the fee) • Please refer to Rule 4b when forming your team	

Number P33	Proposed by SWF
Summary of proposal	To state the action to be taken if it is discovered a player is playing off a handicap lower than they should
Rationale The current rules do not state what should happen in this situation and should be clarified. There are occasions when players inadvertently play off a lower handicap. We consider they are only disadvantaging themselves, not their opponent, and no penalty has been applied.	

Ref to Rule 4g which reads:

Where a player is a member of a team for which the player is not eligible under (a) to (d) above, all of the games involving that player shall be deemed to have been lost by the maximum margin.

Suggested additional wording

Insert new clause 4.f.(3) **Handicap Leagues.**

If it is discovered at any stage during or after a match, that a player's declared handicap in any game was below the correct value, no further action will be taken subject to (g) below

Number P30	Proposed by Bristol CC
Summary of proposal	Relax deadlines for intra-club League matches
Rationale	
If two teams in a block or league have to play each other twice, it's not reasonable for them to have to play each other twice before playing anyone else. Dates are much more difficult to arrange, and there is a significant reduction in player enjoyment. There is no reason to have this clause in full. It is hard to believe that players will deliberately throw games to enhance the position of their club's rival team, and allocation of players to teams is dealt with otherwise. Current: "Where two teams from the same club are in the same block in a League, those teams must play the fixture(s) between them before any other fixture for either of the teams."	
Proposed changes	
"Where two teams from the same club are in the same block in a League, those teams must play at least one fixture between them before any other fixture for either of the teams."	
Please consider the following points	
• If accepted, should there be a limit to when the matches must be played e.g. end of June?	

Section 4 Refreshments

Number 17	Proposed by Bristol CC
Summary of proposal	Remove reference to Refreshments in Appendix Alternative Play-Off Venues
Rationale The SWF AC, GC and SC League Rules, Appendix "Alternative Play-Off Venue" says "The 'Home' team shall remain responsible for the provision of simple refreshments (hot and cold drinks, biscuits and/or cake, but not lunches) for both teams." This is the only mention of refreshments in any of the League Rules. You can't remain responsible for something you are not responsible for. The matter of refreshments at third-party venues is the subject of another proposal. Proposed change The sentence quoted above should be struck	

Number 22	Proposed by Bristol CC
Summary of proposal	Provision of Basic Refreshments at Matches
Rationale Wherever a match is played, the home and away teams should expect tea, coffee and water at no cost. The 'home' team may, in addition, provide biscuits and/or cake, but is not obligated to do so. Players expect drinking water, tea and coffee to be provided at the match venue and for it to be free of charge. This almost always happens where the home club is the host but it should be in the League Rules so everyone knows what is expected. Note that the term "host" is used deliberately below – the host club is usually the home team's club. Changes to the section "Alternative play-off venues" are the subject of another proposal Proposed change In all the League Rules section "2. Fixtures and Venues": 1. Add paragraph numbering to be consistent with other sections 2. Add "Host clubs shall provide drinking water, tea and coffee free of charge to players. If this is not practicable, visiting teams shall be informed at least three days before the match."	

Number 18	Proposed by Bristol CC
Summary of proposal	Host clubs should provide simple refreshments
Rationale Note that in this context, the host club is neither the home nor the away club. When both teams at a host venue are playing away, the host should take responsibility for supplying the very essentials of refreshments for the visiting players as it is very difficult for the	

visitors to do this for themselves.
For normal matches, the home team usually provides these.

All SWF League Rules state:

"Finals. League finals shall be staged at venues (host clubs) and on dates decided by the League Secretary and notified to clubs. For each of the finals, the 'Home' club shall be determined by the League Secretary."

"13 e. For each play-off match and final, the host club shall
(1) determine the number and size of the courts; and
(2) appoint a referee, suitably qualified wherever possible."

Note that the host club should be reimbursed for their costs, which is the subject of another proposal. The SWF is unlikely to choose a club to host a final if they do not have the facilities to comply.

Proposed addition

"(3) provide to players free of charge: drinking water, tea and coffee (including milk and sugar), or the means for self-service."

Number 19	Proposed by Bristol CC
Summary of proposal	SWF should pay Host Clubs Costs
Rationale	
It is common practice for the SWF to pay a fee to clubs hosting finals, whether or not the club plays in the final.	
This should be mentioned in the League Rules so that it is clear, and it should be offered by the SWF, not required to be requested by the host.	
Note that play-offs are normally hosted by the home club and no fee applies.	
This fee should include an amount to cover the club's cost in providing refreshments.	
Proposed addition	
In all League Rules 13 d. Finals, add paragraph numbering, and then add a paragraph:	
"The SWF shall offer to pay the host club for court and equipment hire at the standard 'Base Rate' as defined by Croquet England, plus an agreed fee to cover refreshments to be provided free of charge to the players."	
Please note	
• The SWF currently pay Host Clubs a Lawn Hire fee at the rate set each year by Croquet England for its own fees • If this proposal is passed the refreshment rate will be set by SWF Committee and will not be set out in the Rules	

Number 25	Proposed by Bristol CC
Summary of proposal	That the terms 'home' and 'Host' be used consistently

Rationale

In the SWF League Rules for AC and SC: Appendix: Alternative Play-Off Venue

"The date for the match must be one of the three dates first offered by the host club"

The GC League Rules say

"The date for the match must be one of the three dates first offered by the 'Home' club"

Proposal

a) This latter version should replace the other two. The 'home' club offers dates, not the 'host'.

Proposal

b) drop the capitalisation and quoting of "home" so in all cases the clause reads: "The date for the match must be one of the three dates first offered by the home club"

Number P10	Proposed by Budleigh Salterton CC
Summary of proposal	SWF to review handicapping guidance to clubs
Rationale Handicapping is a key part of encouraging and supporting players. It is clear from the Croquet England Guidance that Clubs should be doing in terms of setting and reviewing GC Handicaps. It is however often a matter of debate as to the range of approaches that Clubs take when setting and reviewing Handicaps. This is true across the Country and not just in the SWF. We are proposing that the SWF reviews with the Clubs the current approaches and reinforces the need for a consistent and visible approach in line with SWF and Croquet England guidance. https://www.swfcroquet.org.uk/handicaps/ and https://www.croquet.org.uk/?pup=y&p=games/golf/handicapping/ClubHandicappers The review would also look at the analysis of the current differences across the Clubs. There has previously been a Handicap workshop. A new workshop could form part of the review and be used to help identify and address changes. We would support and participate in that review, which could allow Clubs to consider and debate what changes could be made, as well as reinforce the need for consistency. Proposal: The SWF should review the current Golf Croquet (GC) handicapping guidance and how it is being applied across all Clubs in the Federation with a view to ensure consistency and to encourage individuals' development and competitive play	
Please consider the following points	
NB this was submitted with specific reference to GC handicap but SWF considers it is relevant to both codes and is very happy to do this	

Section 5 – relating to AC Leagues

Number P3	Proposed by SWF Committee
Summary of proposal	Rationalize the Handicap Bisque Base between B League and Intermediate
Rationale The current handicap base for Intermediate is 6 and B-league is 11 ½. This leads to the situation that a player with handicap 16 gets many more bisques in the Intermediate league than the B league, even allowing for the different formats. Having a common handicap base would mean that there was an understandable 'pathway' for new and high handicap players. Proposal: Rationalise the Handicap Bisque Base between B-League and Intermediate leagues to 8 ½. Changes are required to Rules 7c and 7d, Appendix 3A and 3B.	

Number P9	Proposed by Kington Langley CC
Summary of proposal	To change the pairing of opponents for the Federation League as set out below
Rationale Low handicap players are deterred from playing in matches due to the huge possible difference in handicaps in a game. There is the possibility that a -2 could be playing an 18. A game under these, or even less extreme circumstances, usually results in the HH player dominating the lawn for a long period. Even when the Lower Handicap player wins, he/she has endured a considerable part of the game sat on the side-line. A game is more enjoyable for all when players are more evenly matched in ability. That wording is changed as follows: 9. Pairing of Opponents a. In all leagues, it shall be the duty of the team captains to arrange the pairing of opponents for all games of the match prior to the start of the first session. b. Federation League only (1) The captains should first arrange the pairings for the session with the most games (normally the afternoon session) by choosing their doubles partnerships, if any, and then pairing opponents for the singles games in handicap order. (2) Games in the other (usually morning) session should then be arranged as close as possible in handicap order, but ensuring that no game is repeated. (Retitle existing b as) c. Intermediate and B Leagues (Retitle existing c as) d. Advanced League Rules say Pairing of Opponents In all leagues, it shall be the duty of the team captains to arrange the pairing of opponents for all games of the match prior to the start of the first session. 2 Federation, Intermediate and 'B' Leagues. 1. The captains should first arrange the pairings for the session with the most games	

(normally the afternoon session) by choosing their doubles partnerships, if any, and then pairing opponents for the singles games by random draw.

2 Games in the other (usually morning) session should then be arranged so that no game is repeated.

3 Advanced League. As play may be all singles, all doubles or a mixture of both, the following shall apply.

1. Where one or more doubles games are to be played in a session, the captains shall nominate the partnerships; opponents shall be paired in order of aggregate handicaps. For any remaining singles games in that session, opponents shall be paired in handicap order, subject to (4) below.

2 Where only singles games are to be played in a session, opponents shall be paired in handicap order, subject to (4) below.

3 Where two or more players in a team have the same handicap, the captain shall choose their order, which shall apply for the whole match.

4 Singles players must play different opponents in each session, so the pairings must be adjusted, if necessary, to comply with this requirement.

Number P12	Proposed by Bath CC
Summary of proposal	To reduce to 12 the highest handicap eligible for Federation League – there would be no exceptions to this
Rationale This would re-introduce a sense of higher-level play between each league. i.e. B level, Intermediate and then Federation. We currently find ourselves in an absurd situation where a player/s can play in all 3	

Number P4	Proposed by SWF Committee
Summary of proposal	That the Short Croquet (Restricted) League becomes a High Handicap Short Croquet League
Rationale In 2025 the number of entries to the Restricted short croquet league was too small and too geographically wide to hold the league. A number of reasons have been given: • High handicap players are unwilling to play in the league where they can meet opposition with very low handicaps. • Difficulties with getting the correct handicap players. This would mean changing Rule 4c2 from 'Short Croquet League (Restricted) from to High handicap Short Croquet League. All players must have a Short Croquet handicap of 6 or above.	

Section 6 – relating to GC Leagues

Number P8	Proposed by Taunton Deane CC
Summary of proposal	The SWF Golf Croquet Handicap and High Handicap Leagues should revert to the use of Extra Strokes in preference to Advantage GC, starting in 2026.
Rationale The arguments in favour of Advantage GC prior to its introduction for 2025 were dubious and many clubs had no previous experience of playing this form of the game. The experience during the 2025 season is that players are constantly confused about the score, particularly where timed games are involved, and are having to think about matters that have no relevance to the actual playing of the game. Conversations with players indicate that few are in favour of AGC. Many dislike it and cannot see why it was introduced. The argument that extra strokes are used to play easier shots, rather than trying the more difficult single shot, is absurd, as exactly the same argument could be used to get rid of bisques in Handicap AC. Both forms of handicap play add complexity to the basic Level Play game but AGC adds complexity without any contribution to the game itself. The complexity introduced by Extra Strokes adds to the tactical aspects of the game and is straightforward to understand. The claim that Extra Strokes GC is less fair than Advantage GC is unsupported in several ways: 1. Analysis of past results indicates that Extra Strokes GC is very fair (about 3% advantage to the Low Handicapper) and a small amount of coaching in the efficient use of Extra Strokes would correct for this minor bias. 2. There is no evidence that Advantage GC is fair across the range of handicaps that are involved in the South West Leagues, particularly in the High Handicap League. The starting score tables have been extended to include handicaps for which there is no data whatever. (The federation in which AGC was introduced does not allow handicaps above 12 in its GC leagues.) 3. The claim that Extra Strokes timed games are advantageous to the higher handicapper is contradicted by the analysis. About 53% of timed-out games (i.e. neither side reached 7 hoops) were won by the lower handicapper, which is the same percentage as for all games. We don't, as yet, know whether clubs will continue to support these two leagues at the same level in the future, but they have been two of the best and most supported inter-club leagues in the entire country. It would be a pity to see this support diminish because of the unnecessary introduction of an unpopular version of the game.	

Number P11	Proposed by Bath CC
Summary of proposal	That the SWF consider adding a GC 10+ level play league
Rationale Level Play could be a preferred method of play as it avoids having to consider extra turns or different starting positions, re number of hoops. The extra league would provide the same opportunity, as the current level play leagues do, to another group of players.	
Note SWF Committee is happy to support this	

Number P7 and P16	Proposed by Bude CC
Summary of proposal	To establish a working party to consider these two proposals with a view to implementation in 2027
P7 Proposal Motion regarding GC leagues – match structure and time limits The proposal is reduce the number of rounds by 1, and so encourage play to be untimed apart from in truly exceptional circumstances. Rationale The change to a slightly shortened format reduces the length of the match and so reduces the need for using time limits when longer journeys are entailed. The current rule on time limits should be consequently changed to make their use <u>exceptional</u>. A minimum time limit of 60 minutes per game can be applied if the <u>Away</u> team captain regards it as essential (it is the Away team that potentially faces the longer day). No change is proposed to the match format for single-court clubs (rule 6.1.1). Rule 6 and 9.b.(1) changes 6. Match Format Number of Games. Where a fixture is to be played at a single-court club, the home team shall be allowed to choose to play a match of 12 games, comprising 2 doubles games and 10 singles games. Such a match may therefore result in a 6–6 draw. 2. In all other cases, a match shall consist of 20 16 games: 4 doubles games and 16 12 singles games. A match may therefore result in an 8–8 draw. 3. When a fixture is being arranged to be played at a single-court club, the home team must, at the time of fixing the date, inform the visiting team whether the match is to consist of 20 16 games on half-courts or of 12 games on the full court. Halfway markers are mandatory at all SWF Golf Croquet League matches. Choice of Courts. 4. Where a club has two or more courts available, the home team captain shall choose the courts for the first and fourth rounds, and the visiting team captain shall choose the courts for the second, third, and fifth and sixth rounds, avoiding double-banking where possible. 5. The choices in (1) above may be made at the beginning of each round, or the captains may agree to choose courts for as many rounds as they wish at the beginning of the day, and subsequently as the need arises. 4. The default format for a match is six five rounds; however, if sufficient courts are available and the captains agree, fewer rounds may be used. 5. The order in which the singles and doubles games are to be played shall be agreed between the captains; if no agreement can be found, the home team captain shall decide. 8. Time Limits a. Games should be played without a time limit, unless it is believed that court availability will make it difficult to complete the games within the available time. In such a case a time limit, agreed by the captains and of not less than 50 60 minutes shall be set (except as directed under Rule 13f). If the two captains cannot agree on a time limit, the shorter of the two Away team captain's suggested time limits shall be used. 9. Pairing of opponents	

2. Restrictions.

- (1) Each player may play in up to two doubles games and up to four singles games but may not play more than 5 games in total.

P7 and P16	Proposed by Bude CC
Summary of proposal	To establish a working party to consider these two proposals with a view to implementation in 2027
P16 The proposal is for the SWF to establish a working party to develop a scheme, to start in 2027 if approved, to move the current mid-range GC Handicap and Level Play (5+) leagues to a level play league combining the CqE B-level and C-level bands Rationale SWF has many GC leagues: 4 leagues with 18 areas and 75 teams. This year has seen 14 Level Play 5+ teams and 39 Handicap teams. These two leagues, comprising 53 teams, address largely the same ability range and involve the largest number of clubs and teams. Virtually the entire list of Croquet England GC Calendar Fixtures are played as part of one of the Level Play Series, rather than under any handicap system. It would help our members develop and move into playing Calendar Fixtures if more of our SWF GC match play were following the Level Play Series model. Handicap play has its problems. Extra Strokes was unpopular with some clubs. Advantage also has particular issues (e.g. long games, scoring confusion) which make matches more difficult to manage. Both forms of handicap play continue to suffer from mistrust between clubs as to how accurate the others' handicaps are. This proposal is to consider <u>replacing</u> the current "middle ability" league structure with one that reflects the popular Croquet England "Level Series" approach – so most play would be level but within bands based on similar handicaps. There are several ways this could be done (hence the call for a working party) but as <u>an illustration</u> the existing Level 5+ and Handicap leagues could be merged to form a single new combined B- and C- Level league. This would span handicaps from 4 to something like 9 or 10. It is suggested B- and C- need to be combined to ensure smaller clubs can field a competitive team. It is <u>not</u> proposed to change either the existing Level Play league ("CqE Open Level") which caters for the lowest handicaps, nor to change the High Handicap league. There were 23 teams in the High Handicap league this season which is an ideal league for players starting out on their competitive careers. It could be considered to refine this to be a 10+ league, played under whichever handicap system the SWF favours, but that is not part of this proposal. A combined B- and C-Level league In a suggested B- and C- Level Play league (a single league but spanning 2 of the CqE bands), it may be that one club could field all very strong players at the top of the range, while their opponents (particularly if a smaller club) may have a more mixed range of abilities. This could be countered by the requirement that in <u>each round</u>, there must be at least one player from each team with a 7+ handicap - or alternatively, 2 players in <u>each team</u> with a 7+ handicap. Apart from reducing the amount of problematic handicap play, this would make it an easier step for our players to begin entering the CqE Level Series fixtures, and so help them develop further. By reducing the number of leagues addressing the middle ranges of ability, it should increase the number of teams within each area playing at this level – so reducing overall travel. It would also	

help those clubs further from the centre of the SWF to find enough other teams to play level against.

Number P28	Proposed by Bristol CC
Summary of proposal	Shorter playing day (for less able players)
Rationale: The high handicap GC teams in particular, find it very difficult to complete 20 games in a day and so would like to have an option for a 16-game match. The League Rules say: "6. Match Format a. Number of Games. (2) In all other cases, a match shall consist of 20 games: 4 doubles games and 16 singles games. A match may therefore result in a 10–10 draw." Proposal a) Remove "20 games:" and replace "A match may therefore result in a 10–10 draw." with "A match may therefore result in a draw." Proposal b) Add to the first clause "though the teams may, by agreement, play only 2 doubles and 14 singles". Proposal c) Current: "In all other cases, a match shall consist of 20 games: 4 doubles games and 16 singles games. A match may therefore result in a 10–10 draw." Becomes: "In all other cases, a match shall consist of 4 doubles games and 16 singles games, though the teams may, by agreement, play only 2 doubles and 14 singles. match may therefore result in a draw	
Please consider This echoes suggestions made in P7 – the meeting may vote on these to have immediate effect or may prefer to amalgamate it with the proposed working party's tasks	

Number P26	Proposed by Bristol CC
Summary of proposal	Player Participation Limitation – drop restriction below
Rationale In the Golf Croquet League Rules, there is a limit to the number of games that an individual may play. 'Rule 9b - Restrictions' states that 'No player shall play in more than two doubles and four singles games.' The penalty is that the last-played games are forfeited. There have been several instances when this rule has been breached this year simply because its purpose is not understood and managers have unwittingly fielded ineligible players.	
Please consider – is a failure to follow a rule, or lack of clarity, sufficient reason to drop that rule?	