

2002 Playoff Questionnaire Summary of Results

53 people responded.

28 had played in or been eligible for the Open playoffs (of whom 6 had also played in or been eligible for the Seniors', and a seventh for both Women's and Seniors').

16 had played in or been eligible for the Womens' playoffs.

10 had played in or been eligible for the Seniors' playoffs.

7 had no played in or been eligible for any playoffs. Since these responses had quite different views on some questions they are shown separately and not included in the "all eligible" results.

For each question the response is summarised as the net percentage in favour (this is calculated by adding those who replied "*agree*" or "*strongly agree*", subtracting those who replied "*disagree*" or "*strongly disagree*", and presenting the result as a percentage of all those who answered that question.

	All eligible (Total:46)	Open (Total:28)	Women (Total:16)	Seniors (Total:10)	Non-eligible (Total:7)	Comment
Playoff Points & Eligibility						
1. Should Playoff Points not earned with the partner proposed for the Playoffs:						
a. be reduced by 50% (current rule)	40%	4%	85%	-20%	60%	More support current rule than not.
b. be reduced by say 20-25%	-9%	0%	-9%	0%	-100%	
c. not be reduced at all	-57%	-35%	-100%	-38%	-20%	
2. Should pairs who have not earned any Playoff Points in the same unit be able to enter the Playoff? (currently not allowed)	39%	68%	-6%	60%	71%	Open, Seniors for change: allow any eligible players to enter as partnership. Women neutral.
3. Should people who have played in the same team but not as a partnership be treated as “members of the same unit” for Playoff Points? (currently allowed)	2%	30%	-44%	80%	-14%	Open, Seniors for; Women against.
4. Should the minimum Playoff Points for players to be eligible to enter the Playoffs be raised?	-45%	-42%	-50%	-22%	-71%	All groups against.

	All eligible (Total:46)	Open (Total:28)	Women (Total:16)	Seniors (Total:10)	Non-eligible (Total:7)	Comment
5. Should the minimum Playoff Points for players to be eligible to enter the Playoffs be lowered?	-18%	-15%	-13%	-56%	-14%	All groups against.
6. Is the allocation of Playoff Points to ABF events fairly distributed?	-20%	-33%	6%	-10%	-29%	More disagree than agree.
7. Should the outgoing team, whose international commitments curtail their ability to acquire PQPs, receive automatic entry to a team Playoff or its three partnerships to a Butler Playoff?	44%	37%	63%	-10%	-43%	Most agree.
8. Up to now the ABF have considered the PQP holding of only two pairs for each team entering the Playoffs (providing that the third pair has the basic minimum). Should the PQP total of all three pairs be taken into account?	50%	61%	31%	30%	100%	Most agree.
9. Should the pairs finishing 1st, 2nd and 3rd (or a team derived downwards from these three pairs) in the ANC Butler receive automatic entry, as a team, to a teams Playoff or as three pairs to a Butler Playoff?	-36%	-46%	-7%	-30%	29%	Most disagree.

	All eligible (Total:46)	Open (Total:28)	Women (Total:16)	Seniors (Total:10)	Non-eligible (Total:7)	Comment
Format Of Playoff						
10. Should the system of recent years (i.e. qualification as a team) continue?	-30%	-11%	-44%	-20%	-57%	Most disagree.
11. Should a Butler Final, whose entrants are arrived at by acquisition of PQPs, such as proposed for 2002, apply for all years?	16%	-7%	31%	20%	57%	Some support, not among Open.
12. Within the constraints of practicality should a combination of the two above be attempted?	11%	14%	19%	-20%	-57%	Some support, not among Seniors
13. On the Zonal Playoff years do you consider it appropriate to use the Zonal Playoff, as at present, to select the Australian team?	-18%	-32%	13%	-33%	-57%	Open, Seniors against. Women neutral or for.
Format if a Teams Playoff is used						
14. Currently teams may enter the Playoff with 4 or 6 members. Should teams be limited to 4 members?	-59%	-54%	-75%	-50%	-57%	Most disagree.

	All eligible (Total:46)	Open (Total:28)	Women (Total:16)	Seniors (Total:10)	Non-eligible (Total:7)	Comment
15. Currently if a team of four plays against a team of six in the final of a playoff event and wins, it is required to choose its third pair from the losing team:						
a. Should this rule be retained?	-21%	-32%	-31%	10%	43%	Most disagree.
b. Should the team of 4 be able to choose its third pair from any players on the PQP list, with ABF approval?	31%	35%	57%	20%	-50%	Most agree.
16. In recent years the Playoff has had a round robin stage followed by semi-finals/finals.						
a. Should the (semi) finalists be selected by a round robin?	45%	33%	75%	33%	33%	Most agree.
b. Should the round robin format be replaced by straight knockout?	-34%	-20%	-67%	-22%	-83%	Most disagree.

	All eligible (Total:46)	Open (Total:28)	Women (Total:16)	Seniors (Total:10)	Non-eligible (Total:7)	Comment
<p>Board Requirements</p> <p>The ABF recently adopted a new board rule, requiring players to compete in less than half the number of sessions or boards in an event. The rule (except for 2 or 4-session event, which require 50%) is one session below the halfway mark, (if ending in a half, this is rounded up).</p> <p>Thus 3 sets in 8 sessions, 4 sets in a 9- or 10-session event is enough, 5 sets in 11 or 12 sessions etc. If a 64-board match is played in 4 segments, the board rule requires 32 boards, but if played in 8 x 8-board segments, the rule requires 24 boards to comply.</p>						
17. Do you agree with the new board rule?	-20%	-13%	-40%	0%	-29%	Most disagree.
18. Would you prefer the ABF to revert to the '50% or more' board rule?	51%	39%	75%	50%	43%	Most agree.

	All eligible (Total:46)	Open (Total:28)	Women (Total:16)	Seniors (Total:10)	Non-eligible (Total:7)	Comment
19. Currently if a round robin format applies in a Playoff, a team's Board Requirement is calculated on the total boards played in the round robin: a. Should the Board Requirement be based on the total boards played in the round robin?	15%	4%	27%	0%	14%	Mild support
b. Should the Board Requirement apply to each team played in the round robin?	22%	21%	33%	33%	50%	Slightly more support this.
Awards The ABF gives medals for 1st or 2nd in ABF events. 20. Do you think the winner should receive a medal?	55%	46%	63%	33%	57%	Most agree.
21. Do you think runners up should receive a medal?	48%	35%	63%	22%	29%	Most agree.

	All eligible (Total:46)	Open (Total:28)	Women (Total:16)	Seniors (Total:10)	Non-eligible (Total:7)	Comment
<p>Subsidy</p> <p>The ABF spends approximately one-third of its income on international representation. During the last few years income is relatively static while the costs of international travel have increased. Assuming that a fixed amount is available for international representation:</p> <p>22. Would you prefer to receive less subsidy for more events?</p>	-28%	-33%	-29%	-33%	0%	Most disagree.
<p>23. Would you prefer to receive more subsidy for less events?</p>	3%	17%	-13%	29%	-29%	Neutral