

AUSTRALIAN BRIDGE FEDERATION QUESTIONNAIRE

The ABF is concerned to put in place a system in regard to Playoff and Playoff Point Regulations which both produce teams best qualified to perform well for Australia and whose determination is, and is seen to be, fair and equitable.

The ABF has asked the Player Liaison Committee to seek input from concerned players. Your answers will be compiled and seriously consulted in adjustments to the present method.

We are issuing this questionnaire to members of the "Playoff Panels" for the Open, Women's and Senior Playoffs for 2001 and 2002. Please complete it and either

- | |
|--|
| 1. Leave it in the <i>Player Liaison Committee</i> box at the Playoff, or |
| 2. Mail it to: ABF Player Liaison Committee,
PO Box 397, Fyshwick, ACT 2609 |
| <i>Please send your response by 31 March 2002</i> |

About You

To identify differences in views we ask for limited information about your Playoff eligibility and past experience. But, we will protect your confidentiality and will not identify individual responses to this questionnaire.

Please circle your responses to the following questions:

Were you a member of the Open Playoff Panel in 2001 or 2002 (or both)?		Yes	No
How many Open Playoffs have you played in?	None	1 or 2	3 or more

Were you a member of the Women's Playoff Panel in 2001 or 2002 (or both)?		Yes	No
How many Women's Playoffs have you played in?	None	1 or 2	3 or more

Were you a member of the Senior Playoff Panel in 2001 or 2002 (or both)?		Yes	No
How many Senior Playoffs have you played in?	None	1 or 2	3 or more

Playoff Points & Eligibility *(Please circle one response only to each of the following questions)*

1. Should Playoff Points not earned with the partner proposed for the Playoffs:					
a. be reduced by 50% <i>(current rule)</i>	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
b. be reduced by say 20-25%	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
c. not be reduced at all	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
2. Should pairs who have not earned any Playoff Points in the same unit be able to enter the Playoff? <i>(currently not allowed)</i>	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
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? <i>(currently allowed)</i>	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
4. Should the minimum Playoff Points for players to be eligible to enter the Playoffs be raised?	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
5. Should the minimum Playoff Points for players to be eligible to enter the Playoffs be lowered?	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
6. Is the allocation of Playoff Points to ABF events fairly distributed?	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree

(Details of awards for individual events are on pages 7 and 8. Please complete pages 7-8 if you want to comment on individual awards.)

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?	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
--	-------------------	----------	----------------------------	-------	----------------

ABF Player Liaison Committee
Playoff Questionnaire

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?	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly 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?	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree

Format Of Playoff

10. Should the system of recent years (i.e. qualification as a team) continue?	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
11. Should a Butler Final, whose entrants are arrived at by acquisition of PQPs, such as proposed for 2002, apply for all years?	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
12. Within the constraints of practicality should a combination of the two above be attempted?	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
13. On the Zonal Playoff years do you consider it appropriate to use the Zonal Playoff, as at present, to select the Australian team?	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree

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?	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
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?	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
b. Should the team of 4 be able to choose its third pair from any players on the PQP list, with ABF approval?	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly 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?	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
b. Should the round robin format be replaced by straight knockout?	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree

Board Requirements

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). 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.

17. Do you agree with the new board rule?	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
18. Would you prefer the ABF to revert to the '50% or more' board rule?	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
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?	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
b. Should the Board Requirement apply to each team played in the round robin?	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree

Awards

The ABF gives medals for 1st or 2nd in ABF events.

20. Do you think the winner should receive a medal?	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
21. Do you think runners up should receive a medal?	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree

Open Playoff Point Allocations (*These carry over to Women's / Senior*)

Event	Place	Current allocation			
International representative (prev. year)		Minimum to qualify for P/O	Too high	About right	Too low
South West Pacific Teams	1 st	15	Too high	About right	Too low
National Open Teams	1 st	60	Too high	About right	Too low
	2 nd	30	Too high	About right	Too low
	3 rd	15	Too high	About right	Too low
	4 th	15	Too high	About right	Too low
	5 th	6	Too high	About right	Too low
	6 th	6	Too high	About right	Too low
	7 th	6	Too high	About right	Too low
	8 th	6	Too high	About right	Too low
Gold Coast Pairs	1 st	20	Too high	About right	Too low
	2 nd	15	Too high	About right	Too low
	3 rd	10	Too high	About right	Too low
	4 th	5	Too high	About right	Too low
Gold Coast Teams	1 st	36	Too high	About right	Too low
	2 nd	18	Too high	About right	Too low
2002 Teams Selection (Pairs Playoff)	1 st	35	Too high	About right	Too low
	2 nd	30	Too high	About right	Too low
	3 rd	25	Too high	About right	Too low
	4 th	20	Too high	About right	Too low
	5 th	15	Too high	About right	Too low
	6 th	10	Too high	About right	Too low
Autumn National Open Teams	1 st	36	Too high	About right	Too low
	2 nd	18	Too high	About right	Too low
Victor Champion Cup	1 st	36	Too high	About right	Too low
	2 nd	18	Too high	About right	Too low
	3 rd	12	Too high	About right	Too low
Butler	1 st	55	Too high	About right	Too low
	2 nd	50	Too high	About right	Too low
	3 rd	45	Too high	About right	Too low
	4 th	30	Too high	About right	Too low
	5 th	25	Too high	About right	Too low
	6 th	20	Too high	About right	Too low
ANC Open Teams	1 st	30	Too high	About right	Too low
	2 nd	12	Too high	About right	Too low
ANC Representative in Open Team		6	Too high	About right	Too low
Dick Cummings Blue Ribbon Pairs	1 st	25	Too high	About right	Too low
	2 nd	20	Too high	About right	Too low
	3 rd	15	Too high	About right	Too low
	4 th	10	Too high	About right	Too low
ABF Swiss Pairs	1 st	20	Too high	About right	Too low
	2 nd	15	Too high	About right	Too low
	3 rd	10	Too high	About right	Too low
	4 th	5	Too high	About right	Too low
Grand National Open Teams	1 st	36	Too high	About right	Too low
	2 nd	18	Too high	About right	Too low
Spring National Open Teams	1 st	36	Too high	About right	Too low
	2 nd	18	Too high	About right	Too low

Should any other events (or lower placings get awards?

.....

Women's Playoff Point Allocations

Event	Place	Current allocation			
International representative (prev. year)		Minimum to qualify for P/O	Too high	About right	Too low
National Women's Teams	1 st	60	Too high	About right	Too low
	2 nd	30	Too high	About right	Too low
	3 rd	15	Too high	About right	Too low
	4 th	15	Too high	About right	Too low
	5 th	6	Too high	About right	Too low
	6 th	6	Too high	About right	Too low
Butler	1 st	55	Too high	About right	Too low
	2 nd	50	Too high	About right	Too low
	3 rd	45	Too high	About right	Too low
	4 th	30	Too high	About right	Too low
	5 th	25	Too high	About right	Too low
	6 th	20	Too high	About right	Too low
ANC Women's Teams	1 st	30	Too high	About right	Too low
	2 nd	12	Too high	About right	Too low
ANC Rep in Women's Team		6	Too high	About right	Too low
Hans Rosendorff Memorial	1 st	20	Too high	About right	Too low
	2 nd	8	Too high	About right	Too low
Spring National Women's Teams	1 st	36	Too high	About right	Too low
	2 nd	18	Too high	About right	Too low

Senior Playoff Point Allocations

Event	Place	Current allocation			
International representative (prev. year)		Minimum to qualify for P/O	Too high	About right	Too low
National Senior Teams	1 st	60	Too high	About right	Too low
	2 nd	30	Too high	About right	Too low
	3 rd	15	Too high	About right	Too low
	4 th	15	Too high	About right	Too low
Gold Coast Senior's Pairs	1 st	10	Too high	About right	Too low
	2 nd	5	Too high	About right	Too low
Gold Coast Senior's Teams	1 st	36	Too high	About right	Too low
	2 nd	18	Too high	About right	Too low
McCance Trophy	1 st	12 or 1/table	Too high	About right	Too low
	2 nd	6 or 0.5/table	Too high	About right	Too low
Butler	1 st	55	Too high	About right	Too low
	2 nd	50	Too high	About right	Too low
	3 rd	45	Too high	About right	Too low
	4 th	30	Too high	About right	Too low
	5 th	25	Too high	About right	Too low
	6 th	20	Too high	About right	Too low
ANC Senior's Teams	1 st	30	Too high	About right	Too low
	2 nd	12	Too high	About right	Too low
ANC Rep in Senior's Team		6	Too high	About right	Too low
Sydney Festival Senior's	1 st	36	Too high	About right	Too low
	2 nd	18	Too high	About right	Too low