

PROPOSED RULE CHANGES

We have detailed below the proposed changes to the rules of our Championship.

As previously notified, we have substantially redrafted the entire set of Rules and Playing Conditions. This has been undertaken to reduce anomalies that have built up over 30 years, to reduce the burden of administration, and to rationalise the rules and playing conditions into a more readable form.

We have therefore created the following documents:

- The Surrey Championship Constitution
- Tier One (1st XI Premier and Division One)
- Tier Two (1st XI Divisions 2-4)
- Tier Three (All other Divisions)

The constitution contains all of the rules for the Championship, together with the generic playing conditions that apply across the entire Championship.

The Tier documents contain the specific rules and playing conditions relevant to the named league / division for each format of the game to be played.

The separation of these into their respective documents has made it considerably easier to understand the specific playing conditions relevant for the game that each player will be engaged in.

In all respects, the drafting of the new documents HAS NOT changed any rules, or the intention of any rules, save for that detailed below, upon which we will be voting.

Inevitably, during the redrafting exercise, there has been some merging of rules, and some minor word changes to allow for easier reading. These minor changes are non-significant in the interpretation of our rules. However, if it is discovered that a rule re-draft has compromised its intention, during the 2015 season, we will ask the RPC to recommend new wording for your consideration.

Proposed Substantive Rules Changes for 2015.

Each of these numbered items will be taken as a separate motion for voting at the 2015 AGM, although at the discretion of the AGM items number 8-17 may be taken en bloc.

- 1. The current constitution of the Championship does not reflect the changes which have taken place as a result of the promotion and relegation arrangements between our League and the Fullers League.**

Rationale: The existing rules still assume that clubs will only join if elected by the existing members, and the circumstances in which clubs have one or more sides in one League and one or more in the other, although referred to at scattered points through the rules and playing conditions, are not given a proper overview in one place. The revised Rule 4 addresses these issues and provides a comprehensive account of how clubs and teams will join and leave and makes clear that their status must be looked at in the light of their total presence across both Leagues (“the structure”). It also regularises the handling of situations where clubs find that they have ceased to be able to field a second eleven during the course of a season.

- 2. The following fines (R10 in the old rules) are abolished although the requirement to carry out the relevant actions remains:**

- a. Submission of the Club Information Sheet
- b. Summary Results notification
- c. Submission of the Captains Umpires Report
- d. Entry of the Play-cricket scorecard
- e. Verification of the Play-Cricket Scorecard
- f. Incorrect Result outcome
- g. Failure to make available scorecards to The Statistician
- h. Attendance at RSC Meetings
- i. Submission of end of season reports

Rationale: The Executive believe that the fines regime has become too onerous to clubs, and to manage. We believe that the league is sufficiently mature to be able to comply with the basic compliance regime in place, without having to unduly penalise clubs for minor non-compliance matters.

- 3. The new constitution (R10) allows the Executive to levy a fine to a club where there is a persistent and demonstrable breach in the compliance regime. The Executive will be able to levy a fine not exceeding £100 to such a club. However, the Executive will give due warning to such a club, that it is in danger of having such a fine imposed. The imposition of the fine will be the last resort.**

Rationale: The Executive believe that there should be some measure of sanction to be used as a last resort where there is a club that is **persistently** non-compliant.

- 4. The new rules formally establish the Rules and Playing Conditions (RPC)**

Committee, as a sub-committee of the Executive. (R11(b))

Rationale: The Executive wish to delegate decision making on all RPC matters that require an urgent resolution to its RPC sub-committee, to facilitate rapid and consistent application of rules and playing conditions in dispute. The RPC will also be responsible for advising on amending rules and playing conditions for consideration by the Executive and the AGM. **Note** that this system of delegation currently exists and this rule change formalises this arrangement.

5. The Structure of the 4th XI League has been changed (Tier 3) to reflect the structure that exists in the 3rd XI League. Apart from in the Premier Division of the 3rd XI League, all other Divisions will play 45 overs per side in the Limited Overs format.

Rationale: This has been requested by a majority of 4th XI clubs, to help enhance the standard of cricket, by introducing a tier between the Premier Division and the regional divisions.

6. The Facilities & Grounds Sub-Committee wording has been redrafted to assist clubs in understanding the advisory and mandatory requirements for The Championship.

Rationale: Minor amendments to bring into focus how as a sub-committee we operate. New PC10 (a) revised to replace old PC9 (f)(i) to reflect current operating procedure as part of existing procedure is redundant. Old PC9 (f) (ii) relocated to new R10 (j).

7. New Bonus Points system. ALL TIERS

Proposal as set out in Generic Playing Condition 5 of the Constitution.

Rationale: The 2013 survey of players together with feedback from clubs indicates that many players believe that the number of points currently available to sides which fail to win but may have played a full part in a well-contested game is a poor reward for their efforts. The proposal seeks to deliver both incentives and rewards for good cricket while ensuring:

- (i) Winning a match outright is always the most preferred objective for a captain;
- (ii) winning a Time match is of greater value than winning a Limited Overs match;
- (iii) the total bonus points expected to be won are split fairly equally between batting points and bowling points.

The proposal is close to that used in the Essex League for some time, and also similar to that used in the Fullers Brewery Surrey County League since its inception in 1991.

Contra view: The current system works well enough and incentivises sides to win matches. Specifically in relation to bonus points for limited overs matches, the

professional game does not have this. Currently in timed matches getting a Losing Draw gives a team the same number of points as an Abandoned Match whereas in this proposal a team could get more or less points for a losing draw than the 4 points proposed for an Abandoned match (by playing enough cricket to score sufficient runs or take sufficient wickets to achieve more bonus points).

If voted down: A second proposal, identical to the first proposal EXCEPT there would not be bonus points available in Limited Overs matches will be voted on, If this is voted down then the current points system will remain and PC5 will be drafted to reflect the same.

8. Change of start times. ALL TIERS

Proposal: to bring the start time forward by 30 minutes in Rounds 17 and 18 instead of just matches in September.

Rationale: A few years ago the earlier start time was for the last two rounds of the Championship and was changed to matches in September only. Twice in the last three seasons the last Saturday in August has experienced bad light issues (and these matches can be important in the context promotion and relegation places), and this proposal would reduce this risk.

If voted down: The current rule of earlier starts in September only will remain.

9. Have consistent meal interval duration. TIER ONE and TIER TWO.

Proposal: All meal intervals to be of 30 minutes duration. Affects Limited Overs matches in Tier One and Tier Two (between innings interval, currently 40 minutes) and Time matches in Tier One (currently Lunch is 40 minutes and Tea is 20 minutes).

Rationale: 35 or 40 minute intervals are longer than is required, often players and umpires feel they are waiting around for no good reason, when they feel they could be playing. Brings forward the finishing time of Limited Overs matches by 10 minutes.

Contra view: 30 minutes might not be long enough for some clubs to get a proper meal served and consumed. A longer lunch interval than tea interval is part of cricket tradition.

If voted down: Current interval durations will remain.

10. Abolish Free Hits in Limited Overs matches. TIER ONE and Tier TWO.

Proposal: Remove the Free Hit playing conditions.

Rationale: Simplification of playing conditions.

If voted down: Current Free Hit playing conditions will remain.

11. Penalty Runs for No Ball in Limited Overs matches. TIER ONE and TIER TWO.

Proposal: Reduce the penalty for a No Ball from 2 runs to 1 run.

Rationale: Simplification of playing conditions and brings consistency between the two formats.

Contra view: All Limited Overs cricket at professional level has 2 runs for a No Ball.

If voted down: Current Penalty of 2 runs will remain.

12. Bouncers over Head Height in Limited Overs matches. TIER ONE and TIER TWO.

Proposal: Any delivery which passes over the head of the batsman standing upright at the popping crease to be a No Ball.

Rationale: Brings consistency between the two formats and is in line with the Laws of Cricket and professional cricket in the UK. Currently in Limited Overs matches a bouncer over head height is a Wide, and since a delivery cannot be called a Wide if the batsman hits it, a batsman can currently be out caught off a delivery which is not considered legitimate.

Contra view: In ODIs a bouncer over head height is a Wide.

If voted down: Current playing condition will remain.

13. Revision in total number of overs of Powerplay in Limited Overs matches, when an innings is reduced. TIER ONE and TIER TWO.

Proposal: To bring the table showing the total number of powerplay overs when an innings is reduced in length, into line with that used in 50 overs matches professional cricket.

Rationale: To be consistent with what is used in professional cricket. When the table was introduced into the Surrey Championship playing conditions, it was in line with the table then used in professional cricket. However over the years, the authorities have made minor revisions to this table, so that our table is slightly different.

Contra view: Differences are minor, so does it really matter.

If voted down: Existing table would remain.

14. Fielding Powerplay in Limited Overs matches. TIER ONE.

Proposal: Abolish the Fielding Powerplay in Limited Overs matches.

Rationale: The Fielding Powerplay has long since been discontinued in professional cricket since it was seen a serving no useful purpose in the game.

If voted down: Fielding Powerplay would remain.

15. Revising overs still to be played in Limited Overs matches. TIER TWO.

Proposal: When a match is interrupted, the revised number of overs in the match shall be calculated by reference to the time remaining to the Scheduled Close rather than the playing time actually lost.

Rationale: Tier One and Tier Two are currently inconsistent on this. The Tier Two playing conditions mean that once about two hours of playing time have been lost to interruptions, the match must be abandoned. However this works against a team who managed to bowl out their opponents quickly – in such a situation a match may be abandoned once sufficient time had been lost even though there is much more time available until the Scheduled Close. For example match starts at 12 noon, side batting first are bowled by 1.30 pm, after 25 overs. If rain falls and the match cannot restart by 4.18pm then currently the match is Abandoned, despite the fact that the (proposed) Scheduled Close is not until 7.20pm.

If voted down: Current basis for revising overs would remain.

16. Revising overs still to be played in Time matches. TIER ONE and TIER TWO.

Proposal: When a match is interrupted in the 1st innings, for each full period of 7 minutes of playing time lost, the maximum number of overs for the 1st innings shall be reduced by one over and the minimum number of overs for the 2nd innings shall be reduced by one over.

Rationale: Simplification of rules and making them consistent with TIER THREE. Many captains and players believe this proposal is what the playing conditions currently say. In fact, currently for each full period of 7 minutes of playing time lost, the maximum number of overs for the 1st innings is reduced by one and the minimum number of overs for the 2nd innings is reduced by 1.22 overs (with any fractions rounded up). This means that the number of overs in the match is always reduced by more than that implied by the time actually lost. Captains that do not understand this wrinkle in the playing conditions can find themselves declaring to leave a certain number of overs in the second innings, and then left with either bowling more overs than they expected or faced a penalty for a slow over rate.

Contra view: An interruption in the first innings can work to the advantage of the side batting second, who will know at the start of their innings that they have a smaller number of overs for their innings and thus can afford to take more risks. The

current playing condition makes an attempt to dilute this advantage.

If voted down: Current basis of revising overs will remain.

17. Abandonment of Time matches. TIER ONE and TIER TWO.

Proposal: If, following an interruption, the overs **available** to the side batting second falls below 20, the match shall be abandoned.

Rationale: Brings consistency across formats (in Limited Overs matches, a match is Abandoned if less than 20 overs are available to be bowled in the 2nd innings). Currently the umpires must abandon the match if less than 10 overs can be bowled in the 2nd innings, though since points for the Winning and Losing Draw are only gained if at least 20 overs are bowled in the 2nd innings, captains are, in practice, happy to agree to abandon a match at that point.

Contra view: Very occasionally, if the side bowling first has bowled well, it may be possible for them to win (outright) a match by batting for less than 20 overs. This proposal would prevent that advantage to the side batting second.

If voted down: Current basis for Abandonment will remain.