

Review of the CM Edition of the Laws of the Sport of Bowls: Accepted Proposals

1. Consultation with Member National Authorities (Round 1)

As a result of a first round of consultations between World Bowls (WB) and its Member National Authorities (MNAs) WB issued, on 27th December 2009, a document which listed the proposals for changes to the laws which had been made by the WB Laws Committee (LC) and by MNAs, and the LC's responses to these proposals. In that document the LC accepted the following proposals:

1.1 Changes to the Operation of the Laws

Law	Proposer	Proposal
1.4.3	Canada	Proposal: A definite penalty be inserted into the Laws, for people who "do not play in a sporting manner", such as those who attempt to disguise the fact that they are playing with bowls from different sets.
		Rationale: Ontario recently had a player, play with three bowls from one set and one from another. The bowls were the same make, different sizes, but painted to look identical (enough so that they passed a quick inspection). When one looks at the rules - it implies (states) that people play with a set (Rule 1.4.3 - Page 16). However, there is no penalty for people who do not. One is left with the position that the Umpire changes the bowls (but only after the end of that game, as no 'challenge' may be made sooner) and they continue to play, and in some instances, win the tournament. (Refer to the Bowls Canada Boulingrin proposal document for further explanation.)
		<p>Whilst the Laws Committee rejects this proposal, it accepts an alternative.</p> <p>The premise that “the umpire changes the bowls (but only after the game, as no ‘challenge’ may be made sooner)” is false. It is the duty of the umpire to make sure that all aspects of play are in line with the Laws of the Sport of Bowls - see law 56.2 (5th dot). The umpire should, therefore, have made sure that the bowls were from the same set before the start of the game. If they were not, the player should not have been allowed to play with them – see law 1.4.3.</p> <p>In the light of the issue raised, however, the Laws Committee acknowledges the need to change the wording of the laws to reinforce the intent of the law in this regard – that is, that the use of bowls which are not part of a set of bowls can be challenged. It proposes, therefore, to delete from law 1.4.3 the sentence which reads “In all games, each player should play with the appropriate number of bowls from the same set.” and include the same sentence as a new paragraph - number 9 - in law 8.1. (See also the committee’s response to the proposal from the WB board relating to law 8.4 below.)</p>

Law	Proposer	Proposal
		<p>With regard to the wider aspects of dealing with ‘people who do not play in a sporting manner’ mentioned in the rationale behind the proposal, see the LC’s response to the proposal from USA on law 54.1 in section 1.1 of the document containing details of the proposals rejected by the LC.</p>
4	Laws Committee	<p>Proposal: Add a new paragraph, number 4.6, which reads “If advertising banners are fixed to the face of the bank, they should be made of a material which will not damage the jack or the bowls and should be fixed in such a way that the specifications for the ditch and the bank described in laws 3 and 4 remain applicable. The banners will be regarded as an integral part of the face of the bank for all purposes within the laws.</p> <p>Rationale: To ensure that, if advertising banners are fixed to the face of the bank, their use does not contravene the Laws of the Sport.</p> <p>The Laws Committee accepts this proposal.</p>
5.4 (1 st dot)	Scotland	<p>Proposal: Change to: not more than 50mm wide and not more than 430mm high if they are fixed to the face of the bank.</p> <p>Rationale: Taking up to 430mm, covers the maximum ditch depth and minimum bank height. This would make it easier when using a string or gun sight to determine whether a line bowl or jack is live or dead.</p> <p>The Laws Committee accepts this proposal.</p>
	Jersey	<p>Proposal: Jersey Bowls Umpires Association supports the proposal made by Scotland.</p> <p>Rationale: The suggestion makes perfect sense for the reasons stated particularly as the current requirement of 100mm is far too short.</p> <p>See the Scottish proposal above.</p>
8.4	World Bowls (Board)	<p>Proposal: If a player plays with bowls which are obviously not from the same set (for example, the serial numbers on all bowls are not the same), any challenge should stand without the need to send the bowls to a Licensed Tester. Law 8.4 should be changed to reflect this.</p> <p>The Laws Committee accepts this proposal.</p> <p>The committee proposes to renumber paragraphs 3-6 in law 8.4 as paragraph numbers 4-7 and introduce a new paragraph 3 as follows (note that reference is made to law 8.1.9 – see the committee’s response to the proposal on law 1.4.3 above for its content).</p> <p>“The requirement to send the bowls to a Licensed Tester can be dispensed with if the challenge relates to the bowls not meeting the requirements of law 8.1.9 and the challenge can be dealt with by the Controlling Body without reference to a Licensed Tester (for example, by visual inspection of the serial numbers).</p>

Law	Proposer	Proposal
		<p>If the Controlling Body finds that the challenged set of bowls does meet the requirements of law 8.1.9, the provisions of law 8.4.7 will apply. If the Controlling Body finds that the challenged set of bowls does not meet the requirements of law 8.1.9, the provisions of law 8.5.1 (3rd dot) will apply.”</p>
10 (3 rd dot)	South Africa	<p>Proposal: Change to "... when the distances between them are beyond the range of a telescopic measure",</p>
		<p>Rationale: Surely this is what is meant? As the law reads, it automatically excludes a telescopic measure!</p>
		<p>Whilst the Laws Committee rejects this proposal, it accepts an alternative.</p> <p>However, the law states that a string measure or a telescopic measure can be used if a flexible measure (box or bullet) is not sufficiently long. The committee is no longer aware of any telescopic measure that is longer than a flexible measure (12ft).</p> <p>The committee proposes, therefore, to delete the phrase ‘or a telescopic measure’ from the current law.</p>
15.5.1	Laws Committee	<p>Proposal: In the first sentence change the phrase which currently reads “If a jack in motion passes completely outside the boundaries of the rink of play, or rebounds to a distance of less than 20 metres from the mat line,” to read “If a jack in motion passes completely outside the boundaries of the rink of play, comes to rest in any hollow in the face of the bank, or rebounds to a distance of less than 20 metres from the mat line,”</p>
		<p>Rationale: To ensure that the situations in which a jack is declared dead described in law 15.5 are consistent with those described in law 30.1.</p>
		<p>The Laws Committee accepts this proposal.</p>
15.5.4	Laws Committee	<p>Proposal: Change the phrase which currently reads “If the jack passes over the face of the bank,” to read “If the jack passes above the face of the bank within the side boundaries of the rink of play or comes to rest in any hollow in the face of the bank,”</p>
		<p>Rationale: To clarify that this law applies if a jack passes above the face of the bank within the side boundaries of the rink of play - laws 15.5.2 and 15.5.3 apply if the jack passes above the face of the bank outwith the side boundaries of the rink of play ; and to ensure that the situations in which a jack is declared dead described in law 15.5 are consistent with those covered in law 30.1.</p>
		<p>The Laws Committee accepts this proposal.</p>
15.5.6	World Bowls (G Smith)	<p>Proposal: Would it not be fairer to say that the jack should be placed as near as possible to the covered spot in a position on the line up the green towards the mat line or something like that, a bit like a snooker re-spot?</p>
		<p>Rationale: At present the law dictates that if the relevant spot is already</p>

Law	Proposer	Proposal
		<p>covered then the jack gets re-spotted a further half metre up the green. Personally, I think this potentially punishes a guy who has bowled a nigh on 'perfect' bowl when required to bowl to the spot when in a good position. If he then happens to actually cover the spot his opponent then has nearly half a metre to draw a shot, which of course may be a match winner. We should not have laws that punish a nigh on perfect bowl. (I do not agree that it should be respotted at a point between the covered side spot and the centre spot as utilised by WBT as in affect this could make the jack easier to run into the ditch having a bowl sat on the side of it making a larger target.)</p> <p>The Laws Committee accepts this proposal.</p> <p>The committee proposes to replace the current wording of the law with the following.</p> <p>“If any of the spots mentioned in paragraphs 2, 3, and 4 above are partly or completely covered by a bowl, the jack should be placed as close to the covered spot as possible in a direct line between that spot and the corresponding spot at the opposite end of the rink without touching a bowl”</p>
16.1.3	World Bowls (Board)	<p>Proposal: Change to: Triples: Two or three bowls can be played, with each player playing in turn. The formats of play will be 18 ends (each player plays 2 bowls), 15 ends (each player plays 3 bowls), sets play or any other format decided beforehand by WB.</p> <p>Rationale: The number of ends played in Pairs and Fours was reduced in an earlier edition of the laws without a corresponding reduction in the number of ends played in Triples being made.</p> <p>The Laws Committee accepts this proposal.</p>
16.2.3	World Bowls (Board)	<p>Proposal: Change to: Triples: Two or three bowls can be played, with each player playing in turn. The formats of play will be 18 ends (each player plays 2 bowls), 15 ends (each player plays 3 bowls), sets play or any other format decided beforehand by WB.</p> <p>Rationale: The number of ends played in Pairs and Fours was reduced in an earlier edition of the laws without a corresponding reduction in the number of ends played in Triples being made.</p> <p>The Laws Committee accepts this proposal.</p>
16.3	Laws Committee	<p>Proposal: Change the current unnumbered paragraph to become paragraph number 16.3.1. Add a new paragraph, number 16.3.2, which reads</p> <p>Changing the programme The Controlling Body has the power to alter or amend the programme of the Championship as it considers necessary or appropriate if the weather or other conditions are unsuitable or, in the case of indoor play, if there is a power failure and the lighting is affected. The Controlling Body can also suspend play temporarily in any game or abandon any game, and it can also alter any of the conditions of its programme if it decides that this is</p>

Law	Proposer	Proposal
		<p>essential to successfully carry out or finish the Championship.</p> <p>Rationale: For domestic events, to give Controlling Bodies flexibility over the action which they can take in addition to that described in their Conditions of Play to ensure that their programme can be completed in a satisfactory manner should they be faced with unforeseen or extenuating circumstances. The wording of the law reflects that which is applicable to world events and Commonwealth Games (law 16.1.5) and international events (law 16.2.7).</p> <p>The Laws Committee accepts this proposal.</p>
17.2	Laws Committee	<p>Proposal: At its meeting in January 2008, the WB Board considered a request by Bowls New Zealand to allow domestic regulations to be made to laws 23 and 31 to cover time-limit games in line with the following.</p> <p>Law 23 – Following one improper delivery of the jack, the opposing skip should tell their lead where to place the mat and then the skip should place the jack on the centre-line of the rink (the position of both the mat and the jack to be consistent with the laws).</p> <p>Law 31 – If an end is declared dead after the time-limit warning has been given, the end should be counted as a played end.</p> <p>The WB Board granted permission to Bowls NZ to experiment with this during domestic play and provide feedback on the experiment. Bowls NZ has provided the following feedback.</p> <p>“The placing of the jack by the opposing skip has been very well received and has been successfully deployed by the rank and file members of Bowls NZ.</p> <p>Some confusion has arisen in competitions where the experimental law is not used.</p> <p>It is clear to us that for competitions that are up to one day duration, non-championship and are “fun” rather than serious, there should be flexibility given to Controlling Bodies in formulating Conditions of Play.</p> <p>Any competition that is of a Club Championship status and /or leads on to a District/Centre and then a National play off must be played strictly in accordance with the Laws.</p> <p>Our recommendation is that Controlling Bodies should have the option of adding the experimental conditions to Conditions of Play for all competitions other than those referred to in paragraph 4 above.”</p> <p>The Laws Committee acknowledges that clubs currently run, and wish to continue to run, ‘fun’ competitions in which some aspects of play can differ from those described within the laws. Whilst the proposal from NZ contains some examples of these, the committee is aware of many others – such as those included in the proposal from Israel below.</p> <p>The committee does not wish to stifle such competitions by insisting on a rigid application of the laws (such competitions help attract new members to clubs and the sport as well as providing relaxation and enjoyment for the purely recreational bowler). However, instead of changing individual laws in line with those suggested in the NZ proposal, the committee proposes to give clubs the desired</p>

Law	Proposer	Proposal
		<p>flexibility by replacing the current wording of law 17.2 with the following.</p> <p>17.2. Conditions of Play</p> <p>1 Controlling Bodies should decide what Conditions of Play are necessary to govern their competitions.</p> <p>2 Controlling Bodies governing club competitions which are purely social or recreational in nature (that is, competitions that do not directly or indirectly lead to the winners either being awarded a club title or qualifying to compete for a district, national or international title) can decide on Conditions of Play which include aspects of play which differ in some respects from those described within the Laws of the Sport of Bowls.</p> <p>3 Controlling Bodies governing competitions other than the specific club competitions described in paragraph 2 above should make sure that their Conditions of Play are in line with the requirements described in appendix A.1.</p>
	Israel	<p>Proposal: We agree with the NZ proposal and suggest that at the end of the sentence relating to law 31 be added "and the game is completed".</p> <p>Arising from above: The time-limit warning is given just after the jack has been delivered, and the jack is improperly delivered. A ruling must be applied which specifies that either the head continues in terms of law 23, or the game is ended. Our suggestion is that the game continues.</p> <p>See the NZ proposal above.</p>
18.4	Australia	<p>Proposal: Amend law 18.4 to ensure that an unfair advantage is not taken by a player/team constantly having the last bowl – the law should revert to the proven method of the winner of the previous end taking the mat and jack.</p> <p>Rationale: Giving the winner of the previous end the option of playing first or second has proven to be too much of an advantage – in particular, the advantage of having the last bowl has proven to be the determining factor in many games – far more so than having the choice of rolling the jack to the preferred length. Having the last bowl enables anyone (particularly good to elite players) the chance to add to the head if holding shot; or convert/kill using a variety of shots from trail shots to the drive. (Refer to the Bowls Australia proposal document for further explanation.)</p> <p>The Laws Committee accepts this proposal. (Several other MNAs submitted proposals for making the same change to this law.)</p>
19.1.5	Laws Committee	<p>Proposal: In the first sentence change the phrase which currently reads “for the first end and every end after that” to read “in line with the requirements described in law 1.3.12” . After the first sentence, add a new sentence which reads “Groundsheets should be securely fastened to the surface of the green and should remain in the same position for the duration of the game or until such time as the Controlling Body decides</p>

Law	Proposer	Proposal
		that their use is no longer required.”
		Rationale: To clarify the intent of the current law.
		The Laws Committee accepts this proposal.
23	Australia	Proposal: Alter law 23.1 (and associated laws) to change the minimum length of an end from 23m to 21m to allow for both long and short ends.
		Rationale: This will provide for a greater variation in the legal length of the delivery of the jack – allowing players to showcase all skills. Currently the potential difference between a maximum length and minimum length end is only four (4) metres – this change would provide a six (6) metre differentiation for long and short ends. (Refer to the Bowls Australia proposal document for further explanation.)
		The Laws Committee acknowledges that Australia has a large number of minimum sized greens and the rationale put forward has relevance in that situation. Accordingly, the committee accepts the proposal that MNAs be allowed to make a domestic regulation to cover the situation described
28.5.1	Welsh Ump. Association	Proposal: We suggest the options should be the same as in 28.5.2 “the skips or opponents in Singles should put the displaced bowl where they believe it would have come to rest. If they cannot agree on the bowl’s final position, the end should be declared dead”.
		Rationale: We consider that it is not appropriate to expect a marker to make a judgement on where the bowl would have come to rest. If an umpire is called on to give advice in this situation, he/she is in no position to adjudicate on where the bowl would have come to rest, nor has he the option to declare the end dead.
		The Laws Committee accepts this proposal. The committee’s acceptance, however, is based not on the rationale put forward by the Welsh Umpires’ Association but on the following. Law 28.5.1 is the only section of the displacement law in which the marker is asked to deal with a bowl which was not at rest when it was displaced (in all other sections of the law, the marker only deals with bowls which were previously at rest). The proposed change will ensure consistency within the overall displacement law.
30	Laws Committee	Proposal: Add a new paragraph, number 30.5, which reads “If the jack is dead, Member National Authorities can decide, for domestic play, not to have the end declared dead. Instead, they can decide to have the jack re-spotted in line with law 15.5.”
		Rationale: The current wording of law 17.1.1 (12 th dot) permits Member National Authorities to make domestic regulations for re-spotting the jack in formats of play other than sets play. It refers to law 15.5 but there is no corresponding reference to this within that law. The proposal to add a new law numbered 30.5 addresses this anomaly.

Law	Proposer	Proposal
		The Laws Committee accepts this proposal.
31.3	Scotland	Proposal: Change to: If the jack and bowls need to be transferred to the opposite end of the rink before the end is replayed, as part of the etiquette of bowls, they should be carried up the rink.
		Rationale: As there is no penalty for infringing this law, it should be pointed out the reason for complying with the law.
		The Laws Committee rejects this proposal. However, the committee proposes that the current wording be included within brackets at the end of law 31.2 and law 31.3 be deleted. This would enable the wording to be regarded as 'supplementary / explanatory information' instead of as a law in its own right.
	Jersey	Proposal: Jersey Bowls Umpires Association supports the proposal made by Scotland.
		Rationale: Following a dead end you will be aware of how players apply themselves in the course of transferring bowls to the other end. There remains a strong tendency to literally chuck them down with little regard to play on other rinks and the proposal to bring some etiquette into the game can only be encouraged.
		See the Scottish proposal above.
	Wales	Proposal: Delete this section of the law altogether.
		Rationale: There is no penalty if the players roll the bowls back or continue to infringe this law after being informed. Never caused any problem before, even on fast greens.
		See the Scottish proposal above.
		Welsh Ump. Association
		Rationale: Unless there is a penalty for infringing this law, it should be deleted.
		See the Scottish proposal above.
36.1.2	Laws Committee	Proposal: Add a new dot point before the current 1 st dot point which reads "behind the jack if members of the team which is in possession of the rink" Change the current first dot point which currently reads "behind the jack and away from the head" to read "behind the jack and away from the head if members of the team which is not in possession of the rink"
		Rationale: Under the current laws there is no differentiation between the position of players at the head-end of the rink who are in possession of the rink and that of those who are not. The proposed change, whilst ensuring that players not in possession of the rink remain behind the jack and away from the head, gives players in possession of the rink more flexibility when taking up their positions.(It is not unusual or unreasonable for players in

Law	Proposer	Proposal
		possession of the rink to be in the head whilst their colleague is about to play and they are less likely than their opponents to take up positions which will interfere with or annoy their colleagues.)
		The Laws Committee accepts this proposal.
37.1	England	Proposal: Bowls England wishes to propose that the following addition is added at 37.1.8: The skip in a Triples game should perform the duties of the second, as described in law 37.3.
		Rationale: It is felt that many players and teams already allocate this duty to the skip during a game of triples, as the second has additional duties to perform during the game of Triples, for example agreeing the number of shots and measuring.
		The Laws Committee accepts this proposal. The committee is aware, however, that acceptance of the proposal will introduce an inconsistency within the laws. The current laws are consistent in that the second deals with the score card in all team games – Pairs, Triples and Fours. Acceptance of the proposal results in an inconsistency because the score card will be dealt with by the second in Pairs and Fours and the skip in Triples (or, put another way, the skip in Pairs and Triples and the second in Fours). The committee seeks the views of MNAs on whether they wish either to accept this inconsistency or to remove the inconsistency by having the skips mark the score card in all team games (that is, including Fours). (Note: The views received from MNAs, and the LC’s response to these, are included under law 37.1 in section 2.1 of this document.)
	Australia	Proposal: Alter 37.1.7 to reflect that the skip is in a better position to mark the scorecard than the second in a triples game.
		Rationale: In triples, the second has the duties of determining the head, measuring any disputed shots, kicking back bowls and marking the scorecard. Having the responsibility of keeping the scorecard allocated to the skip would alleviate some of the tasks of the second. (Refer to the Bowls Australia proposal document for further explanation.)
		See the English proposal above.
38.3	Australia	Proposal: Add in the words “Athletes in a wheelchair (who require an assistant)...” at the commencement of 38.3.
		Rationale: The reference to an assistant in 38.3 applies only to partially sighted and blind bowlers – this should be extended to include ‘athletes in a wheelchair’ (who require an assistant). The ‘assistant’ would be bound by the same laws as the player. (Refer to the Bowls Australia proposal document for further explanation.)
		The Laws Committee accepts this proposal.

Law	Proposer	Proposal
	Scotland	<p>Proposal: Change to: Partially sighted and blind bowlers can use any form of assistance necessary (including the use of a fine white breakable string, up the centre of the rink) (including having an assistant, with them) to allow them to take part in the sport of bowls, as long as the assistance is approved by the Governing Body for partial sighted and blind bowlers in the country in which the player is playing.</p>
		<p>Rationale: Although the current law appears to cover this requirement already, some sighted bowlers, when playing visually impaired bowlers are challenging the use of the string. They are interpreting the assistance part of the law as physical assistance only and therefore challenge the use of a string. The string is required to establish that the mat is on the centre line and allow the player to line up properly for delivery of bowl or jack.</p>
		<p>The Laws Committee accepts this proposal.</p>
	Jersey	<p>Proposal: Jersey Bowls Umpires Association supports the proposal made by Scotland.</p>
		<p>Rationale: Players with disabilities need all the help they can get and it is a pity that the use of a string is being challenged. We feel that umpires generally will support any assistance given to visually impaired players provided there are no obstructions on the green or that the assistant (if any) is not involved in the physical actions of their play (i.e. delivery).</p>
		<p>See the response to the Scottish proposal above.</p>
46.1.2	Laws Committee	<p>Proposal: Change the phrase which currently reads “If, within 30 minutes after the scheduled start time for a game,” to read “If, 30 minutes after the scheduled start time for a game, or sooner if decided by the Controlling Body,”</p>
		<p>Rationale: The period of 30 minutes is considered to be excessive in some situations – for example, during competitions which have a number of rounds scheduled to be played on the same day. The proposed change gives Controlling Bodies the option of introducing a shorter period if they consider it appropriate.</p>
		<p>The Laws Committee accepts this proposal.</p>
46.2.2	Laws Committee	<p>Proposal: Change the phrase which currently reads “If, within 30 minutes after the scheduled start time for a game,” to read “If, 30 minutes after the scheduled start time for a game, or sooner if decided by the Controlling Body,”</p>
		<p>Rationale: The rationale for the proposed change is the same as that for the change to law 46.1.2.</p>
		<p>The Laws Committee accepts this proposal.</p>
A.1.4	Laws Committee	<p>Proposal: Add a new dot point following the current 4th dot point which reads “The period immediately following the scheduled start time for a game within which players should be present.”</p>
		<p>Rationale: The proposed changes to laws 46.1.2 and 46.2.2 (described above) give Controlling Bodies the option of introducing a ‘waiting’ period for absentee players shorter than the current 30 minutes. This proposed</p>

Law	Proposer	Proposal
		change requires that Controlling Bodies provide details of any shortened period in their Conditions of Play.
		The Laws Committee accepts this proposal.
A.4.2	Australia	Proposal: Add in the words "...or a singles player can ask the marker..." after the word "head" in A.4.2.
		Rationale: As this law relates to law A4.1, the skip in pairs, triples and fours is covered, but the law does not adequately provide guidance for a singles game where the players request to visit the head. (Refer to the Bowls Australia proposal document for further explanation.)
		The Laws Committee accepts this proposal.

1.2 Changes to the Format / Presentation of the Laws

Law	Proposer	Proposal
Various	Australia	Proposal: Amend all dot points to a continuation of the decimal numbering system – ensuring only the decimal system is used.
		Rationale: The reference system used in the laws of the sport should be consistent and clear – a decimal numbering system is the only method which can provide the required clarity. (Refer to the Bowls Australia proposal document for further explanation.)
		The Laws Committee accepts this proposal. Note, however, that the committee received the following comment on the proposal from PEC. “Our experience shows that the decimal numbering system can get very confusing (1.3.13), but using this style of numbering would not prevent you from keeping your Crystal Mark approval.”
8	South Africa	Proposal: After Law 8.2 insert paragraph 8.6 and call it 8.3. Then the old 8.3 becomes 8.4, and so on.
		Rationale: Makes sense to me.
		The Laws Committee accepts this proposal.
15.2	Laws Committee	Proposal: Change the wording of the law to reflect the following wording approved at the Biennial Council Meeting held in Christchurch in January 2008. 15.2 Tie-breaker 1 If the game is tied after the two sets have been completed (each player or team having won one set or both sets having been drawn), a tie-breaker consisting of three ends should be played to decide the winner. 2 The winner of the tie-breaker will be the player or team with the highest number of shots when the third end is completed. 3 There should be no further play in the tie-breaker if, at any point, it becomes impossible for one player or team to draw or win the tie-breaker, given the number of ends left. 4 If the shot scores are tied after the third end of the tie-breaker, the players or teams should play a fourth tie-breaker end to decide the winner. 5 If the fourth end of a tie-breaker is a tied end, the players or teams will play more tie-breaker ends until a winner is found.
		Rationale: To ensure that the amendment to law 15.2 previously approved by the WB membership and currently in operation is included in the next edition of the Laws of the Sport of Bowls.
		The Laws Committee accepts this proposal.
16.2.6	South Africa	Proposal: Change to: “... The game will end when the pre-arranged number of shots or ends has been completed; or when there is a prearranged time limit, the end in progress will be completed as soon as the time limit is reached.”

Law	Proposer	Proposal
		<p>Rationale: Surely this makes better sense? (Much clearer to us.)</p> <p>The Laws Committee rejects this proposal but accepts the alternative suggested by PEC.</p> <p>The committee has received the following comment on the proposal from PEC.</p> <p>“The version suggested is not clear to me. I suggest: ‘The game will end:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ when a pre-arranged number of shots has been scored; ○ when a pre-arranged number of ends has been completed; or ○ if an end is in progress when a pre-arranged time limit is reached, when that end has been completed.’”
17.1.1 (12 th dot)	Laws Committee	<p>Proposal: Change the reference to law 15.5 to law 30.5.</p> <p>Rationale: The current wording refers to law 15.5 but there is no provision within that law to allow Member National Authorities to make domestic regulations for re-spotting the jack in formats of play other than sets play. This anomaly in the current laws has been addressed by the proposal to add a new law numbered 30.5 (see below).</p> <p>The Laws Committee accepts this proposal.</p>
23.1 (3 rd dot)	Laws Committee	<p>Proposal: Change the phrase which currently reads “less than 23 metres from the mat line after the jack has been centred” to read “at a distance of less than 23 metres as measured in a straight line from the centre of the mat line to the nearest point of the jack after the jack has been centred”</p> <p>Rationale: To ensure consistency of wording with the proposed change to law 30.1 (see below)</p> <p>The Laws Committee accepts this proposal.</p>
27.1 (3 rd dot)	Laws Committee	<p>Proposal: Change the phrase which currently reads “it comes to rest less than 14 metres as measured in a straight line from the mat line” to read “it comes to rest at a distance of less than 14 metres as measured in a straight line from the centre of the mat line to the nearest point of the bowl”</p> <p>Rationale: To ensure consistency of wording with the proposed change to law 30.1 (see below)</p> <p>The Laws Committee accepts this proposal.</p>
28, 33	M Cowan – Laws Committee	<p>Proposal: One piece of information that I think would be beneficial to the umpires is a graph/table for Law 28 Bowl Displacement and Law 33 Jack Displacement inserted as an Appendix.</p> <p>Rationale: Many umpires have made up their own and consistently use this type of mapping as the players tell their story instead of trying to work out the wording in the Laws.</p> <p>The Laws Committee accepts this proposal.</p>

Law	Proposer	Proposal
		A draft table is included in section 1.3 of this document for illustrative purposes.
30.1 (4 th dot)	Laws Committee	Proposal: Change the phrase which currently reads “comes to rest at a distance of less than 20 metres as measured in a straight line from the mat line” to read “comes to rest at a distance of less than 20 metres as measured in a straight line from the centre of the mat line to the nearest point of the jack”
		Rationale: To eliminate current misinterpretations of the phrase “as measured in a straight line from the mat line” which have resulted in the distance being incorrectly measured from the mat line in a straight line along the centre line of the rink.
		The Laws Committee accepts this proposal.
	South Africa	Proposal: Suggest “... as measured in a straight line from the centre of the mat line to the nearest point of the jack.”
		Rationale: N/a The wording of this proposal is similar to the wording of the proposal previously submitted by the Laws Committee – see above.
34.2.2	South Africa	Proposal: Should read: “in the presence of the skip, and advise the manager or coach when they are present, that a warning has been given.”
		Rationale: The parenthetic commas are necessary.
		The Laws Committee rejects this proposal but accepts the alternative suggested by PEC. The committee has received the following comment on the proposal from PEC. “I agree that the parenthetical commas improve the sentence as it stands. However, this whole sentence is too convoluted and already has too many commas. I suggest the following. ‘If a player delivers a bowl before the previous bowl has come to rest, the first time this happens the umpire should: ○ warn the player, while the skip is present; and ○ tell the manager or the coach, if they are present, that the player has received a warning.’”
35.3	South Africa	Proposal: Punctuate exactly the same as Law 34.2.2.
		Rationale: N/a The Laws Committee rejects this proposal but accepts the alternative suggested by PEC (see law 34.2.2 above).
55.1 (2 nd dot)	M Cowan – Laws Committee	Proposal: Change “check” to “make sure”.

Law	Proposer	Proposal
		Rationale: To eliminate a current misinterpretation of this law which implies that the law does not specifically permit the marker to take any action – only make a check.
		The Laws Committee accepts this proposal.
55.2	M Cowan – Laws Committee	Proposal: Add a new dot point which reads “stop any bowl from a neighbouring rink that is in danger of moving a jack or bowl at rest.”.
		Rationale: To reflect in the duties of the marker the required actions of the marker described in laws 28.6.2 and 33.6.
		The Laws Committee accepts this proposal.
55.2 (2 nd dot)	M Cowan – Laws Committee	Proposal: Change “check” to “make sure”.
		Rationale: To eliminate a current misinterpretation of this law which implies that the law does not specifically permit the marker to take any action – only make a check.
		The Laws Committee accepts this proposal.
56.2 (1 st dot)	M Cowan – Laws Committee	Proposal: Change “check” to “make sure”.
		Rationale: To eliminate a current misinterpretation of this law which implies that the law does not specifically permit the umpire to take any action – only make a check.
		The Laws Committee accepts this proposal.
A.1.4	South Africa	Proposal: "Prizes and rewards" should surely read "Prizes and awards".
		Rationale: N/a
		The Laws Committee accepts this proposal.
B.2	S Chung – WB Board Member	Proposal: Marks on the surface of the rink - Diagrams 3.1 and 3.2. Distance charts indicate the distances by means of terminating solid spots which do not represent the jacks. May I suggest that the technical convention by lines with the point of the arrow reaching the cross line be used. (B.4 2 Distance charts indicate the distances by means of terminating solid spots which in this case could represent the bowls and jacks.)
		Rationale: To avoid misinterpretation of the spot as a jack, or the jack's centre
		The Laws Committee accepts this proposal.
B.4.2	S Chung	Proposal: Diagram viewing directions differ: Diagram B. 4 2 views with the front ditch above the head. Diagrams B.2 2, B.2 3.1 and 3.2, B.3 1 and 2 view the front ditch below the head.
		Rationale: Technical convention maintains the same viewing direction as far as possible for ease of reference and assimilation.

Law	Proposer	Proposal
		The Laws Committee accepts this proposal.

1.3. Draft Displacement Laws Reference Table (Laws 28 and 33)

Displacement	Bowl	Jack
Original Course		
By member of same team who delivered, head not disturbed	A	I
By member of same team who delivered, head disturbed	B and A	–
By opponent, head not disturbed	C or D or E	J
By player after head disturbed but not disturbed thereafter	D or E	–
By player after head disturbed and head disturbed thereafter	G, and D or E	–
In Motion		
By player, head not disturbed after	D or F	D or F
By player, head disturbed after	D and G, or F	D and G, or F
At Rest		
By player, head not disturbed	H	H
By player, head disturbed	H and G	
Neutral Object		
Original Course		
Within boundaries of rink, Head not disturbed after displacement	C	J
Within boundaries of rink, Head disturbed after displacement	K and C or L	–
Outside boundaries on correct bias, Head not disturbed after displacement	C	–
Outside boundaries on correct bias, Head disturbed after displacement	K and C or L	–
Disturbed head before displaced, Head not disturbed after displacement	M or L	–
Disturbed head before displaced, Head disturbed after displacement	M and G or L	–
In Motion		
Not disturbed the head after displacement	N or L	N or L
Disturbed the head after displacement	N and G or L	
At Rest		
Not disturbed the head	H or L	H or L
Disturbed the head after displacement	H and G or L	
Rebounding Non-toucher		
Original Course	D	–
In Motion	D or L	D or L
At Rest	H	H

Category	Description
A	Opposing skip declares bowl dead
B	Replace the head
C	Bowl replayed
D	Place bowl / jack where opposing skip believes it would have come to rest
E	Leave bowl where it came to rest
F	Declare end dead
G	Replace part of head disturbed
H	Place in former position
I	Opposing lead place mat and re-deliver jack (does not play first)
J	Re-delivered by same player
K	Skips agree how to replace head
L	No Agreement – declare end dead
M	Agree where bowl would have come to rest.
N	Skips place bowl / jack where they believe it would have come to rest

2. Consultation with Member National Authorities (Round 2)

During a second round of consultations which was completed on 28th February 2010, MNAs were invited to comment on the contents of the document issued by WB on 27th December 2009 (see section 1 above). Having reviewed the comments it received, the LC accepts further proposals for changes to the laws (see section 2.1 below) and responds to MNAs' requests for clarification (see section 2.2 below) as follows:

2.1 Changes to the Laws

Law	MNA	Comment
17.1.1	Laws Committee	Comment: Add a new dot point allowing MNAs to make domestic regulations covering the change to the minimum length of an end from 23 metres to 21 metres (see the proposal to change law 23 in section 1.1 above).
		LC's Response: This has now been included in the proposed laws.
18.2	Laws Committee	Comment: Add a new paragraph 4 to clarify the options available to the winner of the toss if the toss is conducted before the start of the trial ends.
		LC's Response: This has now been included in the proposed laws.
19.1.5	England	Comment: We would prefer the term "securely pinned, flat headed pins and non-protruding".
		LC's Response: Equivalent wording has now been included in the proposed laws.
	England	Comment: Could clarification be given as to whether groundsheets can be placed at any time during a game?
		LC's Response: Groundsheets <u>can</u> be placed at any time during a game. This clarification has now been included in the proposed laws.
28	England	Comment: The appendix is not user-friendly and the old Laws clearly identified 4 options for mistakes involving a bowl and three with a jack. Bowls England appeal to the Laws Committee to seriously review this and to consider the needs of the average bowler who will be using the Law Book for a quick and simple reference.
		LC's Response: With reference to the first part of the first sentence, a revised version of the appendix, aimed at making it more user friendly, has now been included in the proposed laws. A copy of the revised appendix is included in section 2.3 of this document for reference purposes. With reference to the remaining comments, please see the document containing details of the proposals rejected by the LC.

Law	MNA	Comment
28.3.4	Laws Committee	Comment: Clarification is required that the position of the bowl referred to in both dot points is its former position.
		LC's Response: This has now been included in the proposed laws.
33.5	Laws Committee	Comment: Renumber current paragraph 3 to be paragraph 1 then renumber current paragraphs 1 and 2 to be paragraphs 2 and 3 respectively to ensure consistency of topic sequence with the other sections of law 33.
		LC's Response: This has now been included in the proposed laws.
36.1.3	Israel	Comment: Your comment to our proposal refers us to the proposed change to rule 36.1.2 which relates only to those players not in control of the head. Our suggestion is that the present wording be amended by deleting the words "if they are in front of the Jack". This would cause the person controlling the head to comply with rule 36.1.2 not only if they were 1 cm. in front of the jack but also if parallel to or 1 cm. behind the jack. In our view there is no difference to all the above 3 situations.
		LC's Response: Equivalent wording has now been included in the proposed laws.
37.1	England	Comment: England wishes to amend their proposal to allow consistency in the Laws and for the Skip in the Pairs, Triples and Fours to control/mark the scorecard.
		LC's Response: The proposed laws have now been revised (by incorporating law 37.3 into law 37.1) to say that the skips should mark the score card in Pairs, Triples and Fours games. As a result, law 37.3 has been deleted, laws 37.4 and 37.5 have been renumbered as laws 37.3 and 37.4 respectively, and the title of law 37 has been changed to 'Player's duties'.
	Australia	Comment: Change to skips marking all cards (pairs, triples and fours)
		LC's Response: See the response to England's comment above.
	Israel	Comment: We understand England's (initial) proposal but agree that to avoid inconsistency and confusion, the skips should keep scorecards in all team games.
		LC's Response: See the response to England's comment above.
	Jersey	Comment: It would make a great deal of sense for the skip to keep the card also in both triples and fours. If this were to be implemented it should be made quite clear, as it already does in law

Law	MNA	Comment
		37.1.8, that such duties cannot be delegated. Further, a responsible player would need to communicate quite clearly the resultant score for each end although this factor does not appear in the current laws. A duty for the third in fours maybe.
		LC's Response: See the response to England's comment above. Also, the duties of the third (law 37.2) have been revised accordingly.
	Scotland	Comment: The SBA are in favour of keeping a consistency in the laws and are in support of 'the Skip marking the card in all team games'.
		LC's Response: See the response to England's comment above.
38.3	Laws Committee	Comment: Clarification is required that the law applies to partially sighted or blind bowlers who are classified as such by their National Governing Body.
		LC's Response: This has now been included in the proposed laws.
38.4	Laws Committee	Comment: Clarification is required that the person assisting a partially sighted or blind bowler is not breaking law 35.2 when telling the player the position of the jack or bowl as soon as it comes to rest.
		LC's Response: This has now been included in the proposed laws.
54	Laws Committee	Comment: Experience of the law in operation indicates that the 10 minute period within which an appeal has to be made is too restrictive. It is suggested that a period of 24 hours would be more appropriate.
		LC's Response: This has now been included in the proposed laws.
General	South Africa	Comment: Bowls South Africa confirms that we agree with the recommendations made by the Laws Committee on all the proposals as listed per your Proposed Changes to the Operation of the Laws document with the exceptions of laws 18.4 and 23.1. Kindly withdraw all the proposals submitted by South Africa.
		LC's Response: The comment is noted.
General	South Africa	Comment: Bowls South Africa places on record our support of the comments made by the Laws Committee on all proposals in the Proposed Changes to the Format/Presentation of the Laws document. Kindly withdraw all the proposals submitted by South Africa.

Law	MNA	Comment
		LC's Response: The comment is noted.
Reserves	England	Comment: Bowls England at their Annual Conference will flag a discussion on the use of players/reserves being permitted to change their playing positions during a game; hence no response to date from Bowls England as the Conference is to be held on 7th April 2010.
		LC's Response: Since no further comment has been received no response is necessary.
	South Africa	<p>Comment: World Bowls (WBL) allows for reserves and changes to teams at International level. As domestic conditions and circumstances vary between MNA's it is our belief that each MNA should have the right to allow reserves and substitutes in sympathy with local circumstances and distances to be travelled to compete in domestic tournaments. We attach herewith an example of our domestic Conditions of Play and the WBL Conditions of Play for Champ of Champs which allows for situations where a "reserve or substitute" is required.</p> <p>Many of our local tournaments are played over a number of week-ends and not all players are available every time. In South Africa we allow for a team to enter with a named reserve who would play where any player in the team is unavailable for a specific week-end. We recommend that the above be considered favourably.</p>
		<p>LC's Response: Laws 50.4 and 51 are the only laws which describe the procedures to be followed when introducing substitutes. Law 50.4 deals with the use of substitutes in a game which is being continued after a stoppage; law 51 deals with the use of substitutes in a game which is currently underway. (Not that, within the laws, the term 'substitute' is used exclusively in the context of a game which has already started.)</p> <p>Law 51 gives MNAs some flexibility in the use of substitutes – law 51.5 allows Controlling Bodies to decide a substitute's eligibility and law 51.9 allows MNAs to decide the requirements for introducing a substitute. The LC accepts, however, that situations can arise where further flexibility is required.</p> <p>The laws do not place any requirements / restrictions on the use of 'reserve or replacement' players – that is, players who can replace members of a team between rounds in a tournament (for example, due to the unavailability of one of the original team members). Controlling Bodies by default, therefore, have the power to decide their own regulations for the use of reserve players (any regulations</p>

Law	MNA	Comment
		<p>would, of course, have to be included in the Conditions of Play). The LC accepts that it would be appropriate to clarify this power within the laws.</p> <p>Accordingly, a new paragraph describing the Controlling Body's powers with regard to substitutes and reserve or replacement players has been include in laws 16.1, 16.2 and 16.3 in the proposed laws.</p>

2.2 MNAs' Requests for Clarification

Law	MNA	Comment
15.4	Israel	<p>Comment: Clarification needed as how the proposed change to law 18.4 relates to 15.4 and especially to tie-breakers</p>
		<p>LC's Response: The principles which apply to games which are not played in the sets format are</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a coin will be tossed prior to the start of the game and the winner of the toss can choose whether to play first in the first end or ask their opponent to play first. - with the exception of an extra end (where a further toss is conducted), the winner of the previous scoring end will play first in all ends after the first end. <p>These principles also apply to games which are played in the sets format (note, however, that a 'game' in that format comprises two sets so additional consideration has to be given to who starts the second set. Also, there is provision for a tie-breaker – similar to the extra end provision – should a game be tied at the end of the second set). Therefore</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a coin will be tossed prior to the start of the first set and the winner of the toss can choose whether to play first in the first end or ask their opponent to play first. - the winner of the first set will play first at the start of the second set. If the first set is a draw, the winner of the last scoring end in that set will play first. - with the exception of the first, fourth and any further ends of a tie-breaker (where a further toss is conducted), the winner of the previous scoring end will play first in all ends after the first end.
28.1.3	Israel	<p>Comment: We would still like to know why the opposing skip should not have the option of leaving the head disturbed.</p>
		<p>LC's Response: It is assumed that this comment, like the original comment, refers to law 28.1.3 (1st dot). The opposing skip does have the option of leaving the head disturbed. If the skip chooses the first course of action (placing the bowl where the skip believes it would have come to rest), only the position of the displaced bowl in motion needs to be addressed. The position of all other bowls in the head would not be affected (the law does not tell the skip to replace any part of the head).</p>
59.2	England	<p>Comment: The Bowls England Laws of the Sport Review Committee ask for clarification of the word “modifier”.</p>
		<p>LC's Response: A modifier is a word that qualifies the sense of</p>

Law	MNA	Comment
		<p>another word. In the South African proposal, 'only' is a modifier.</p> <p>The point, therefore, is whether the phrase 'will only be granted if' should read 'will be granted only if'. That is, South Africa are arguing that the sense of the phrase is different depending on where the word 'only' is positioned within it.</p>
Date for Laws Intro.	England	<p>Comment: The Bowls England Laws of the Sport Review Committee would like confirmation, if possible and subject to approval, that implementation of the new Laws will be in place for the 2011 Outdoor Season in the UK.</p>
		<p>LC's Response: The LC's objective is to have the latest edition of the laws introduced at the earliest opportunity (possibly 1 January 2011). As far as the UK is concerned, that would mean that implementation would be at the start of the 2011 outdoor season on 1st April 2011.</p>

2.3. Revised Displacement Laws Reference Table (Laws 28 and 33)

Appendix C

C.1 Bowl and jack displacement chart

Laws 28 and 33 describe the action that needs to be taken when a bowl or jack is displaced in a number of situations. To decide what is the correct action to take, players and umpires should decide the following.

- C.1.1 Who or what caused the bowl or jack to be displaced
 - C.1.1.1 A player or wheelchair
 - C.1.1.2 A neutral person or a neutral object
 - C.1.1.3 Being marked as a toucher or during measuring
 - C.1.1.4 A rebounding non-toucher
 - C.1.1.5 A bowl from a neighbouring rink
 - C.1.1.6 A dead bowl

- C.1.2 Where the bowl or jack was when it was displaced
 - C.1.2.1 In its original course
 - C.1.2.2 In motion
 - C.1.2.3 At rest

- C.1.3 Whether the head was disturbed before or after the bowl or jack was displaced
 - C.1.3.1 Not disturbed before and not disturbed after
 - C.1.3.2 Not disturbed before but disturbed after
 - C.1.3.3 Disturbed before but not disturbed after
 - C.1.3.4 Disturbed before and disturbed after

The chart on the following page provides a quick-reference guide for deciding what action to take in the two most complex situations – displacement by a player (laws 28.1 and 33.1) or a wheelchair (laws 28.2 and 33.2), and displacement by a neutral person or neutral object (laws 28.3 and 33.3).

Situation	Action
Bowl displaced by a player or wheelchair	
In original course – head not disturbed before	
• By member of team that delivered the bowl, head not disturbed after	Declare the bowl dead
• By member of team that delivered the bowl, head disturbed after	Replace the head and declare the bowl dead
• By opponent, head not disturbed after	Have the bowl replayed, or place the bowl where it is believed it would have come to rest, or leave the bowl where it came to rest
• By opponent, head disturbed after	Replace the head and have the bowl replayed, or replace the head and place the bowl where it is believed it would have come to rest, or declare the end dead
In original course – head disturbed before	
• Head not disturbed after	Do not replace any part of the head disturbed before the displacement. Place the bowl where it is believed it would have come to rest, or leave the bowl where it came to rest
• Head disturbed after	Do not replace any part of the head disturbed before the displacement. Replace any part of the head disturbed after displacement and either place the bowl where it is believed it would have come to rest or leave the bowl where it came to rest
In motion	
• Head not disturbed after	Place the bowl where it is believed it would have come to rest, or declare the end dead
• Head disturbed after	Place the bowl where it is believed it would have come to rest and replace any part of the head disturbed after displacement, or declare the end dead
At rest	
• Head not disturbed after	Put back to former position
• Head disturbed after	Put back to former position and replace any part of the head disturbed after displacement
Bowl displaced by a neutral person or neutral object	
In original course – head not disturbed before	
• Within boundaries of rink, head not disturbed after	Have the bowl replayed
• Within boundaries of rink, head disturbed after	Agree how to replace the head and have the bowl replayed, or , if no agreement, declare the end dead
• Outside boundaries on correct bias, head not disturbed after	Have the bowl replayed
• Outside boundaries on correct bias, head disturbed after	Agree how to replace the head and have the bowl replayed, or , if no agreement, declare the end dead
In original course – head disturbed before	
• Head not disturbed after	Do not replace any part of the head disturbed before the displacement. Agree where the bowl would have come to rest, or , if no agreement, declare the end dead
• Head disturbed after	Do not replace any part of the head disturbed before the displacement. Agree where the bowl would have come to rest and replace any part of the head disturbed after displacement, or , if no agreement, declare the end dead
In motion	
• Head not disturbed after	Agree where the bowl would have come to rest, or , if no agreement, declare the end dead
• Head disturbed after	Agree where the bowl would have come to rest and replace any part of the head disturbed after displacement, or if no agreement, declare the end dead
At rest	
• Head not disturbed after	Put back to former position, or , if no agreement, declare the end dead
• Head disturbed after	Put back to former position and replace any part of the head disturbed after displacement, or , if no agreement, declare the end dead
Jack displaced by a player or wheelchair	
In original course	
• By member of team that delivered the jack	Opposing lead to place the mat and re-deliver the jack (but not play first)
• By opponent	Re-delivered by same player
In motion	
• Head not disturbed after	Place the jack where it is believed it would have come to rest or declare the end dead
• Head disturbed after	Place the jack where it is believed it would have come to rest and replace any part of the head disturbed by the displaced jack, or declare the end dead
At rest	
Put back to former position	
Jack displaced by a neutral person or neutral object	
In original course	
Re-delivered by same player	
In motion	
Place the jack where it is believed it would have come to rest, or , if no agreement, declare the end dead	
At rest	
Put back to former position, or , if no agreement, declare the end dead	

