

## Review of the CM Edition of the Laws of the Sport of Bowls: Rejected 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 27<sup>th</sup> 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 rejected the following proposals:

#### 1.1 Changes to the Operation of the Laws

Law	Proposer	Proposal
1.3.2	South Africa	<b>Proposal:</b> Dealing with a bowl accidentally slipping from a player's hand during delivery - how far is that bowl allowed to travel before it is declared a dead bowl?
		<b>Rationale:</b> Needs clarification.
		<p>Players and officials should be capable of making a distinction between a bowl that has been deliberately released from the hand but delivered incorrectly and a bowl that has accidentally slipped from the hand.</p> <p>The Laws Committee does not believe that including a minimum distance will help in making that distinction (for example, a bowl that has been delivered incorrectly and a bowl that has accidentally slipped could well travel the same distance). Therefore, it does not propose making any change to this law.</p>
13.1.3	New Zealand	<b>Proposal:</b> Add the word "or Umpire" after Controlling Body to enable the Umpire to allocate rinks for practice play.
		<b>Rationale:</b> This is what happens in reality as the Controlling Body is not usually at a venue where competitions are in progress. Adding these words would give the umpire the authority to allocate rinks.
		<p>The Laws Committee rejects this proposal.</p> <p>The umpire currently has the authority to allocate rinks for practice play in the absence of a representative of the Controlling Body as he is an agent of the Controlling Body (see law 56.1).</p>
15.5.4	Welsh Ump. Association	<b>Proposal:</b> Suggest that the re-wording in the Laws Committee proposal should use the word 'beyond', rather than either 'over' or 'above'.
		<p><b>Rationale:</b> We think this should remove any possible confusion, where the jack may bounce high, above the height of the bank, yet does not go beyond the face of the bank.</p> <p>The re-wording also applies to law 30.1</p> <p>The Laws Committee rejects this proposal.</p>

Law	Proposer	Proposal
		<p>The jack, whilst travelling above the face of the bank, may not travel beyond the face of the bank in some circumstances. For example, when it strikes a boundary peg fixed on the top of, but close to the face of, the bank (note that the legal requirement for such pegs is to be fixed not more than 100 millimetres back from the face of the bank).</p> <p>Also, in South Africa, where Afrikaans is the first language of many, the translation of the word ‘beyond’ is not as clear as the translations of the words ‘over’ or ‘above’.</p>
20.1	Scotland	<p><b>Proposal:</b> Change to: Delete 1<sup>st</sup> sentence and start with: At the moment they deliver the jack or bowl, the player should have all or part of one foot on or over the mat.</p> <p><b>Rationale:</b> Simplifies the law, why start from a stance with one foot fully on the mat, when at the moment of delivery they are only required to have all or part of one foot on or over the mat?</p> <p>The Laws Committee rejects this proposal.</p> <p>The committee had two objectives when it included the first sentence in the CM Edition of the laws. Firstly, to prohibit players from stepping / running onto the mat and delivering their bowls in one continuous movement and secondly, to improve the chances of the umpire being able to identify players whose position on the mat is not within the laws when delivering their bowls. The committee’s objectives remain.</p> <p>The committee, however, seeks the views of MNAs on the acceptability of changing the phrase in the first sentence which reads ‘standing on the mat with one foot fully on the mat’ to ‘standing on the mat with all or part of one foot on the mat’.</p> <p>(Note: The views received from MNAs , and the LC’s response to these, are included under law 20.1 in section 2 of this document.)</p>
	Jersey	<p><b>Proposal:</b> Jersey Bowls Umpires Association supports the proposal made by Scotland. May we suggest that law 20.2 regarding wheelchairs also be looked at as the two laws might easily be combined together (with renumbering of the current law 20.3).</p>
		<p><b>Rationale:</b> Our initial thought is that this proposal is reverting in part to the earlier 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition law 21, and would also be in line with current WIBC laws – not a bad thing for umpires. We are very much aware, therefore, that there would no longer be a prescribed stance on the mat which means that a player can take a position off the mat and step onto it when effecting the delivery. This is not necessarily a bad thing and hope that clubs will not feel that their greens might be affected. Further, the suggestion removes at least an item of foot-faulting being extinguished to the delight of umpires!</p>

Law	Proposer	Proposal
		See the Scottish proposal above.
	Wales	<b>Proposal:</b> Just delete the first sentence.
		<b>Rationale:</b> A fraction of the heel of one shoe off the mat at stance, is a foot fault and the player may not know it. An umpire would be warning players and stopping bowls all through the game, if the law was enforced, is that helping the game?
		See the Scottish proposal above.
	Welsh Ump. Association	<b>Proposal:</b> We endorse the views of Welsh Bowls Association.
		<b>Rationale:</b> This law is unnecessary and if adequately enforced could lead to significant disruption to games.
		See the Scottish proposal above.
28.1.1 / 28.1.2	Israel	<b>Proposal:</b> In rule 28.1.1 dot one refers to displacement by a member of the team which has NOT disturbed the head. One ruling only is given by the opposing skip to declare the bowl dead. Rule 28.1.2 dot two again refers to the above. Here the opposing skip can choose to leave the bowl where it came to rest, or where he believe it would have come to rest. Why the difference ?
		<b>Rationale:</b> N/a
		The premise that ‘rule 28.1.2 dot two again refers to the above’ stated in paragraph 2 of the proposal is false – suggesting the author’s failure to distinguish between bowls disturbing / not disturbing the head <u>before</u> further disturbance and those disturbing / not disturbing the head <u>after</u> further disturbance.  Law 28.1.1 (all dot points) deals with the situation in which a bowl <u>has not</u> disturbed the head <u>before</u> it is displaced. Law 28.1.2 (all dot points) deals with the situation in which a bowl <u>has</u> disturbed the head <u>before</u> it is displaced. These are two different situations requiring two different courses of action.
28.1.3 (1 <sup>st</sup> dot)	Israel	<b>Proposal:</b> The head has not been disturbed. Why should there be an option to declare the end dead. If the head has been disturbed, should the opposing skip not have the option of leaving the head as disturbed?
		<b>Rationale:</b> N/a
		The question is based on a false premise – that the head has not been disturbed. For a jack or bowl to be in motion (that is moving during play after it has been at rest as part of the head – law 1.3.16) the head must have been disturbed (altering the position of a jack or bowl in the head – law 1.3.5). The head has, therefore, been disturbed before the displacement took place.
35.4	Israel	<b>Proposal:</b> We suggest that an additional penalty should be added: - deduction of a point(s).

Law	Proposer	Proposal
		<p><b>Rationale:</b> This will make players even more aware of the importance of possession of the rink and the consequences of offences when an opponent has possession.</p> <p><b>The Laws Committee rejects this proposal.</b></p> <p>Nowhere in the laws is there so severe a penalty as having a shot deducted. To include one in this law, therefore, would signal that the committee was of the view that breaching this law was the most serious offence which a player could commit. The committee is not of that view.</p>
36.1.2 (1 <sup>st</sup> dot)	South Africa	<p><b>Proposal:</b> Suggest: "behind the jack and away from the head in such a way as not to obscure the white pegs".</p> <p><b>Rationale:</b> N/a</p> <p><b>The Laws Committee rejects this proposal.</b></p> <p>The function of boundary pegs is to mark the division of the green and not to act as a guide for players when deciding the line on which to deliver their bowls – so there is no need for a legal requirement that they be visible for the latter purpose. If players wish to see the pegs when deciding their line they can simply ask the player who is obscuring them to move away.</p>
36.1.3	Israel	<p><b>Proposal:</b> The rule requires that a player controlling the head to move to a position described in section 2 of this rule only if they are in front of the jack. We suggest that the rule should be broadened to encompass any position of the player in the head - alongside or behind the jack.</p> <p><b>Rationale:</b> This will also create a clear view of the head and reduce the possibility of bowl displacement by the person in the head.</p> <p><b>The Laws Committee rejects this proposal.</b></p> <p>See the Laws Committee proposal to change law 36.1.2 above.</p>
40.1	Israel	<p><b>Proposal:</b> We suggest that the rule be changed so that the players controlling the head in a team game should have the right to call the 30 seconds.</p> <p><b>Rationale:</b> The wording suggests that the 30 second period has to be requested immediately on the last bowl coming to rest. In most situations the person nominated under the present rules to request the 30 seconds is at the mat end – a singles player or the skip - and therefore the rule is difficult to invoke in all instances.</p> <p>We do not have an answer for a singles player remaining at the mat end. Should he be allowed to tell the marker of a 30 second request on a certain bowl(s) prior to delivering his last wood and assuming that the nominated wood(s) will not be disturbed. The other solution is that the singles player reach the head in time to call the 30 seconds – not always possible e.g. last wood a drive. We suggest that if the 30 second rule cannot be applied for all, then it should be deleted.</p>

Law	Proposer	Proposal
		<p>The Laws Committee rejects this proposal.</p> <p>The convention used in the laws is to refer to skips by default (because skips are in charge of their teams). Skips can, however, delegate their own powers and duties to any other members of their teams (see law 37.1.8). Any player controlling the head in a team game, therefore, can call for the 30-second period under the current law if the skip so chooses.</p> <p>Note also that the premise that ‘the wording suggests that the 30-second period has to be requested immediately on the last bowl coming to rest’ is false. The law makes no reference to when the period should be requested. The request can be made at any time after the last bowl has come to rest, but the 30-second period starts as soon as the last bowl has come to rest – not when the period was requested. (So, for example, if a Singles player who has just delivered the final bowl of the end arrives at the head 5 seconds after the last bowl has come to rest, the player can, on arriving at the head, ask for the 30 second period to be invoked but there would only be 25 seconds left of that period before the players can start deciding the number of shots scored.)</p>
47.4.1	South Africa	<p><b>Proposal:</b> Suggest this is added: This bowl should be returned to the head only after the process of scoring has been completed.</p> <p><b>Rationale:</b> N/a</p> <p>The Laws Committee rejects this proposal.</p> <p>It doesn't matter when the bowl is returned to the head as it can not be counted in the score at that end.</p>
51.7	Spain	<p><b>Proposal:</b> It is proposed that the law be changed to read as follows: If a player has to leave the green during the course of a Singles game due to illness or some other reasonable cause, and they cannot return within 10 minutes, the defaulting player will forfeit the game to their opponent. This includes Singles Side game.</p> <p><b>Rationale:</b> Controversy exists with many clubs in Spain due to various interpretations of Law 51 regarding the use of a substitute during the course of a singles side game. In order to clarify this, it is proposed that Law 51 be re-worded as above.</p> <p>The Laws Committee rejects this proposal.</p> <p>This is covered in the current law. The law applies to Singles players and Singles players can be part of a side (law 1.2.1) so the law applies to side games.</p> <p>Note, however, that the Conditions of Play would need to cover this</p>

Law	Proposer	Proposal
		situation – for example, by describing how shots difference / sets difference and so on are to be handled when deciding the winners of a side game when a Singles game has been forfeited.
54.1	USA	<p><b>Proposal:</b> Change the current language to If an opponent, the manager in a side game, the umpire or the Controlling Body decides that a player has deliberately committed an act designed to give them or their team an unfair advantage <u>or is blatantly unsportsmanlike</u>, they can appeal to the Controlling Body.</p> <p><b>Rationale:</b> Many improper behaviours can be characterised as unsportsmanlike. Behaviour "designed to give them or their team an unfair advantage" is only one example. General lack of sportsmanship not involving team or side advantage, has to be taken into consideration.</p> <p>The Laws Committee rejects this proposal.</p> <p>The Laws Committee is of the view that individual perceptions of what may be classed as ‘unsportsmanlike’ and the penalties that should be applied if a person is deemed guilty of ‘unsportsmanlike conduct’ can vary due to a number of factors (for example, the cultural background prevailing in a specific country and so on).</p> <p>The committee feels, therefore, that it would be impractical (if not impossible) to introduce a law that covers every eventuality. So, rather than covering the subject within the laws, the committee believes that it is best left to MNAs / Controlling Bodies to deal with using their own Codes of Conduct and Disciplinary Procedures.</p>
54	Canada	<p><b>Proposal:</b> In other sports it is not unusual to have a disciplinary offence of “Bringing the Sport into disrepute” and we consider that it is time that such an offence was introduced into the sport of lawn bowls with an appropriate penalty. An offender would be charged by the Controlling Body - Provincial and/or National Authority - after an investigation and/or review of the evidence.</p> <p><b>Rationale:</b> We are hearing a number of comments relating to an increasing tendency for players to argue or attempt to intimidate umpires, especially when they are attempting to enforce Law 20, 21 and 35. Additionally, there have also been occasions when a player has made public comments in which officials have been criticized.</p> <p>The Laws Committee rejects this proposal.</p> <p>The Laws Committee is of the view that individual perceptions of what may be classed as ‘bringing the sport into disrepute’ and the penalties that should be applied if a person is deemed guilty of such an offence can vary due to a number of factors (for example, the cultural background prevailing in a specific country and so on).</p> <p>The committee feels, therefore, that it would be impractical (if not impossible) to introduce a law that covers every eventuality. So,</p>

Law	Proposer	Proposal
		rather than covering the subject within the laws, the committee believes that it is best left to MNAs / Controlling Bodies to deal with using their own Codes of Conduct and Disciplinary Procedures.
General	England	<p><b>Proposal:</b> I would also like to take this opportunity to re-iterate that Bowls England continues to receive regular correspondence from our Members regarding the use of bowls outdoors in England that have been primarily designed for use on faster surfaces, either in the Southern Hemisphere or indoors.</p> <p>This continues to cause concern for Bowls England and we would urge World Bowls to consider this further as matter of urgency on behalf of our Members who consider the use of such bowls to be detrimental to our sport.</p> <p><b>Rationale:</b> N/a</p> <p>It is not within the remit of the Laws Committee to deal with this proposal. It has, therefore, been referred to the board of World Bowls for consideration.</p>
General	Ireland	<p><b>Proposal:</b> The changes suggested by our Umpires Association are in line with the other UK Countries' suggestions with only a few differences which would only reflect on our domestic game and would therefore not be included in any change to World Bowls rules.</p> <p><b>Rationale:</b> N/a</p> <p>No comment from the Laws Committee is required.</p>
General	Laws Committee	<p><b>Proposal:</b> A discussion document on the use of reserves and on players being permitted to change their playing positions during a game was considered at the Biennial Council Meeting held in Melbourne in March 2006. At the subsequent WB Board meeting, Member National Authorities were encouraged to experiment with this during domestic play and provide feedback on the experiments.</p> <p>To date, the Laws Committee has received no feedback on this subject. The Committee, therefore, invites Member National Authorities who have conducted experiments to provide feedback at this time.</p> <p>The Laws Committee does not propose to take any action - the absence of feedback from MNAs suggests that a change to the law is not necessary.</p>

## 1.2 Changes to the Format / Presentation of the Laws

Law	Proposer	Proposal
Various	South Africa	<p><b>Proposal:</b> User Friendliness. This can be very easily improved by the addition of a few letters/numbers after each cross-reference to a Law. (Refer to the Bowls South Africa proposal document for examples.)</p>
		<p><b>Rationale:</b> It would make looking up those cross references much quicker.</p>
		<p>The Laws Committee rejects this proposal.</p> <p>The committee is of the view that the inclusion of the information suggested in the proposal would not add value to the readability of law book – it may even detract from it. A better home for such information, if required, would be an umpire’s training manual.</p> <p>In addition, the inclusion of page numbers in any cross-reference within the law book would be a non-starter because page numbers are dependent on factors such as the page size, margins, font size and so on used when the law book is printed. Each MNA can, within the guidelines published by PEC, print their own law books so page numbers can vary – making a master-copy containing references to page numbers obsolete.</p>
Various	South Africa	<p><b>Proposal:</b> Law 1.3.8 should read as follows: "…the ditch at the end of the green which is directly in front of the player when that player stands on the mat."</p>
		<p><b>Rationale:</b> One cannot at random switch from singular to plural as is done in the Crystal Mark version. The same applies throughout, e.g. Law 8.5.</p>
		<p>The Laws Committee rejects this proposal.</p> <p>The committee has received the following comment on the proposal from PEC. “It is now widely accepted to use ‘they’ as a singular pronoun to refer to a person of unspecified sex. Such use has existed since the 16<sup>th</sup> century but is more common now since the traditional practice of referring to people of either sex has been deemed unacceptable. It also avoids the cumbersome approach of saying ‘he or she’. We have no problem with changing ‘they’ to ‘that player’ in the example given, but such a change may not work in all instances.”</p>
Various	South Africa	<p><b>Proposal:</b> We recommend that every time "<b>should</b>" and "<b>will</b>" are used that they are printed in bold.</p>
		<p><b>Rationale:</b> The judicious use of bold print elsewhere would also serve a purpose, e.g. Law 28.1.1 (second bullet) "…the opposing skip <b>should:</b> replace the head; <b>and</b> declare the bowl dead."</p>

Law	Proposer	Proposal
		<p>What about Law 51.1 where printing "<b>unless</b>" in bold draws immediate attention to this restriction?</p> <p>The Laws Committee rejects this proposal.</p> <p>The committee has received the following comment on the proposal from PEC.  “Too much emboldening reduces its effectiveness. Bold print is not necessary or particularly helpful in the example given.”</p>
14.2	South Africa	<p><b>Proposal:</b> Should read:  "...the order in which the players will play their bowls as follows:"</p> <p><b>Rationale:</b> A colon is required.</p> <p>The Laws Committee rejects this proposal.</p> <p>The committee has received the following comment on the proposal from PEC.  “After ‘follows’, the punctuation mark should be a full stop, not a colon, as the introductory line to the list is a complete sentence and each point starts with a capital letter.”</p>
21.3	South Africa	<p><b>Proposal:</b> What about adding a few cross-references to indicate to T.O.'s where identical (or very similar) alternative penalties exist; perhaps state as follows: "Compare the same penalties under Laws 34.2.2; 35.4; 36.2.4; and 47.1.." Obviously the same would then have to be inserted in the four laws referred to above.</p> <p><b>Rationale:</b> N/a</p> <p>The Laws Committee rejects this proposal.</p> <p>The committee has received the following comment on the proposal from PEC.  “There is a risk of overkill here. References to other laws are generally only useful when they are referring a reader to other laws that have an impact upon the one being read, not when the laws are merely similar.”</p>
27.2 (5 <sup>th</sup> dot)	South Africa	<p><b>Proposal:</b> Suggest  "... within the boundaries of the rink of play."</p> <p><b>Rationale:</b> N/a</p> <p>The Laws Committee rejects this proposal.</p> <p>Law 1.3.27 defines ‘rink’ and ‘rink of play’ – the former does not include the end ditches whilst the latter does. The current wording is correct as it deals with a jack or bowls within the boundaries of the rink. A jack or bowls in the ditch is dealt with separately in the 4<sup>th</sup> dot point.</p>

Law	Proposer	Proposal
28	Israel	<b>Proposal:</b> Divide the displacements into two categories, viz. when the head is disturbed, and when the head is not disturbed. We have done so for our own use and enclose a copy for your consideration. (Refer to the Israel proposal document for further explanation.)
		<b>Rationale:</b> We feel the subject could provide much easier explanation if the displacements were divided into two categories.
		<p>The Laws Committee rejects this proposal.</p> <p>Note, however, that the committee has accepted a proposal from M Cowan (see below) to include a graph / table as an appendix. The committee is of the view that this presents a better alternative than that contained in the proposal from Israel.</p>
36.1.1	South Africa	<b>Proposal:</b> Suggest "...should stand at least 1.6 metres behind the front of the mat".
		<b>Rationale:</b> This is a far more meaningful a distance (although it is exactly the same).
		<p>The Laws Committee rejects this proposal.</p> <p>The committee is of the view that change is not necessary because the current wording is perfectly clear.</p>
59.2	South Africa	<b>Proposal:</b> The correct position of the modifier ("only") is as follows: "...will be granted only if..."
		<b>Rationale:</b> N/a
		<p>The Laws Committee rejects this proposal.</p> <p>Note, however, that the committee has received the following comment on the proposal from PEC.          ‘The modifier can be placed in either position. We are happy for it to be moved to read: ‘...granted only if...’</p>
B.2.3	South Africa	<b>Proposal:</b> Suggest a rider is added to the effect that the arrows are placed in the illustration for the purpose of explanation and do not indicate the nearest portion of the jack to the mat line, and T.O.'s are referred to Appendix B3.
		<b>Rationale:</b> N/a
		<p>The Laws Committee rejects this proposal.</p> <p>Note, however, that the committee accepts the proposal from S Chung regarding the technical convention used in the diagrams. This acceptance should eliminate the need for a rider to be added to the diagrams.</p>

## 2. Consultation with Member National Authorities (Round 2)

During a second round of consultations which was completed on 28<sup>th</sup> February 2010, MNAs were invited to comment on the contents of the document issued by WB on 27<sup>th</sup> December 2009 (see section 1 above). Having reviewed the comments it received, the LC rejects the following comments / proposals:

Law	MNA	Comment
11.4 / 14.8	Israel	<p><b>Comment:</b> Our emphasis is on the time limit games, and we believe the subject warrants a separate heading for easy finding and reading. We suggest an additional clause to be added either under law 14 "play arrangements" or under law 11, "arranging a game". 14.8 or 11.4</p> <p>1: If an end is declared dead after the time-limit warning has been given, the end should be counted as dead and <b>THE GAME IS COMPLETED</b> (the latter capitals to be added).</p> <p>2: If a time-limit warning is given after the jack has been delivered, and the jack is improperly delivered, the jack must be redelivered in proper order for the game to continue. No other options should be available from National Authorities. (The rule could be abused)</p> <p><b>LC's Response:</b>  The LC does not agree that games limited by time merit a separate section in the laws. The only difference between that format of game and other formats is that the game can end when a time limit is reached. All laws apply equally to time-limit and non time-limit games.</p> <p>Re: point 1: Law 1.3.7 defines an end. An end is completed when the number of shots scored has been decided. Law 31.2 states that a dead end should be replayed. The suggestion, therefore, runs contrary to the existing laws.</p> <p>Also, the LC does not support the view that a game should finish on a dead end. To do so would leave the laws open to abuse. For example, a team that is one shot up on the score card but is two shots down in the head could deliberately kill the end to achieve the desired overall result.</p> <p>Re point 2: Law 18.3.2 states that the start of play in any end is the delivery of the jack by the first player to play in that end. Applying laws 18.3.2 and 1.3.7 to the situation described means that the end has started but has not been completed. Therefore, under the existing laws, the jack should be redelivered and the end played to a conclusion.</p>

Law	MNA	Comment
16.1.3 / 16.2.3	New Zealand	<b>Comment:</b> Should consideration also be given to varying the number of ends for pairs depending on the number of bowls being played? if considered worthy then a change to the restriction on movement of players should also be looked at.
		<b>LC's Response:</b> The LC does not consider this to be necessary.
16.2.6	Jersey	<b>Comment:</b> It is noted that the Laws Committee has suggested a change in wording. May I suggest that in the last sentence after the words 'when that end has been completed' the words 'or has been declared dead' are added. This may give some comfort to the comments raised by Israel as I have found it necessary to express the position in my own dealings with indoor timed games.
		<b>LC's Response:</b> See the response to Israel's comments on laws 11.4 and 14.8 above.
18.4	South Africa	<b>Comment:</b> Bowls SA disagrees with the Laws Committee and believes that having the option of giving away the Jack has contributed to "strategy" and should remain in the interests of the game for both players and spectators.
		<b>LC's Response:</b> See the response to South Africa below.
	South Africa	<b>Comment:</b> South Africa submitted previously that we will oppose the change to law 18.4 (see above). It would appear that most Member National Authorities (MNA's) are in favour of the change. In view of this we recommend, that similar to the Australian proposal of changing law 19.1.1 it be allowed in the Conditions of Play. We therefore recommend the same concession for law 18.4.
		<b>LC's Response:</b> The LC has no record of receiving a proposal from Australia to change law 19.1.1. The LC assumes, however, that the South African suggestion is that MNAs be permitted to introduce a domestic regulation which would enable them to retain the so-called 'giving the jack away' option.  If so, the LC is unable to accept the comment. The LC will only grant dispensation for the introduction of domestic regulations where such regulations are deemed necessary to deal with local circumstances, local conditions and so on. Deciding who starts an end is not influenced by local factors so no dispensation can be given.
20.1	England	<b>Comment:</b> We support the Scottish proposition and if accepted agree to the following:- "to standing on the mat with all or part of one foot on the mat".
		<b>LC's Response:</b> The LC shares the view expressed by New Zealand (see below) that allowing players to stand with all or part of

Law	MNA	Comment
		<p>one foot on the mat before delivery “would enable players to deliver from a much wider point and permit extreme stances such as heel only or toe only, thus allowing much greater changes of angle, and potential damage to the green if players persistently have their toe off”.</p> <p>The LC believes that the first sentence of the law as currently written achieves its objective of ensuring that all players start their delivery from the same position within the limits of the mat. It also believes that any perceived breaches of the current law are due either to a lack of awareness of the law’s requirements by players and coaches or to failures on the part of coaches to teach players to take up a stance as required by the law. Neither of these are seen to be reasons for changing the current law.</p>
	Australia	<p><b>Comment:</b> The NOC agreed with the suggestion of altering the first sentence of 20.1 from “standing on the mat with one foot fully on the mat’ to ‘standing on the mat with all or part of one foot on the mat.’</p> <p><b>LC’s Response:</b> See the response to England’s comment above.</p>
	Israel	<p><b>Comment:</b> We support present wording to be maintained for reasons given by law committee.</p> <p><b>LC’s Response:</b> See the response to England’s comment above.</p>
	Jersey	<p><b>Comment:</b> I cannot see any problem with the suggestion that before delivery one foot is also included in the stance as this would actually make matters easier for umpires. Currently there does seem to be a tendency for players to have small parts of their foot over the edge of the mat and this can be difficult to judge if over the front edge of the mat. Therefore such a change would eliminate this potential problem and would also accord with the current (WIBC) indoor laws.</p> <p><b>LC’s Response:</b> See the response to England’s comment above.</p>
	New Zealand	<p><b>Comment:</b> On behalf on NZ coaches I would request that the wording should not be changed to “<i>standing on the mat with all or part of one foot on the mat</i>’ as that would enable players to deliver from a much wider point and permit extreme stances such as heel only or toe only, thus allowing much greater changes of angle, and potential damage to the green if players persistently have their toe off. I would however support wording that permitted the heel only to be off the mat in the address position.</p> <p>I was just last week told by a usually very sensible umpire that the</p>

Law	MNA	Comment
		<p>current law allows a player to start their delivery with one foot only partly on the mat provided they had first placed it entirely on the mat. I presume that was not the intention of the law and if not then perhaps the first sentence should read “Immediately before delivery.....”.</p> <p>Also, in our coaching material we assume that the two sentences refer to the same foot, it would be helpful if that was explicitly stated. My suggestion would be:</p> <p>“Immediately before delivery a player should be standing on the mat with all, or all but the heel, of one foot on the mat. At the moment they deliver the jack or a bowl, the player should have all or part of that foot on or above the mat.”</p> <p><b>LC’s Response:</b> See the response to England’s comment above.</p> <p>In addition, the LC envisages problems if any reference to the heel were to be included in this law. It should be noted that law A.2.1 refers to heel-less footwear. An umpire, therefore, could not establish with any certainty where a ‘heel’ starts and where it ends – making it’s inclusion in any law impractical to enforce.</p>
	Scotland	<p><b>Comment:</b> The SBA are happy to accept changing the phrase in the 1st sentence to ‘standing on the mat with all or part of one foot on the mat’.</p>
		<p><b>LC’s Response:</b> See the response to England’s comment above.</p>
23.1	New Zealand	<p><b>Comment:</b> Suggestion is that the dispensation be allowed for all greens under a certain length (suggested 35 metres or less) but not allowed for any greens over 35 metres.</p>
		<p><b>LC’s Response:</b> Under the proposed law MNAs can decide to introduce a domestic regulation to reduce the minimum length of an improperly delivered jack from 23 metres to 21 metres - they are free to decide the circumstances under which they do so. Therefore, the LC does not consider that imposing restrictions on the length of greens covered by the domestic regulations has any merit.</p>
	South Africa	<p><b>Comment:</b> Bowls SA agrees with the Laws Committee. We intend to maintain the minimum length of an end in South Africa at 23m.</p>
		<p><b>LC’s Response:</b> The comment is noted.</p>
28	England	<p><b>Comment:</b> 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</p>

Law	MNA	Comment
		<p>who will be using the Law Book for a quick and simple reference.</p> <p><b>LC's Response:</b> With reference to the first part of the first sentence, please see the document containing details of the proposals accepted by the LC.</p> <p>With reference to the remaining comments, to suggest a return to the edition of the laws which identified only 4 options for resolving displacement of a bowl and 3 options for resolving displacement of a jack, would be to totally disregard the many submissions made to the LC by MNAs when revisions to the past three or four editions of the laws were being considered. All of these submissions pointed to anomalies and weaknesses in what was then the current law.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the level of detail in the current laws has its roots in the complexity caused by the number of situations which it has to deal with. If you take the 7 causes of a bowl or jack being displaced, factor into them the 3 places where the jack or bowl was when it was displaced, and factor into the result the 4 situations arising from the head being disturbed or not, you will appreciate that there are several dozen situations which the laws have to deal with. It should be no surprise, therefore, that this complexity has resulted in fairly detailed and lengthy laws!</p>
28.1.1	England	<p><b>Comment:</b> We strongly recommend that the whole of this Law is looked at. It is too complicated for members to understand and surely we should keep the game as simple as possible.</p> <p><b>LC's Response:</b> See the response to England's comment on law 28 above.</p>
28.1.3	England	<p><b>Comment:</b> Again, too complex.</p> <p><b>LC's Response:</b> See the response to England's comment on law 28 above.</p>
28.5.1	England	<p><b>Comment:</b> We recommend that the Law reverts back to the former one which was much more simple to understand.</p> <p><b>LC's Response:</b> See the response to England's comment on law 28 above.</p>
28 / 33	Israel	<p><b>Comment:</b> This is a common occurrence and many umpires would need to refer to written rules which would be easy to read for quick decisions. We are pleased to note that a graph/table has been provided as an appendix.</p> <p>Nevertheless we believe that a clear division between NOT DISTURBED and DISTURBED as we previously proposed, is the</p>

Law	MNA	Comment
		<p>easiest to follow.</p> <p><b>LC's Response:</b> Whether the head has been disturbed or not is only one of three principal factors which need to be taken into account when addressing situations regarding bowl and jack displacement.</p> <p>In the LC's view, the other two – ‘who or what caused the displacement?’ and ‘where was the bowl or jack when it was displaced?’ – rank higher in the decision making process than questions relating to disturbance of the head. The laws have, therefore, been structured with this ranking in mind.</p>
40.1	Israel	<p><b>Comment:</b> Having read your comments to our proposal we are still not convinced. However, the now important task of timekeeper should be added to players duties in a team game and to markers duties in a singles game.</p> <p><b>LC's Response:</b> The laws are not being changed with regard to the so called '30-second rule', so the LC does not accept that the task of time-keeper has taken on any greater importance than it has in the past. Since the LC is not aware of any problems with the operation of the current laws it does not see any requirement for changing them.</p>