

Performance committee response to recommendation from senior committee on the restriction of national team players in the Blincoe cup.

The 2016 season saw the lifting of all restrictions and registration within cricket which was agreed by clubs as a positive move and is agreed by the performance committee. The importance of players playing the game to develop cannot be questioned.

The recommended restriction of national team players playing in the Blincoe cup from the senior committee therefore brings concerns and confusion.

The rationale for common sense being used by clubs has been followed in 2016 and in the only instance of 'Island players' appearing this has bought about a blanket statement of restricting players on the 'island player' tag again.

The game in question saw the players in question score a combined total of total of 72 runs at an average of 18 runs and return bowling figures of 8 overs 6 for 40. Hardly figures to put a blanket ban on ALL NATIONAL TEAM PLAYERS.

The rationale for restricting national team players is also very disproportionate on the basis they compete biannually and if you take this years weather affected competition will see players not eligible to play on the basis of bowling a maximum of 11 overs or batsmen stopped playing on the back of scoring as few as 12 runs in a tournament.

If restrictions are to be bought in (which we are totally against) they have to be robust and equitable to all clubs and not be open to be adjusted annually to allow certain clubs 'more chance' of winning a cup.

The recommendation of taking away common sense and bringing in rules not only restricts playing and development options but is clearly flawed and will bring in future rule proposals from certain quarters.

The National team has strong representation from Peel and St Johns and Cronkbourne however for varying reasons both would be in a position to put out very strong sides next year (Cronkbourne in particular) if the element of trust and common sense is removed and rules applied. This will then most certainly bring future debate and suggestions when a side loses like the named 8 which was introduced previously (which was manipulated by some clubs).

The performance committee are completely against as a result of representing the Isle of Man you are restricted playing opportunities on the Island (of which 8 players didn't play and 4 others are juniors therefore eligible under the exemption of juniors rule) being reintroduced in any competition.

We would like to propose the following be re-presented to the senior committee:

The return to common sense as utilised in 2016 which we believe worked and an acknowledgement there are winners and losers in the game of cricket.

The game in question the 'Island players' didn't influence the result as much as other players and the result could and should have been different.

As an alternative if this isn't accepted and to ensure equity to ALL clubs that the 'island player' restriction not be used but a more robust eligibility criteria of 'any player who has played 50% or more premier league games in the preceding season for any club is ineligible for the Blincoe cup the following season to keep this as a 'second team' competition for all clubs.

Any schools or representative side entered into the premier league shall be exempt of the above restriction.

In the event of premier league games being cancelled or abandoned teams must enter their team onto play cricket to ensure accuracy with players number of games. In the event of a game being conceded due to lack of players ALL players who have represented the club at any level will be accredited with a premier league game to their total.

We would hope common sense is the chosen option as the Blincoe is recognised as a huge opportunity to develop younger players and senior players are important to allow this to take place, 'Island players' could have a key role in this happening in the right environments.

The tag of 'national team player' needs to be removed as a first port of call when playing restrictions are being considered and more detailed/measured approach taken if this is to be suggested in future.