

Laws courses 2021 – topics related to changes in the Laws

General comments about the revision

The changes will mostly make little difference to the way the game is played. One objective of the revision was to make the Laws more comprehensible and to assist players and referees in locating issues within the Laws when they crop up. To that end, a much more comprehensive index has been produced and tables have been added at the end of the Laws summarising the marginal case rulings and the consequences and limits of claims of the various irregularities (errors and interferences) that can occur. A secondary objective was to have greater commonality with the Rules of Golf Croquet where that is appropriate.

Certain things have also been added to the Laws. The rules concerning time limits have been brought in from the regulations. Laws on alternate stroke doubles and super-advanced play have been brought into the body of the Laws from the appendices in recognition of the fact that these forms of play have become more common in some jurisdictions.

Some issues that can cause difficulties for referees have been covered more comprehensively. What actions should a referee take when a player is wasting time? How should a referee deal with situations where a player either gratuitously receives advice or improperly seeks advice? Previously, the Laws mandated referees to take action without always giving guidance on what to do. These additions are intended to help referees with some more difficult aspects of their job without taking away their freedom to take other measures that seem appropriate in the circumstances.

Critical strokes and hampered strokes

The 7th Edition of the Laws introduces two concepts: critical strokes and hampered strokes, which are relevant to different parts of the Laws. (In fact, the concept of a hampered stroke has been in use for a long time, but was not formally defined in the Laws as we have been using them in the recent past.)

- The concept of a critical stroke is important in dealing with situations where the striker's mallet accidentally contacts a ball (usually but not necessarily the striker's ball) or the striker somehow moves a ball between strokes when not entitled to do so.
- The concept of a hampered stroke is important because some actions are faults if the stroke is hampered, but are not faults if the stroke is not hampered.
- Some strokes will be both critical and hampered; others will be critical but not hampered; and still others will be hampered but not critical. The great majority of strokes, of course, will be neither. We will cover both of these concepts in more detail.

Accidental contacts between mallet and ball

Origins of the problem: a ball that is accidentally moved may not be accurately replaced, perhaps as a consequence giving the striker a more plausible hampered roquet or a more plausible hoop. This applies to someone who accidentally moves a ball while casting, and also to someone who does not cast but accidentally moves the striker's ball when placing the mallet behind the ball before playing a stroke.

The problem could be solved by making any contact between mallet and ball a stroke and perhaps a fault (as is done in GC). But there has been opposition to that in the AC community. In addition, it doesn't entirely avoid problems: it leaves open the opportunity for the opponent to allege an accidental contact which the striker denies. Who is to be believed?

The way this accidental contact problem is addressed is to say that an accidental contact should not count as a stroke if it occurs in a situation where the exact position of the striker's ball is not crucial. The striker is permitted to start again. But an accidental contact with the striker's ball does count as the stroke if it occurs in a situation where the exact position of the striker's ball does matter, and it may be a fault, depending on how the contact occurs. In such a situation, an accidental contact with another ball is a fault, a stroke has been played and the striker's turn ends.

Accidental contacts during a stroke (Law 8)

- The definition of critical stroke: one where the striker's ball is in a critical position so far as the intended outcome of the stroke is concerned. A critical position is defined as in the current laws (currently Law 6(d)): a minor change in position could materially affect future play – in

other words a minor change in position could materially alter the likelihood of the striker achieving what is intended.

- Examples (commentary G3)
- Striker's ball in position where running hoop would be difficult. It is the combination of distance and angle that matters, not either distance or angle separately. (This may also be a hampered stroke, depending on how the striker plays the stroke)
- Striker's ball in position where hoop, peg or another ball obstructs swing in making a roquet (necessarily also a hampered stroke). Note that in a situation where an extraneous ball anywhere behind the striker could be contacted on the backswing, the stroke is considered to be a critical stroke. Marking the balls does not change that, and it doesn't matter how far the ball is behind the striker.
- Striker's ball is close to another ball the striker intends to involve in the stroke and their proximity creates a risk of a fault (not just because their proximity means striker needs to play a difficult cut rush) (not a hampered stroke – neither stance nor swing is impeded)
- Striker's ball in a position near a hoop where it can see just a sliver of a ball the striker wants to roquet past the hoop (not a hampered stroke – neither stance nor swing is impeded)
- What is a "minor change" in a ball's position? Take this to be roughly up to a quarter of a ball's diameter. The law deliberately does not quantify this, to avoid players using rulers and getting into arguments.
 - Definition of striking period Now more extended and defined in the same way as for GC. Stroke and striking period start when striker takes a stance with the apparent intention of playing a stroke.
 - For a critical stroke: Once a stroke has started, any contact with a ball is a stroke and may be a fault, depending on how the contact occurs; but If the striker's ball has already been marked by a referee or to the joint satisfaction of the players, an accidental contact with the striker's ball does not count as a stroke. The stroke can effectively be treated as non-critical. The striker just casually placing a marker somewhere is not sufficient to satisfy the law.
 - For a non-critical stroke: Contact with striker's ball does not count as a stroke
Contact with the ball from which croquet is taken does not count as a stroke (note official ruling)
 - Contact in non-critical stroke: Striker required to try to avoid further contact
Avoiding further contact annuls stroke
But if there is further contact in a swing in which the striker intended to play the stroke – the stroke is played. The fact that the striker accidentally hit the ball and then deliberately hit it a second time is not in itself considered to be a multiple contact fault (Law 8.5.2.2). Unlikely that there would be further contact in a swing when striker did not intend to play the stroke
 - Non-critical stroke annulled: Striker may start stroke again, but
Striker may not then attempt any critical stroke that could have been an alternative to the annulled stroke.
 - Decision on borderline cases Stroke is to be considered a critical stroke

Accidental contact between strokes (Law 36)

If a striker has a difficult position and the stroke the striker would like to play would be a critical stroke, the striker cannot get around the accidental contact regime just described by trying out what might be possible using a stance obviously different from that used to play a stroke (so that the striking period cannot be said to have started). There is a second part to the accidental contact regime set out in Law 36 (and cross-referenced in Law 8.5.3). This covers an accidental contact between strokes with any ball that would then be involved in the next stroke.

- Accidental contact with any ball between strokes carries a penalty (with certain exemptions)
- Contact with striker's ball: Striker may not then attempt any critical stroke
- Contact with another ball: Striker may not attempt any critical stroke involving that ball
- Exemptions:
 - Ball already marked by a referee or to the joint satisfaction of the players
 - Ball striker is entitled to lift or move temporarily and if necessary it has been marked
 - Ball moved in emergency (whether or not marked)
- Striker about to attempt forbidden stroke: opponent's right to intervene (Law 36.5)
- Striker does attempt forbidden stroke: opponent's right to obtain remedy under overriding law (Law 36.5)

Hampered strokes (Law 29)

A familiar concept, but until now the laws have used only a limited form of it. A stroke is hampered if the striker has to take special care because the swing of the mallet or the striker's normal stance is impeded by a hoop, the peg or an extraneous ball – one that the striker is not taking croquet from nor intending to roquet in the stroke.

- Examples (commentary G3)
- Striker's ball in position where hoop, peg or another ball hampers swing in making a roquet (may also be a critical stroke);
 - Striker's ball in position where hoop, peg or another ball requires striker to alter stance even though swing of mallet is not impeded (not usually a critical stroke but may be, depending on position)
 - Striker's ball in position where another ball is close to where the striker would stand to play the stroke and striker must be careful not to touch it (not usually a critical stroke)
 - Extraneous ball is close to the striker's ball, so that the striker has to take care not to contact it either before or after hitting the striker's ball (will usually also be a critical stroke)

If a stroke is hampered, then two of the faults become relevant. Deal with those next.

Faults (Law 29)

There are only minor changes to the faults law (now Law 29). Three of the faults have been extended to a wider range of situations. In addition, because of the extension of the striking period, as previously discussed, some faults may be more likely to occur.

Two faults have been extended in scope to the same range of circumstances. These are:

- striking the striker's ball with any part of the mallet other than an end face of the head (Law 29.1.5); and
- causing significant damage to the court with the mallet (Law 29.1.14).

The circumstances in which each of these is a fault are:

- a hampered stroke (hampering of the striker's stance is new for both faults)
- an attempted single-ball jump stroke (new for failing to hit with the end face)
- striker's ball is part of a group (new for failing to hit with the end face)

Note that damaging the court with the mallet in a croquet stroke is not a fault, but damaging it in a cannon is a fault. Note also that these two faults do not apply to a croquet stroke played so that the striker is attempting to make the striker's ball jump (which is how some players play certain types of croquet stroke).

The third fault that has been extended in scope is resting a hand or arm against the legs during a stroke (Law 29.1.2). This contradicts the interpretation commonly used previously in NZ (but not elsewhere!) that allowed a stroke to be played one-handed with the other hand braced on the leg.

The only other point about the faults law needing to be made is that the law now more explicitly defines the circumstances in which a multiple hit in a croquet stroke or continuation stroke with balls in contact is a fault. The stroke is a fault only if an adjudicator or the striker sees a separation of the balls and then sees a second contact between them. This will be rare.

Note that it may well be that the striker will feel a double contact in a croquet stroke but it occurs so rapidly that the relevant fault law does not apply: the separation of the balls and then the second hit would not both be visible.

Referee's ability to award a fault in a stroke that was not adjudicated (Law 55.4)

- If neither striker nor opponent calls a referee before stroke and opponent believes a fault was committed, opponent may ask a referee to award a fault post facto.
- To award a fault, referee must be satisfied that one was committed (note standard of proof) on basis of:
 - facts about the stroke on which the players agree; or
 - the striker's evidence (not that of the opponent); or
 - the referee's observations of the stroke, its effects and its outcome (i.e. the positions of the balls after the stroke and any signs of court damage); or
 - the evidence of suitable neutral witnesses (specifically excluding the opponent) whom the referee chooses to consult

Scoring a hoop, and hoop and roquet in the same stroke (Laws 20 and 21)

There is a change of principle here which will occasionally make a difference in practice

The laws now use the term "protrudes out of the jaws" of a hoop rather than "breaks the plane of the playing (or non-playing) side" of the hoop in describing certain positions of the striker's ball. This corresponds to what a referee looks for when checking the position of the ball: can any of it be seen projecting beyond the uprights of the hoop on the relevant side?

The law about a ball scoring its hoop (Law 20.3) now specifies that if a ball comes to rest where no part of it protrudes out of the hoop on the playing side then it has scored the hoop. This means that in the limiting case where the back of the ball exactly touches a straight line stretched between the uprights on the playing side, then the ball has scored the hoop. This reverses the ruling that has applied until now. It treats the plane defined by the uprights as being part of the jaws (which the 6th Edition of the Laws did not). It also removes the need for a referee to carry a length of fishing line to test whether a ball has scored its hoop (something I dislike anyway because of the risk of moving the ball!).

The law about a ball placed for a croquet stroke within the jaws of its hoop in order (Law 20.4.2) means that it can start to run the hoop and score it from that position if no part of the ball protrudes out of the jaws on the non-playing side. This means that in the limiting case where the contact point between the striker's ball and the ball from which it is about to take croquet is exactly on the straight line between the two uprights, the striker's ball can run the hoop and score it from that position. This is the same ruling as has applied until now. It treats the plane defined by the uprights as being part of the jaws (which the 6th Edition of the Laws also did).

The 7th Edition of the Laws thus removes an inconsistency of principle between these two cases.

The Laws use the term "clear of the jaws" of a hoop in describing the position of a ball other than the striker's ball in dealing with positions where the striker's ball runs its hoop and hits another ball during a single stroke (Law 21). All of the provisions of this law are the same as they used to be.

Note the test a referee should use in checking the position of a ball outside the hoop in relation to the jaws: can any gap be seen between the ball and the plane across the hoop uprights?

The limiting case where the edge of a ball outside the hoop exactly touches a line between the two hoop uprights does not create a dilemma for a referee. The referee cannot see a gap between the ball and the hoop, and the law about hoop and roquet in the same stroke (Law 21.2) cannot apply, because the outside ball is not clear of the jaws of the hoop on the non-playing side.

Marginal ball positions (Laws 8, 13, 15, 16, 20, 21 and 36)

The new laws specify how a number of marginal cases are to be treated. These are positions where a referee (or the players) have carried out an appropriate test as accurately as possible and are unable to decide between the two possibilities. The rulings that the laws give for these marginal cases must not, however, be used as an easy substitute for careful adjudication. The laws previously covered some, but not all, of these marginal situations.

The positions that the rulings cover are:

- ball scoring hoop – it has scored the hoop, as already described (Law 20.6.1)
- ball placed to score hoop – it can score the hoop from that position, as already described (Law 20.6.2)
- other ball outside hoop – it is within the jaws. Hoop and roquet in the same stroke is not possible and there are other consequences specified in Law 21.5 depending on whether the other ball is live or dead (Law 21.5)
- whether a ball is on or off the court – it is off (Law 13)
- whether ball to be placed on the yard-line should be in contact with another ball already there – they are to be placed out of contact (Law 15)
- whether the relevant ball is wired from a target ball – it is wired (Law 16, same as previously)
- whether the stroke the striker intends to play is a critical stroke when this may not be permitted under Laws 8 or 36 – it is a critical stroke

Players and referees are not expected to remember these marginal case rulings. In the rare cases when one of them occurs, look up the ruling in Table 1, at the end of the Laws. It summarises all of them and references the relevant law.

When a stroke may be played and declared (Laws 8, 26)

Normally, a stroke may be played when all balls are at rest on the court, so that the previous stroke has ended (or they have been moved to avoid interference). But striker may play a stroke before the previous stroke has ended provided the striker's ball is at rest in a lawful position and the outcome of neither stroke could be affected.

This can apply to the striker declaring a stroke to have been played. If time is about to be called, the striker may be able to declare a stroke before previous stroke has ended, potentially gaining an extra turn as a result.

What happens if one stroke affects the other (balls from the two strokes interfere, or the striker is not entitled to play the second stroke at all because something in the first stroke ends the turn)? The second stroke is treated as the striker playing when not entitled and Law 26 applies to that stroke. Balls moved in the second stroke are replaced, and any ball from the first stroke interfered with by a ball from the second stroke must be placed where it would otherwise have come to rest.

Striker entitled to a lift able to create a group on the baulk-line (Laws 16, 39, 40, 11)

- When the striker takes a wiring or advanced play lift and can create a 3-ball or 4-ball group by placing the striker's ball on the baulk-line, the striker may take croquet immediately only from a ball that the striker's ball can touch while placed on the baulk-line.
- Demonstrate examples; in each case the striker of Black and Blue is entitled to a lift:
 - Red and Yellow in contact in the centre of A-baulk (striker may take croquet immediately from either of them);

Red on the first corner spot and Yellow in contact with it on the West boundary (striker can take croquet only from Red);

Red on the first corner spot and Yellow in contact with it on A-baulk (striker can take croquet only from Yellow).

- Contrast this with the situation where the striker begins a turn when the ball the striker chooses to play is part of a group. There is then no restriction on the ball from which the striker may take croquet, regardless of how they are arranged.

Involving an outside agency in play (Law 33)

There is a range of idiocies a player can commit by involving an outside agency in play in various ways. A law has been introduced specifying when the striker gets relief from these idiocies and when the striker must live with the consequences. The 6th Edition Laws covered only some of these situations and only in the commentary on the wrong ball law (noting that it isn't a case of playing a wrong ball anyway).

- When the striker gets relief: plays or introduces into play a ball not belonging to the game
plays or introduces into play a ball not yet involved in the game
plays or introduces into play a ball that has been involved in the game but has been pegged out and removed from the court
- Remedy in these situations situation corrected, striker resumes turn without penalty, subject to other errors that may need to be dealt with
- When the striker gets no relief striker attempts to roquet a double-banked ball
striker plays to roquet a double-banked ball in the next stroke
- Inadvertent ball swap when striker's play is unaffected and swap may be reversed
play in game from which ball is taken will probably be affected

Examples:

The striker of Red and Yellow goes onto the court and strikes Pink (striker can try again, opponent should forestall, other game might intervene);

The striker of Black attempts to roquet Pink (no relief permitted – was striker trying to roquet Pink or just play Black past Pink? Opponent not required to forestall, other game might intervene but should not);

The striker of Black plays a take-off from Blue attempting to get a rush on Pink (no relief permitted, opponent not required to forestall);

The striker of Blue roquets Yellow off the court, retrieves the Red ball from the next court and takes croquet from it (striker gets relief, opponent should forestall);

The striker of Blue roquets Yellow off the court, retrieves the Yellow ball from the next court and takes croquet from it (how can anyone tell? This is a case of inadvertent ball swap so far as the striker's game is concerned, but the game from which the ball is stolen will probably be affected and will need relief if mistake is discovered.

and so on.

Hoops (Laws 4, 5 and 38)

- Tolerances in position have been amended to be the same as in GC, as has the tolerance in the height of the hoop.
- Striker can require hoop to be adjusted if any part of the base would affect either the swing of the mallet or the passage of the ball, even if the height is within the specified tolerance. No consequential adjustment is made to the position of any ball. Protruding base of hoop cannot be a cause of wiring.

- Incorrect equipment that has materially affected play must be corrected before it might next affect play (Law 24.3.5) If striker takes a replay, equipment must be corrected first. If no replay, adjustment may be delayed to avoid additional disruption to the striker's turn. No disadvantage to either side, since each player can get the width of the hoop adjusted when it is that player's turn.

Multiple errors and interferences (Law 24)

- Basic rule is that errors and interferences are considered in the chronological order of their occurrence
- Additional considerations
 - any error or interference past its limit of claims is ignored
 - dealing with more than one error or interference occurring simultaneously when a stroke is played – precedences: interferences in order first then errors in order
 - if stroke materially affected by incorrect equipment and a fault occurs later in stroke not caused by the equipment, the fault must be dealt with
 - once error or interference is dealt with under this law, subsequent errors or interferences are ignored
 - correction of equipment as described earlier
- This can get complicated. Use examples C24.5.4 and C24.5.5 from commentary

Player misled by false information (Law 32.1.1)

- The causes of being misled for which a remedy is available have been extended to false information supplied by a referee or someone the players have authorised to act as timekeeper (the latter limited to information about time remaining)

Player fails to follow a different line of play in a replay after being misled (Law 32.5)

- If a player is granted a replay but then does not follow a different line of play in the replay and the opponent (not a referee) complains, the player loses the right to the replay. The original play is reinstated. Limit of claims the third stroke of the replay.

Interference with a ball during a stroke or interference with playing of a stroke (Laws 34.2.1 and 35.2)

- It is now explicit that the striker must attempt the same stroke with the same objectives in a replay. The objectives of a stroke include doing something specific with the striker's ball (making a roquet, running a hoop, sending it to a particular position etc.) and, if the stroke is a croquet stroke, positioning the croqueted ball for some purpose.
- Example Striker's ball collides with a moving ball when striker has played a roll stroke from the side of the hoop to attempt to get hoop running position and it is unclear whether the striker's ball would have stopped in position. In the replay, the striker must attempt to get hoop running position again, but is the striker required to do so with a roll stroke again? I think that is required by the phrasing of the law (Law 34.2.1, and Law 35.2 for analogous situations under Law 35): the striker must replay the same stroke with the same objectives.
- What happens if striker does not do this? Opponent has the choice of accepting the outcome or forcing a further replay of the original stroke.

Stroke affected by incorrect equipment (Law 38.2)

- Of the two options permitted previously, the one that we always used is now the only option. The law is framed in the same terms as the official ruling on Law 53(b)(3) that we have used in recent years.
- If the striker is entitled to a replay, the replay is optional, not compulsory
- If a replay is chosen, striker must attempt to get the ball through the hoop again (but not necessarily by the same method).

- If the striker does not attempt the replay properly, opponent has choice of accepting outcome or forcing a further replay of the attempt to get the ball through the hoop.
- Note that the law does not apply only to attempts to run a hoop to score it but also to attempts to get the ball through the hoop for any other purpose.
- There will be rare occasions when a ball does jam in a hoop but the striker cannot plausibly claim a replay. For example, the striker misses a short roquet and the striker's ball then stops in a hoop some metres up the court that just coincidentally happens to be the ball's hoop in order. On testing it is found that the ball would contact both uprights of the hoop simultaneously. Is the striker entitled to replay the stroke as a consequence? No! The striker cannot plausibly claim to have been attempting to get the ball through the hoop.

Special damage (Law 37.3)

- Repair is now the preferred option. Moving balls to avoid damage is to be done only when repair is not practicable.

Consultation by the striker

- In many places, the laws previously required the striker to consult the opponent before doing something (e.g. check whether a hoop is scored). Often that did not happen in practice: the striker called a referee immediately. The laws now specifically permit that.
- If opponent is consulted and requests adjudication, striker must call a referee, or involve someone else appropriately if no referee is available.

Conduct of the game: when the players' opinions differ (Law 55.6)

- When the players' opinions differ on some matter, there is now greater emphasis on someone being well-placed to make a judgement if that person's opinion is to be preferred
- When a player disturbs a ball or fails to avoid interference, the circumstances in which each side's opinion should prevail are:
 - non-offender's opinion should normally prevail if non-offender is well placed to make a judgement (regardless of how well placed the offender is to make a judgement) or if neither side is well placed to make a judgement;
 - offender's opinion should normally prevail only if offender is well placed to make a judgement and non-offender is not
- In situations where the striker is not to blame for an accidental misplacement of a ball, the opinion of the player better placed to make a judgement is generally to be preferred.
- When question is whether a ball has been hit or has moved, opinion that it was hit or did move is generally to be preferred providing the person holding that opinion is well placed to make a judgement.

Addressing the issue of time wasting (Laws 56 and 63.5)

- The law specifies how a complaint is to be dealt with (Laws 63.5.1 to 63.5.3, same as at present)
- The law (Law 63.5.6) gives specific options for addressing a justified complaint and also allows a referee to choose some other option that appears reasonable in the circumstances
- First option: add time to the game (a minimum of 10 minutes). To be used only when one player is wasting time when the game is getting close to the time limit. NOT to be used for routinely slow play
- Second option: apply a cumulative time limit to each turn of both sides. Deals with routinely slow play, but requires constant involvement of referee
 - cover what the cumulative limit involves (Law 63.5.6.2)
 - cover what happens if a cumulative limit expires (Law 63.5.8)
- The manager of a tournament has the power to vary the times employed in the cumulative time limit (but should be cautious about doing so)

- Action taken by the referee under this law is always subject to appeal to the RoT

Advice – Laws 57 and 63

These two laws now cover more fully the problems that can arise as a result of gratuitous advice and what a referee's options are for dealing with these problems. In all cases, a referee is entitled to choose options that are different from those set out in the laws. Previously, the actions a referee should take in response to gratuitous advice were largely left to the referee's imagination.

Advice: player seeking advice during a game (Laws 57 and 63)

- Things that the law forbids: consulting reference material; watching, listening to or reading commentary; improperly seeking advice. Note, however, that it is acceptable for a player to seek advice on the Laws, refereeing regulations, or event conditions when these are relevant to something that has already happened or may be about to happen. A player may also ask about the state of the game or the amount of time remaining.
- Law 63.6 specifies penalties for improperly seeking advice, graduating in severity up to loss of match for a third offence. But Law 57.3 permits a referee to decide that different penalties should apply.
- Because penalties are imposed under the overriding law, they are always subject to appeal

Advice: provided by spectators (Law 57.4)

- Note the restriction on what the striker is permitted to do after receiving advice in a team event from team members or officials: the striker is not permitted to act on the advice (Law 57.4.2).

Advice that an error or interference has been committed (Laws 57.5 and 63)

- Such advice is dealt with in the same way as previously, but Law 63.4 specifies options a referee can use when required to restore the balance of the game. These options depend only on the likelihood of the mistake otherwise being discovered.
- A referee's decision is always subject to appeal and referee is entitled to choose options different from those the law specifies.

Advice that a mistake is about to be committed (Laws 57.6 and 63)

- If striker is advised about an imminent non-fatal mistake, striker is permitted to take advantage of the advice (Law 57.6.1); and
- If striker is advised about an imminent fatal mistake, striker may act on advice but if it is correct may not then score any further points during the turn (Law 57.6.2)
- If either side considers its interests are adversely affected by these provisions it can ask a referee to restore the balance of the game (Law 57.6.3)
- A referee asked to restore the balance of the game must take into account both
 - the likelihood of the mistake otherwise being discovered; and
 - the advantage the striker would gain by acting on the advice
- Laws 63.4.6 to 63.4.9 specify actions the referee may take and allow the referee to take any other action that appears more suitable in the circumstances.

Other unsolicited advice (Laws 57.7 and 63)

- A player receiving other unsolicited advice is required to consult the opponent. (This might, for example, be advice such as "you haven't used Blue yet"). Either player who considers his or her interests have been unduly affected can ask a referee to restore the balance of the game
- The referee is required to negate as far as possible any advantage the player would gain from the advice (Law 63.4.10)

Restriction on the use of headphones and earplugs (Law 57.9)

- Restriction on devices capable of receiving advice from an external source
- Restriction on any device that makes communication difficult

- Who is entitled to deal with a player infringing this law (referee only)
- Dealing with hearing aids: not restricted, but functionality enabling receipt of information electronically may need to be switched off.

Time limited games (Law 61)

- Relevant rules that were previously in the regulations have been brought into the laws
- A law has been introduced specifying when a bisque is taken for the purposes of deciding whether it is before time expires (and the bisque may therefore be played) or after it expires (so that the bisque may not be played). A bisque is taken only when the first stroke of the bisque turn is played (Law 61.2.2).
- The definition of when one turn ends and the next begins for the purposes of deciding who is in play when time expires has been expanded to cover
 - discovery of an error after last stroke of a turn is played that is within its limit of claims – the turn does not end until the error has been dealt with (Law 61.1.3)
 - requirement to replay a stroke to remedy an interference – when the replay starts time is reset to what it was to when the original stroke was played (Law 61.1.4)
- New law has been included specifying when a timer may be stopped temporarily (Law 61.4). This is significantly stricter than has been common practice in NZ. Timer may be stopped for:
 - non-standard refereeing action (not including a normal wiring test)
 - finding a lost ball or replacing it
 - unavailability of a player because of official duties, illness or injury
 - adjournments of the game
 - a delay of at least 5 minutes for other reasons, including double banking
 - disruption and weather
- These laws can be varied in tournament regulations or event conditions.

Croquet strokes – purporting to take croquet replaced (Laws 28.4, 28.5)

- Definition of a croquet stroke: any stroke where two balls are in contact except for a lawful continuation stroke
- Same treatment of errors as before, but given different names:
 - unlawful croquet stroke involving a dead ball (fatal)
 - unlawful croquet stroke involving a live ball (non-fatal)

Rover ball becoming dead when it is pegged out (Law 22.3.1)

- This could be omitted as its occurrence will be very rare

Alternate stroke doubles (Laws 48 to 50)

- Cover what is involved if audience is interested