

Technical Working Group Minutes

Date: Monday 23rd of September 2019

Time: 6:00pm to 8:00pm

Venue: Meakin Park (Football Queensland)

Attendees

Tom Laxton (Brisbane City FC), Nick Croyden (Logan Lightning), Matthew Poole (Moreton Bay United), Michael Angus (Sunshine Coast Wanderers), Sarah Willington (Souths United), John Sime (Lions FC), Jon McKain (Football Queensland), Robert Cavallucci (Football Queensland), Gabor Ganczer (Football Queensland), Murray Bird (Football Queensland), Connor Ellis (Football Queensland)

Apologies

Nacho Ferrer (Brisbane Strikers), Craig Midgley (Gold Coast United), Warren Moon (Brisbane Roar), Scott MacNicol (Rochdale Rovers)

Agenda

Update on FQ Technical Audits

An update on the technical audits that are being completed by State Technical Director Gabor Ganczer. Gabor plans on having all audits completed by the end of this week (Friday 27th of September)

Gabor plans to work with clubs to further develop the matrix that is used for the technical audits for the future.

Potential Model/Matrix Update – Robert Cavallucci

Update around a couple of potential options that have been put forward around how the technical audits and points would be coupled to determine the rankings of all clubs from 1-24.

There was comments and discussion around the third model created to be a dynamic and allow for changes to the weighting of points etc. to create a difference in the percentage given to the technical audits and points.

Model 1 as a multiplier between technical audit score and points is the preferred method of ranking over model 2 which is technical audit score plus points. Model 2 has been determined by the Working Group to not be an accurate model and has been removed from conversation.

Ability in the model to give as an example the technical audits a weighting of 70% of the total ranking and also the option to give individual data points a weighting to make up the 70%. Equal weighting of each data point of the technical audit was seen as the preferred option amongst the Working Group. Model 3 and Model 4 were created to give visuals for the WG.

Potential Formats

Proposal 1

Top 6 Clubs rewarded for their technical audits and consistency by being 'ring-fenced'

Feedback:

- Five (5) games is not enough
- Not enough best v best or like v like
- Any club can qualify for the high competition phase
- Top clubs are rewarded
- Quicker and simpler grading period
- Not as much integrity in the competition only playing them once

Proposal 2

Top and Bottom six (6) teams are 'ring fenced' in their pool and competition whilst the middle two (2) pools may have movement between them.

Feedback:

- Too many issues with this model and has been scraped by the Working Group
- Blocking the bottom six (6) teams for aspiring to play at a higher level

Additional model proposed by Tom Laxton – Now known as Proposal 4

Proposal 3

Feedback:

- Aspirational for all
- Seen as fair for all
- Club '7' not playing as many good games, not as much like v like
- Top six (6) still ring-fenced and rewarded
- Majority of the Working Group preferred proposal 3 over proposal 1

There was discussion and conversation about there to potentially be three (3) pools of eight (8) rather than top 6, middle 9 and bottom 9.

This model along with operational considerations (i.e centralized venues) was preferred and nominated by the Working Group to be recommended to the FQ Board for consideration.

Proposal 4

Same as Proposal 2 with the middle two (2) pools being combined to create one larger middle pool.

Feedback:

- Difficult to follow on in 2020 when the Star Academy Rating is introduced
- Bottom six (6) teams have no opportunity to go up and playing in a higher competition
- Demotivating to the lower ranked clubs
- Best with Best more often and Like v Like more often

Proposal 5

Have the competitions determined solely with the technical audits and previous results with no grading games.

Noted that there are limitations to the technical audit being the sole basis for a club's competition ranking and the result of the model used to determine the ranking needs to be validated through grading games. Gabor commented that the Audit wasn't designed for this purpose, rather for FQ and clubs to better understand their current position and the potential opportunities ahead.

The Working Group as a majority wanted to see the data validated. Many of the audits need to be validated because the Working Group felt with considerable player and coach movements

this would be the best way to determine the club's position from 1-24.

Grading v Competition Phase Length

How long should each phase be to follow the guiding principles of best v best and like v like was discussed.

Operational Concerns

A number of factors were considered around the competition format, such as:

- Midweek games to shorten the 'grading' phase
- Central weekends at one venue
- Multiple games on a weekend
- Starting season time and length of season

NPLW

Conversation had around how the changes to the NPL/FQPL should ideally be in line with the potential changes to the NPLW with the additional of up to three (3) new licences.

If the NPLW does increase to sixteen (16) teams how would it grade out to two (2) competitions of eight (8).

Further discussion to be had by the Working Group around the NPLW for 2020

Club Championship

Potential for there to be a club championship across the competition, to generate interest across the competitions and give clubs aspiration to be better.

Representative Players Score

Tom Laxton presented a model to be considered for how clubs would be rewarded for players that join a National Elite Pathway Program or gain an international call-up.

Further discussion to be had around this model would work in application.

Club Position Based on Teams

How are clubs placed in a competition phase based on the differing results of each individual

team across the 4 age groups.

Further discussion to be had by the Working Group around how this would work and factors that would influence competition positions.

Recommendations

Recommendations were discussed with some to be proposed to the FQ Board.

Next Meeting

The next Technical Working Group meeting will be held:

Tuesday 1st of October – Perry Park -

Working Group Chairman

Jon McKain