



## NAF Annual Review 2023

Outcome of the open discussion with international tournament staff

---

### Content

This document summarizes the discussion in the weeks preceding November 5<sup>th</sup> on the semi-public forum <https://nafreview.freeforums.net/>. Invitations went out to international tournament staff and associates to bring up and debate current topics that should be covered in the NAF Annual Review.

### Participants

Coaches that logged in at least once during the discussion period:

<b>NAF name</b>	<b>Function</b>
Bucks	RC France
Claymore	NC New Zealand
Deferdan	NC England
Fiki	RC Ireland
Gaixo	NC USA, President
Grant85	NC Canada
Grither	RC USA
Grom	NC Czech Republic
Hachablanca	NC Spain
Ironbreaker	NC Portugal
Janninu	NC Malta
Jelmer	NC Netherlands
Jokaero	NC Switzerland
Lunchmoney	RC UK
Magikmoon	RC France
Matte8	NC Italy
Megamind	League Director, Media Officer
Oberwald	NC Sweden
Pebguin	RC USA
Sann0638	Advisory board member
Sebco	NC France
Shawass	RC Poland
Stewbacca	RC UK
Stimme	Tournament Director, NAF Review Coordinator
Straume	NC Norway
Tank	NC Denmark
TheShepherd	NC Wales



Thot	RC France
Topas	Tournament Series Coordinator
Twyllenimor	NC Germany, Membership Director

*NC = National Coordinator; RC = Regional Coordinator*

## Items covered in the open discussion

The following items were addressed during the discussions:

1. Definition of "Specialist" tournaments
2. Future of Slann
3. Distances between overlapping tournaments
4. Online NAF tournaments
5. Recording of non-NAF matches
6. Disciplinary actions
7. World Cup voting process
8. Naming policy
9. Ranking of squad tournaments
10. Various others

### 1. Definition of "Specialist" tournaments

A discussion revolved around the need for clearer guidelines on what rule variations classify a Blood Bowl tournament as 'Specialist.' There is some concern about inconsistencies in tournament approvals across different regions, with some members noting that certain untested and unbalanced custom rules significantly deviate from the standard game format. The NAF Tournament Approval Document already details restrictions, but a problem was perceived in the enforcement and awareness of these guidelines by tournament approvers. The discussion also called for better communication within the tournament approval team to ensure consistent application of the rules globally.

### 2. Future of Slann

Some members feel that Slann teams, which are not officially recognized by Games Workshop, may offer an unfair advantage to those familiar with them against opponents who are not. However, there's a sentiment that it would be harsh to completely forbid them, considering their historical official status and the fact that many players have invested in Slann teams. The current position allows tournament organizers to decide whether to include Slann teams or not. The consensus among several members is to maintain Slann teams due to their unique playstyle and established presence in the community.

### 3. Distances between overlapping tournaments

There was a discussion about the approval process for tournaments and issues arising from the rules about event proximity. In the UK, there is a 100-mile rule that sometimes conflicts with the reality of tournament organization due to the country's size and the varying formats of events that might not actually compete with each other. The conversation highlighted the need for better coordination and communication among Tournament Organizers (TOs), possibly through the use of technology that can alert TOs to potential clashes at the time of event entry. Different approaches in other countries like France and Germany involve dividing regions into zones, using challenges to coordinate, and employing chat groups for TOs to manage tournament dates and prevent conflicts.



## 4. Online NAF tournaments

Concerns were raised about the fairness and inclusivity of the sign-up processes for online tournaments (specifically the very recent BB3 tournament), particularly the use of lottery systems versus first-come-first-served methods for tournament entry. There is a debate over whether a lottery system might be more equitable, especially when events sell out quickly. The discussion leans towards creating a set of guidelines for online tournaments to formalize procedures and clarify the rules, with a view that if events become as in-demand as major music concerts, a lottery might indeed be preferable to ensure equal chances for participation.

## 5. Recording of non-NAF matches

The discussion centered on how to handle the participation of non-NAF members in NAF-sanctioned tournaments. The idea of a generic 'NO\_NAF' account was proposed to maintain match history without affecting rankings. However, opinions differ: some believe that NAF membership should be mandatory for tournaments, while others suggest offering "free" membership or allowing TOs to choose. The conversation also touched on reasons why some players resist joining the NAF, such as disliking official bodies, having a negative perception of the NAF, or anxiety over recorded performance. Some members propose a firm stance on requiring NAF membership for tournament participation, as catering to non-members may not align with the NAF's interests and could diminish the incentive to register.

The implementation of a generic account for non-NAF members is debated, with some members liking the idea as it would preserve the historical aspect of matches. However, others suggest that it may be a complex change to the NAF database and could potentially discourage players from registering with the NAF. There's also an acknowledgment that the issue may not be widespread outside of France, and the focus remains on whether it's beneficial to adapt to the preferences of a few non-members versus reinforcing the importance of NAF membership. The consensus leans towards the latter, with the understanding that non-members may choose to participate in other, non-NAF sanctioned events instead.

## 6. Disciplinary actions

The community was debating the enforcement of bans on coaches from tournaments due to misconduct. A recent blog post about a year-long ban of a coach has raised questions about how such a ban would be implemented and enforced, considering the possibility of the coach attending events under false pretenses. There is no current system for flagging banned individuals across the community or on the NAF website, and there's concern about the precedent this sets for future cases. The discussion suggests the need for an Ethics Committee to propose measures for how to deal with problematic coaches, or setting up a Disciplinary Board.

## 7. World Cup voting process

The NAF community was discussing how to improve the World Cup bid selection process for greater transparency and feedback. The suggestion is for voters to use a criteria grid to score bids, which would help unsuccessful candidates understand how to improve future proposals and provide winners with insights for organizing the event. However, there are concerns that such a grid could overly influence voting by not allowing voters to weigh certain criteria according to personal importance. The conversation also touches on providing feedback to losing bids and reviewing the gap between the project proposals and the actual event, with a call for the NAF to take a more professional approach in overseeing the organization of such large-scale events.



## 8. Naming policy

The question was brought up whether the NAF needs a naming policy for coach names, sparked by a coach questioning the appropriateness of certain edgy or potentially offensive usernames, especially in the context of events attended by younger players, emphasizing the need for a policy that reflects the diversity of the player base's age range.

Also, the TD suggests to limit coach name changes to significant personal reasons, not frivolous ones like losing bets.

## 9. Ranking of squad tournaments

There was a debate about whether team tournaments should be considered majors for individual ranking purposes, as it could lead to individuals gaining ranking points even if their team loses. Some members think that major events like the World Cup should be exempt from this due to their infrequency and prestige, while others believe that the current ranking system doesn't reflect the true skill level if it's influenced by team performance. There's also a mention of implementing the Glicko system, which accounts for activity and could address the issue of ranking point accumulation from such tournaments.

## 10. Various other topics

- There was a discussion on whether the NAF should have a dedicated person to advise on streaming Blood Bowl events, following disappointment from those unable to follow the World Cup.
- It was suggested to create a role to promote diversity at Blood Bowl events due to the low number of female and ethnic minority participants.
- Access to the Coordinator section of the NAF forum was granted to all current RCs/NCs.
- The NAF is considering implementing badges, armbands, or other identifiers for staff members at large tournaments to help participants easily recognize them, with suggestions ranging from a simple lanyard and ID card to more official gear such as captain armbands.
- Improvements were done to the website based on feedback.
- It was questioned whether NAF trophy requirements for tournaments should be reviewed.
- In the near future, rights to correct match entries will be extended to national and regional coordinators. For this purpose, an event logging system has already been set up.