Appendix B: Fan Comments

Survey respondents were asked for comments both for the purposes of being quoted and anonymously for reference at the ICC. Each of these are given below, edited only to remove empty answers.

Comments made publicly

Day-Night Test match is one of the best things to happen to cricket. Let's please have more of these matches.

WC qualification should be based off of short 2 week long regional events. 3 European sides, 2 African, 5 Asian, 2 Oceanic, 1 American = 12 sides. Then the best non qualifier from each region lets say Netherlands, Namibia, UAE, PNG, Canada should play off in a repechage tournament like the recent U19 event, with the best two sides making it to a 15 team WC. WC = 3 groups of 5. Could have something like India England Pakistan Scotland Namibia Australia South Africa West Indies Ireland UAE New Zealand Bangladesh Sri Lanka Afghanistan Netherlands Top two qualify automatically from each group = 6 teams, Best two 3rd place sides (based off of points in respective groups and if tied then NRR) also qualify = 8 qualifiers. Adds context to every single match as NRR becomes vital for every team. Two groups of four, top two from each side make it to a semi and then the final. Alternatively could have it so top side of each group makes the final, or even have straight up quarter finals?

Reversing the 2014 reforms and ensuring that cricket gains a spot at the Olympics is essential if we're at all serious about global expansion of the game

The obstacles and complexities are great but a test championship is necessary to keep test cricket relevant and interesting - and to draw in new audiences.

No more than 12 tests a year.

Test Championship essential - 4 year cycle to match World Cup. Game needs to balance expansion with competitive games. Best done by a tier system. Non-Tests should be scheduled between lower tier sides and upper tier A sides, in addition to other games. Player burnout is huge concern - ICC should realise that less is more. 17 tests for England last year was ludicrous

The Big 3 takeover is the most scandalous happening to our sport ever. No other major sport would allow a small cadre of people to dominate a sport to the detriment of 100 other nations, who deserve as much say as the 10 test nations

A way of clearing the ground for more radical changes may be to make participation in the World Cup by qualification only (except host). Regional tournaments, status-neutrality, expansion as well as excellence could all be served. The step towards changing Test cricket may then be easier. 'Context' is a many-faceted thing. Context through the structure of an ongoing competition is but one of those facets. Football/soccer World Cup qualifiers are an example of where the competition is insufficient in most ties to raise the interest of fans. Cricket is already laden with 'context'. As your survey acknowledges, balancing the different kinds of context is difficult.

Ranking a set of predetermined answers will induce bias.

Cricket needs the Woolf report implementing in full as soon as possible, 'Full Membership for Life' has no place in the modern game. Cricket must follow the models set by World Rugby if it hopes to ever grow the game in a meaningful way world wide.

In no other sport are teams/nations prevented from playing a form of the game. If Ireland and Hong Kong want to play a 5 day test, let them. Records and achievements wont be damaged in a way that many think. San Marino lose almost every international football game they ever play, but they have the right to compete at the appropriate level. As fans we know that a team recording a 'biggest ever' win against them isn't much of an achievement. If Australia beat UAE by an innings and 500 runs we as fans can put it into context. If a batsman scored 400 runs we would know it's not as good an innings as Lara. Don't worry about the sanctity of statistics. We arw advanced enough to work out what is meaningful. Just let everybody play.

Cricket is currently a game run by the few, for the few. Opening it up and making it more inclusive will benefit the sport in the long run, rather than the short-term interests of certain board and administrators. If cricket is to thrive and survive it should try to move forwards, rather than conservatively protecting those who are currently in power.

Minnow countries need to have more first class clubs tour major nations and need first class players from Big Nations teams playing for them in popular tournaments to boost their standard-like having sister cities/counties/clubs. You could see Brad Hodge playing for Afghanistan against Australia. That would be cool and fair.

Test match cricket should be seen as the pinnacle and if played the icc should ensure it is financially rewarded. People will watch if there is good cricket against different nations.

Need more games with a lot more at stake, can be money or anything historical.

Status per se is not necessarily a problem. I don't particularly like it, but given the current structure of the ICC membership I think unpicking it completely would be extremely messy. Instead, the ICC should move to a membership model similar to the EU - a set of clear, consistent and achievable criteria for entry, and assistance to prospective members in reaching those goals.

Test cricket neither needs nor 'fits' a championship. Any such competition designed to do the game justice will take too long to complete and generate no additional interest and indeed may be counterproductive to interest levels. Test cricket does not need context to be interesting to watch.

I'm concerned that some teams are playing significantly less test cricket than others.

It may not look like it now to Full Members and other alike but inclusion and expansion will serve cricket the best for the future of the game and is essential to keep cricket alive and prosperous going forward.

Test cricket urgently needs context. Currently these series are just friendlies.

Please, please try and expand the game to as many countries as possible. Support the current non-test nations to improve both on the field and off.

5 divisions of 4 teams with promotion and relegation every 4 years

Invest. Grow cricket - all formats, in countries where cricket is big and in new countries.

Expansion is absolutely critical. Test Cricket as a whole is very weak, with even the best teams trading home series. The interest is dying as domestic T20 leagues with much better production and entertainment offerings are soaring. Even the ODI format has experienced a resurgence since the excellent World Cup. There are at least two Associate nations right now whose full strength lineups are strong enough to trade matches with the lower ranked test playing nations - help them out by adopting a more fluid and dynamic tier system that encourages expansion of the game and discourages the likes of England and Pakistan benefiting from players switching allegiances due to there being no clear pathway to the highest level of play (Tests).

Think it's time to do away with archaic "test series", many people want test expansion but still expect long series, two things that seem to be contradictory.

There is no need for a radical overhaul of the FTP. Tour lengths and home/away series rotations should simply be standardised over a four year period. The top ranked 6 teams should play each other home and away over a period of 4 years (10 series in 4 years). A stipulation of minimum 4 and maximum 5 tests per series, with 2 points per series win, 1 point for series tie, and 1 point per test win (to eliminate dead rubbers). The two teams with the most points after 4 years play a deciding series, with the first team to win 2 tests being declared the champion. The team with the least points swaps places with the winner of a second division (also with 6 teams, but in this case playing 3 test series)

I would like to see tiers with promotion/relegation. Top tier (say 8 teams) play each other regularly in full series (3 Tests & 5 Tests for marquee series) and annually play at least two one-off tests with 2nd or 3rd tier teams. Promotion/relegation at 3 year intervals according to rolling rankings (so a promoted team has 3 years to cement its place in higher tier). NO international T20! Domestic T20 leagues played whenever - national administrators to control priorities for their top tier players to maintain primacy of Test status!

I fully endorse the plan published on Idle Sunmers - its brilliant

Test status should be irrevocable once earned, except in extreme situations. In other words, promotion should be allowed, but not relegation. There should always be a vision of increasing the number of Test nations, but still maintaining a high standard.

Another potential option for Tests is that there should be just a handful of continental/regional teams, like a global Ryder Cup of cricket. England is already the de facto European Test team. A Test championship could still be held over a 3-4 year cycle and you wouldn't need to have promotion relegation. The standard would be maintained to appease pearl clutching statistical guardians, although you would of course lose rivalries like the Ashes. The Europe v Oceania fixture would be close enough for me. ODI cricket should be structured similarly to international football, with a full qualification World Cup and teams such as Barbados, Jamaica, etc competing as separate nations. T20 cricket should be for domestic franchise cricket only. The marketing strategy of Test and ODI cricket should be examined and overhauled.

Associates and Affiliates are so poorly handled by the ICC, it borders on criminal!

Australia are beginning to play India and England more frequently. I think this is reducing the competitiveness of other nations. At the current rate, we will only play test series against these teams and few others.

Test cricket is the ultimate. There can only be one level of "ultimate", and the weaker teams will not get stronger without playing the stronger ones.

This would be awesome if it were to happen.

All teams should have right to play 4,3,2 match series with teams ranked 1,2,3 positions above them respectively

First of all, ICC Rankings also need to undergo a change with more weight-age to away series results rather than home results.Test Championship could be held once in every year (or two years) - with the top 4 teams per the ICC Rankings qualifying. Rather than knock-outs, these teams shall play among-st each other (i.e. total of 6 matches) and the team with most number of wins in the tournament shall be declared the winner. We have the Champions League T20 slot available every year in September which could be utilized for the ICC World Test Championship.

Expanding the game will surely generate interest from a wider audience

The ICC has to make qualification for competitions meritocratic rather than a members club.

Cricket needs the Olympics.

In my opinion - Divisions of 4/5 with home/away series (3 tests) between all in division completed then relegation/promotion. No limits on amount of divisions - ie test cricket for all 'associates' if they want and obvious reward of promotion if play well. Unfortunately would mean potentially sacrificing marquee series (ie Ashes) but for development of sport and future of test cricket is probably necessary.

The most important thing is that the ICC runs the Test championship centrally and that nothing is left to bilateral agreement between certain boards. Equitable distribution of television revenue from a central pool is also essential or it simply will not work.

The shrinking of cricket is a great worry to me. Cricket should be expanding and be increasing the teams/ tournaments below and among the elite. T20 and odi world cups should be 16 and 14 teams respectively. Test cricket should be expanded to more teams as well. Every team

should play every other home and away in a 4 year cycle with the team ranked top at the end crowned the world test champion.

If the ICC continues to pour money into the Americas at the expense of other Associate nations, countries such as Afghanistan will be left behind in search for more TV money.

College Football is a good format to look at

A test championship must include many nations and aim to add context to test series. Countries not in the Test championship should want to aim to get in it and they should be allowed to realistically achieve it in a short time (1-4 years). All test series should be as important as each other and encourage players from lower ranked countries to stay with their country and try to reach the test championship rather than moving to another country (like Eoin Morgan). The championship should allow for inform teams to rise and out of form teams to fall but also giving support to less financially stable nation (Zimbabwe, Kenya, Bangladesh). The Test Championship should aim to grow test cricket to more countries and build new rivalries than don't happen every year or two. Eg. England and Holland rivalry that only appears every 3-4 years (when fixtured together) rather than an England vs Australia rivalry that appears every two years and is very similar due to the same players playing. In the end every match should count for something if it's West Indies doing a rain dance to avoid relegation out of the test championship or Afghanistan taking 10 wickets on the last day to get into the test championship all teams should be fighting for something without feeling they are climbing a never ending hill.

I like the format of the first 2 tests in any series counts towards the tournament. 1 home and away competition between each team pair should then be achievable in a 4 year period.

Lovely job, guys. Good luck

Any test championship would need a tight schedule to maintain interest and not inhibit the rest of the playing season too much. This would also help reflect the depths of teams which would have to make changes during the tournament. Every test should be given relevance by affecting the championship/qualification but not necessarily equal relevance etc

1. ICC should work for all members, including the Big 3, all full members, and associate members. Otherwise, interest in the sport will diminish, leading to contraction and an eventual demise of the game. Everything either expands or contracts. Unless ICC is serious about expansion, the game will die in a decade or two. 2. Continuing on the above theme, while expansion of cricket has been slow, we need to put adequate resources on the associates. If

Ireland and Afghanistan gets some support from the ICC, they will become good teams very soon. 3. Every sport is trying to expand its reach. Even the deeply American games of baseball and American Football made incredible inroads into the other continents. Why is the ICC planning to contract the World Cups? After the last WC, we can no longer argue that the Associates are not competitive against the top teams! -Dr. S Kaisar Alam

http://www.pakpassion.net/ppforum/showthread.php?195248-A-Proposal-for-a-legitimate-Test-First-Class-Promotion-System This type of set-up with a 5 test home/5 test away final between the two top ranked teams. Only fair way of giving every team a goal and helping the lower teams improve.

Money should not dictate on a country's ability to progress or be relegated. Performance should. All countries should have the opportunity to progress based on performance, likewise all countries should have the opportunity to be relegated based on performance.

Very difficult to conceive of a widening of the test cricket playing nations. For that reason, it would be better for the game as a whole if test cricket died, much as I love it. It's my favourite format, but its maintenance is behind most of the shit that goes on.

In my opinion, there are at least 30 teams, members and associates at present who can play Test cricket or has the basic talent to be nurtured to play Test cricket in the future. I don't understand why there cannot be a two tiered Test league schedule above Div 1 of WCL. History has established already that the step up to test cricket is massive. It is about a two decade process for an associate nation to really become competitive. That shouldn't stop promoting two teams every four years to have a crack at 'staying up' in Test Div 2 or whatever. Sick and tired of it.

T20 or World T20 success doesn't equate to anything else other than T20 success. I also think that the 50 over World Cup should be 10-12 teams. Scotland and the UAE didn't win a game last World Cup and Afghanistan and Zimbabwe respectively only defeated the teams that didn't win a game.

Follow the FIFA model of qualification. While this may not be easy to implement, some sort of compromise must exist. Why should stories such as Afghanistan be an outlier? Why can't other smaller nations be given the incentive to perform at the higher level? Create a qualification structure for the ODI World Cup and let the teams qualify. Shouldn't be hard. Both 50 and T20 WCs should be open to all nations, as should the qualification system. The Test Championship should be more inclusive as well, if not totally, with a pro/rel system to give teams like Ireland and Afghanistan a shot.

The current ICC ranking system is deeply flawed by only considering the last series, and not the last home-plus-away series, between two countries.

All teams should have the right to play equivalent amount of tests over the course of the championship.

These issues are difficult but a change has to be made. The nature and method of the change is just as important the changes themselves, and they will not happen quickly. Until we break the grip of advertising revenue (especially Indian money) on governance there will be no progress in terms of expanding the game. The shorter formats of the game are the best way to spread the game and gain new fans, but test cricket should be maintained as the premier form of the game. Having said that, cricket like any sport is a fluid and organic entity that is subject to so many factors of influence that is hard to fully control.

The expansion and development of Test cricket for nations like Zimbabwe, Bangladesh and possibly Ireland is vital to the development, popularity and credibility of the game.

More test fixtures, less odi fixtures. Red ball should be an integral part of test cricket, as are the white shirts. Drawn test matches is an essential part of the game, and should not be considered boring. Better marketing and integrating test as the pinnacle to the young will ensure more supporters worldwide. Test cricket matches in ideal conditions (not like the sri lanka vs india match which was all rained out??), not in monsoon seasons. Pakistan and India should consider having a test match series against each other again. The dust bowl in Dubai and unresponsive, flat pitches are no good for the game. Bowlers need more domination, and bat thickness restrictions should be enforced. In no way should a top edge or toe batted shot be rewarded for a six.

My idea of a Test championship would be to segment the seasons globally so Test matches have yearly windows in different nations. The Test rankings should be used over a number of years to provide a top four (say) and those four can play in a semi-finals/final. It could become a once-in-a-career thing for players to aspire to, teaching the idea that players need to perform at a high level for a long time. Please visit www.fb.com/TaiwanCricket and share this survey.

Three divisions (10 teams each). Two tiers at each division. Premier Division = series of 3 tests (5 days), 5 ODI, 3 T20. Assign points to importance. 10 teams, 5 in each tier. Two years to play home and away vs each tier opponent (4 series a year). Plan any other rivalry/important series around it. Division One = 10 teams, 5 at each tier. Single round robin tours against each team in tier (4 series over two years). 3 "tests" (4 day games), 5 ODI, 3 T20. Look to expand this

eventually to either double round robin, or make it a 12-14 team division with two tiers to increase games. Division Two = Same as division one except three day "tests". Below that = The five ICC regional groups come up with their own two year system. The five regional winners meet in a three week tournament at the end of the two years to play each other once each in ODI's and T20s (8 games each). The winner is promoted to the bottom tier of Division 3. Promotion/Relegation between all divisions.

Need to change rules on appeals on reviews. If review shows batsman out, that means OUT. Need to change overs maximum to permit bowlers to bowl more than 1/5th total. Need to bar excessive bowling aimed at body; intimidation is the default at present.

Help the Associates! Cricket is lagging behind, if it is to stay relevant it can't rely on the audiences of a few select countries. Associates will only get better with more opportunities. So more flexibility is required to judge whether teams are ready for higher levels of cricket.

Cricket cannot survive as a three-nation game, no matter how many times the Big Three play each other. A global game requires global participation.

Please give all international games full International status. No more Associate status. These are sovereign states. The fact that Hong Kong is not 'representing China' is disappointing. Other than the West Indies, all other countries play their own games.

I feel like some of the questions asked imply trade-offs that might not exist in reality. For example, it isn't that hard to imagine a structure where teams are separated into divisions for most test matches, but on occasion can play teams from the other division, therefore maintaining the marquee fixtures even if teams get separated out in different divisions. With a little care, some of the questions presented don't require any trade-offs to be made. I think the most important thing that I would like to see is a clear direction as to what each international format is about, what it is for. Tests should be about bilateral tours, and these tours should mean something, ODIs should be about the World Cup, but should also appear each year in a meaningful competition, and T20s should be about quickfire tournaments like the World T20 and franchise competitions. At the moment, the formats seem to be a little muddled, and I very much think that clear direction on which each one means and is about is needed. Also, for this reason, I think any discussion about test structures should also think carefully about how to make ODIs relevant instead of the endless bilateral series that hardly seem important. The two formats should be considered together in order to ensure that they work together.

I'm totally opposed to any "championship deciding" sem-finals/final set up consisting of one-off test matches. Test Cricket is about winning SERIES, not matches.

The most important thing is that test cricket maintains its prestige while being expanded.

Afghanistan seem to have what it takes to make it at the top (eventually). If they never get the chance we'll never know.

I would like to see regional franchise Test cricket - ie. 2 franchises in Australasia, 4 in Asia, 2 in Africa, 1 in North America and 2 in Europe/UK

1)Reducing the T20 internationals, particularly the frequency of world cups would be a good start to having more emphasis on a test championship. 2) It will never work properly if all teams do not play the same number of matches (that is a major problem with interest in the current test ranking system . . . its meaningless). 3) if countries want to play longer series than 3 matches (eg. the Ashes) - then play them but only the first three matches can be for championship points. 4) an even number of home and away games for all teams is essential, home conditions is a part of cricket, which helps make it a unique sport. 5) If there is to be two tiers; then there must be 12 Test nations, not 10. Promote Ireland and Afghanistan, there are far above the other non test teams teams. 6) All matches in a championship league must have test status, regardless of which teams are playing. 7) The time to play out the championship is important - too frequently or too seldom will, overtime create a lack of interest. Either 2 or 3 years would be would be adequate.

Sort out player eligibility rules - if you've played for a country at u19 level, you can't play for any other

If shorter Test series become the norm, countries should be allowed to schedule additional 'friendlies' not counting towards the championship.

Cricket must strategically embrace global goals. T20 in olympics. Open Test cricket to any country who wish to participate. Mismatches happen in football why not cricket. Encourage others to lift standards. China/USA embracing cricket will be amazing. ICC must reform to an independent commission running the game for all just as other sporting organisations do. Regarding test match championship specifically. Championship should be played by top 7 ranked teams played over twelve months. Each team plays each other home and away following each participants cricket season. Eg July in England march in NZ etc. 3pts 1pt for a draw. Winner is the team with most points out of their 12 matches. No contrived results. Joint winners if teams are equal on points. This is true to test tradition of drawn series. A similar structure for a second and subsequent divisions. Teams promoted and relegated thereafter.

Associates should be playing more cricket and matched against full members must be organised if possible. Also, all cricketing nations must receive financial support from the ICC. The idea of 'the Big Three' must be abolished

To decide drawn tests you should use run rate throughout the match (higher wins)

It's time to do more than pay lip service to the notion that Test cricket is the sport's "pinnacle," and at last organize an exciting Test championship structure.

International cricket should give more opportunities to all nations in all formats

England toured the United Arab Emirates to play a series of matches against Pakistan. Why didn't they play matches against UAE while they were there; even if they were warm up games for the ODI/T20 series?! They did play against Hong Kong in a game that didn't have ODI status for no reason other than England not paying their players ODI rates. What is the point of awarding ODI status to member nations if a country like England can do that to a smaller nation, thereby denying them of the opportunity to improve their ranking (and potentially qualify for events like the World Cup/Champions Trophy).

test championship can work on promotion and relegation over two years in 4 team divisions - each play 3 3test series home and away. 3points for a win, 1 for a draw. One team promoted, one relegated. Include Ireland and Afghanistan for 3 divisions and a 4th FC ICC cup division to promote a team into and out of third division each year. 9 tests minimum per team each year. Teams should also be able to play each other in bilateral series to protect Ashes and have India vs Pak or Aus if they are in different divisions. Sell the tv rights as a package and split the revenue to keep everyone in the game. It allows 5th and 6th division expansion as more nations get multiday cricket organised.

I live upstate NY. THere are 10 cricket fans on the floor of my office alone. Cricket is often the conversation around the coffee machine.

Design of a test championship calendar

I won't mind a draw it is also important in test cricket it should be a league so that a draw would award 1 point each to both teams.

How about a FTP where each team plays every-other team home and away over a 5 year cycle. Only 3 Tests in each series would count. Marquee series can continue as it is, however the teams can decide which 3 matches will count towards the Test championships. If two teams

want to play each other more, they can without it counting towards the Test Championships. Something similar to the points system used in county cricket can be used. With 10 Test teams currently, each team would end up playing 54 matches in a 5 year cycle (which is similar to the number of Tests the Big 3 play). Top 2 teams at the end of the 5 year cycle play a timeless test to be crowned the champion. While the bottom 2 teams get relegated to Intercontinental Cup. Intercontinental Cup might need some restructuring too.

Teams should pay a fixed number of test matches over a period of time mandated by the ICC. Series decided between boards often leads to the scenarios where England, India pay disproportionately more test matches as compared to Pakistan, New Zealand etc. Also a warm up 3-day/4-day should be played with one or two associate team in the nearby geographical location of the Full member in case of test tours.

As you can see from my responses i am bit conflicted and confused.

Calling it "Test" cricket is not always helpful. The Inter Contintental Cup should be regarded as "Test" cricket, albeit at the third tier (on the basis that the 10 fulls should be regarded as filling the top two tiers)

1) The question of finances must be investigated in depth. Financial incentives for winning the hypothetical Test championship should be large. To be unsentimental about it, money makes the world go round, and if the financial side of things is not well looked after, Test cricket will go the way of the dodo, regardless of how nostalgic some people will be about the good old days.
2) While the spread of cricket among the Associate countries is to be encouraged, often it is seen that the cricket in some of these countries is played by Indian or Pakistani expatriates and not by the native population at all. In other words, grass roots support seems to be lacking. Of course this does not apply to countries like Afghanistan, Scotland or Ireland.

Start with including 4 Teams. In future increase the number and qualification must be from the Rankings table.

Test series should be 3 or 5 matches. There should be 4-day tour matches before (2 or 3) for visitor preparation and between (at least 1) to allow squads to experiment. Sort out drop-in wickets so we retain different ground characteristics but stop home sides producing different wickets to those in the domestic comp.

There should be multiple tiers. All tiers should include 8 (eight) teams. All members of ICC should be divided in these tiers (96 countries should be divided in 12 tiers). Only the top 2 (two) tiers should be given test status (div-1 test & div-2 test). All tiers should be played

simultaneously over a league period of 4 (four) years. There should be a relegation and promotion system. Top 2 (two) teams from each tier should be promoted to the upper tier while the bottom 2 (two) should be relegated to the lower tier at the end of the league period.The team at the top of the top most tier should be crowned as test champion.

There are a few teams that could do well at Test cricket if they got the opportunity. For example, I have long thought Ireland should get it, and probably Afghanistan as well. Not clear about other Associates because we really don't hear much about them.

Test cricket shouldn't be victimized for being less commercial venture than T20's and 1-Day internationals, and so as its players. The Test cricketers should be paid directly according to their rankings like Top-10, Top-(11-25), Top-(26-50) and so on, by the ICC, irrespective of the country they belong. This will help to groom and sustain the 'Craft of Playing Cricket'. The Test palyers should be ranked as '1st Grade Players' In1-Day internationals and T20's, though players are earning handsomely from endorsements etc., may be ranked '2nd' and '3rd' grade players. So their pay-checks shall be paid by their respective boards as per their ranks etc. The players playing domestic leagues should be auctioned but paid a fixed amount corresponding to their ranks. The fixed part of profits earned from international tournaments and domestic leagues shall be utilized to promote Test cricket as well as cricket in new countries

Test Cricket is the pinnacle in cricket, but should e available to all qualified nations.

Context will always bring spectators. Long series are wonderful, but only when competitive - the series could get longer as the tournament progresses. Scheduling multiple T20 leagues simultaneously (e.g. SA/NZ/Aus/Zim?, Ind/Pak/Ban/SL, Eng/Ire/Sco/Neth/WI) could lead to some very exciting playoffs between winners of leagues.

A 4 year league structure with 8 teams (3 home and away test against each other) over 4 years should be the format.

1) Test cricket does not require saving. It is great enough and will survive on its own, championship or not. And no matter how much ICC/other formats mess with it. 2) What is needed is to make it more popular, so that there are more teams playing highly competitive matches across all formats and all formats. 3) No cricket is bad cricket. ICC should give all member nations right and opportunity to play test cricket, while creating a top tier based on rankings. whose matches would be treated as part of the test championship. Then top three teams should play home and away followed by a timeless final. Venue will be last winner. First final will of course, be at Lords.

The World Cup should have more associate teams or at least something like T20 World Cup

Support for the growth and expansion of international cricket should be the number one priority. Creating context for Test and ODI cricket is paramount to growing interest and expanding the reach of the game.

Ireland to have Test Status and Associates should be included in the World Cup and have more ODI matches against the Test Nations

Why not have a World Cup of test 4 week 8 teams knock out format 1vs 8 etc quarters semi and final

Please bring context to this great game. That will bring the crowds.

The best format is a two year six team tiered system (five series, two tests home, two tests away) with 3 points for series win, 1 point for series draw.

I would like to have three divisions of 5 teams with promotion and relegation on a 4 year cycle would allow for a championship in which each team plays each other home and away leading to an overall winner (worked out on a points system). This would allow the gradual introduction of new teams to test cricket playing against teams of similar ability and so avoiding the one-sided contests that (for example) Bangladesh were initially involved in. It would also leave teams enough time to organise 'marquee' fixtures outside of the championship (for example if England and Australia were in different divisions the Ashes could still take place but the result would not affect their standing within the championship).

I think we should simulate European club soccer in trying to set up the Champions trophy structure. Divide countries into regions and top teams from each region participate once every four years. The interim three years can be used for qualifications

About Knockouts, I think they should not be a match, they should be a series in Test cricket. Like 3-match series with first 100 overs each team plays deciding the match in case of a draw. If both made equal runs in thier first 100 overs, then deciding by wickets. If still tied then by thier league standings etc.

all teams should be being prepared to play tests so A teams should play series against strong associates e.g. ireland, afghans India should play more home tests as england do. more home tests for bangladesh so they can improve and gradually get them competitive away

I think tie breaker rules like the NBA and a structure points system, (first innings points, run rate, away win bonus) should be used to determine a ranking in a two division, round robin, home and away, single test competition over a calendar year. The subsequent year could see teams play tri-series (assuming 16 test teams) with 3 tests home and away against the teams in their tier. Then home and away 5 test series to determine champions.

5team group A, 5 team group b, 5 team group c, 5 team group D play 1year than last 2 team are relegated a group push to b like English premeir league football / or uefa champions league football in test championship. than test cricket are more attractive. also every year should brings every country domestic t20 team champions play a champions league. one country 2 team one country 3 team it's not pair. also oneday & international cricket can follow uefa champion ship football type mach. it's should be very existing.

Ireland deserves test status now, not four years later. Now!

The most important people to be consulted are current and former players and fans. Make sure that's done.

If we can't make test cricket work for the nations involved (not just the big three) then we should abolished it all together and focus on ODI and 20/20. There's no point calling yourself champion of the world when you only really compete with two other nations.

I suggest the following test championship format: A 3-year cycle (commencing in Oct-Nov.), every team to play every other team once, whether home or away decided by draw (max. of 5 home series/team) (reversed in the following cycle). Only one in every 2 Ashes series to be a World C´ship series. The top 8 to play 3, 4 and 5 match series amongst each other and 2-match series against the bottom 2, who will play each other in a 5-match series. Points: all series worth 30 points (ie 6 for a win in 5-match series, 7.5 in 4 match series, 10 in 3 match series, 15 in 2-match series), 40% to each team for a draw; plus 5 bonus points for winning the series. Top 2 sides play off in a 3-test finals series, first 2 games at home for the top side, played in Aug-Oct at the end of year 3.

Test Cricket shouldn't be a closed shop!

stop the australia, england, india cartel - it is killing cricket

Look, promotion/relegation has NO place in any international sports competition. It doesn't happen in football and shouldn't happen in cricket. Simply lengthen the FTP (to one and half times the current length) and put in place a test championship as a home and away timeless

test series between the top two ranked teams. No team should HAVE to be relegated to accommodate some other team - that goes against the very ethos of expanding the game. In any case only Afghanistan seems to be really interested in test cricket. The Irish claim to be, but lagged behind Afghanistan in putting in place the domestic structures necessary for it, establishing their own 3-day tournament after the Afghans. At best the only nations over the next generation likely to really push for test cricket will be Afghanistan, Ireland, Nepal and perhaps Kenya and Scotland. The Dutch are not interested and none of the other sides really are. Why have promotion/relegation when at most only 15 teams will ever really play test cricket over the next 30-60 years? For the rest like the Netherlands, Papua New Guinea, Namibia, Canada, Malaysia, the UAE and Oman their ultimate desire would probably be permanent ODI and T20I status. That's also fine as those countries are likely to be able to sustain it. Why do we talk about "expansion" but "relegation" in the same breath? That's contradictory.

1)The expansion of the game is critical and rife with possibilities.We are left wondering about the level the game could have been if only we had a more proper structure and more important important tournaments.Inclusion in the olympics will help a great deal. 2)Matches throughout a 2 year period must lead to a winner as a part of home-away bilateral tours, While a test championship must also be held every 4 years on neutral grounds bringing along with it the local condition challenges.It must be the crown jewel of tournaments that unites the fans. 3)Historic fixtures must always be valued and must find a slot in the biennieal tour schedule. 4)Domestic T20 must be assigned a schedule slot and different leagues must take place simultaneously during these slots.At most, two slots can be provided and the different leagues may fight it to dominate these slots. 5)I am not in favour as a tier system as I believe this system will not do much to bridge the quality gap between main members and associates.The rise must be gradual and crisp.For eg) 11th to 9th placed teams must have a lot of games scheduled with the 8th to 6th placed teams as well as 14th to 12th placed teams. The teams that shine can have more tours in place with the higher teams for the next calendar cycle while the losing ones will face more lower ranked teams for the next calendar cycle. Assuming the 8th to 6th placed teams are part of the 2 year championship, their games with the lower teams must be outside the championship will loses there reflecting heavily on the points and wins giving minimum points.It's a test of their credentials.

I'm a big lover of watching cricket. And I'm not watching much cricket now let alone Test Cricket. Is it going to survive et all? I would love for it to survive atleat to catch it for my retirement years.

Slight change in T20 format is necessary. I want these three suggestions to be considered seriously: 1) Allow maximum of three fielders outside 30 yard circle in the first 6 overs instead

of two fielders. This will give more protection for bowlers, especially on flat tracks. This will give more confidence for spinners. 2) Allow maximum of 6 fielders outside 30 yard circle for a maximum of 24 balls (or can be lesser balls) after the first 6 overs. The captain has the freedom to choose these 24 balls at any time from over number 6 to 20. For example, after 7.4 overs, captain thinks that he might need 6 fielders for the next two balls of the over. He will indicate to the umpire, who will give a standard signal (similar to signalling the powerplay in ODIs) at start and the end. So 7.0 to 7.4 would have had 5 fielders outside the circle, while 7.5 and 7.6 will have 6 fielders outside the circle. The captain still can choose 22 such "Mini-Powerplays" till the end of the innings. Such an arrangement will not only increase the excitement and unpredictability of T20 cricket, it will also ask for greater intelligence from captains and team management. Such Mini-Powerplays will transform T20s in the following ways: a) There will be more running and athleticism from both batsmen and fielders as taking twos and threes will become important. b) It will introduce the concept of close-in and deep fielders (more prominent in tests) to T20s, especially when spinners are operating. So when a very good spinner is operating, the batsman might have to think whether to defend (possibility of getting out to close-in fielders), or to attack (possibility of getting caught in the deep). This will force T20 batters to improve their technique. c) Big Hitting in the slog overs, both while chasing and constructing an innings, will become more challenging. So batters will be forced to improve their skills of finding the gaps, soft-hands, running between the wickets and playing proper cricket shots. So becoming a good T20 batsman will be as difficult as becoming a good T20 bowler, eventually bridging the gap between bat and ball in T20s. d) Cricket, unlike football, rugby, field hockey and basketball (the popular team sports of this era), has majority of period where play is "dead" (between balls and between overs) than when it is "alive". The play is alive most when twos and threes are being taken, so the Mini-Powerplays will enable more alive play. This will make Cricket more watchable and exciting (as twos and threes will create more runout chances) for non-cricket fans, especially if Cricket is to be played in Olympics. 3) Allow one bowler to bowl maximum of 5 overs. The captain will decide who that bowler is after the 8th over, and will inform the umpire. This will ensure that the best bowler of the innings will bowl maximum of number of overs, making batting more challenging. Again this will ensure that the batsmen with proper technique and ability to face quality bowling will succeed more than the sloggers. Apart from these changes in T20 format, I would like some changes regarding playing conditions to be considered: 1) The white ball used in T20 should be able to start reverse swinging atleast from the 17th over. The shine on a new white ball can be slightly reduced to achieve this thing. Ofcourse, research has to be done in this regard. But it is essential that the T20s reflect all aspects and skills of Cricket, as it will be the format that will be showcased at the Olympics. 2) The thickness of the edges of modern bats has to be reduced to a threshold value, above which the bat should be regarded "illegal". This is important to address the gap between bat and ball that is severely affecting the quality of cricket being played today. The batsman will still have the advantage of larger sweet spots typical of modern

bats, but should not get away with edges flying towards the boundary. This rule is easily enforceable, as the umpire can check the thickness of each new batsman's bat on the field itself using simple instruments (digital Vernier Callipers maybe). This will ensure that most of the edges go the slips or the wicket keeper, where they deserve to go. All these above suggestions might bring down the average totals in T20s initially, but will eventually make batsmen more technically qualified and smart. This will ensure that totals like 150 to 160 will be challenging, and kids watching only T20 cricket, especially in Associate nations, will also dream of becoming T20 bowlers.

Fully acknowledge that this will be a challenge while the ICC remains a "co-ordinator of cricket" not a governing body so strongly controlled by the strongest nations.

Test cricket is the most incredible form of cricket devised - a true pinnacle of hard-fought elite competition that is just about unrivalled in any sport for the extraordinary narratives it can tell across a summer. Let us aim not just to defend it for future generations, not just to preserve its extraordinary history and traditions, but to expand its reach and appeal to as many new Test-playing and Test-watching nations as possible in an accessible, competitive format.

So mant teams but yet we continue to play the same teams

It is crucial Test cricket regains its primacy and also important that all nations are given equal opportunity to get Test status

Each team, to play the other, same # of times, within stipulated period, on a home/away basis to decide the Top 4. Eliminator process to find the winner!

The outstanding work and topics raised by the documentary 'Death of a Gentleman' by Jarrod Kimber and Sam Collins must be looked into. The fact that one board, the BCCI, looks to be governing over the ruling body, the ICC, is ridiculous. The BCCI wields too much power and influence over the running of the game, without any opposition from other members and the BCCI

test championship can be scheduled as a bilateral series between the top 4 ranking teams of the year as semifinals and the two winners play finals. or the 2nd and 3rd ranked team play bilateral and the winner challenges the top ranking team as the champion.

make test championship tiered similar to county championship in England and allow everyone to play or at least provide opportunity to do so.

I would definitely like to know who the real boss in test cricket is, hence a test championship is a great idea but I also hope that whatever structure is designed for it, it doesn't kills the interests of fans in test cricket. Also I feel the ICC should be incharge of the pitches not the home side and I would not prefer a neutral venue unless it's England or Australia.

My main concern for the future of cricket is that the ICC exists only to further the best interests of the Test Nations, and that over time, this slowly constricts and narrows the scope of cricket, until it becomes irrelevant as a major international sport. The elitism of cricket terrifies me- no other sport actively denies international teams opportunities because they do not have the required 'status' to play an official game. If I was the ICC, to save Test Cricket, I would be implementing a fully meritocratic Test Championship, held over a 4 year cycle, with multiple divisions and many more teams. The WCL model is actually a good one, the Test Championship can be based upon it. The paucity of fixtures for nations such as Netherlands, Nepal, Afghanistan, Hong Kong, Ireland, Scotland, Namibia, Canada (I can go on) is atrocious. There is enough money within the ICC to go around, the problem is that far too high a percentage goes to the Full Members, particularly the so called Big Three. From an economic point of view, I can somewhat relate to the ICC's position. The biggest money is to be generated from focussing on the countries where cricket is most popular. The problem with this approach, however, is that cricket is always looking inwards. It needs to be braver. If, in ten years time, the only viable Test matches are the Ashes or India-England/ India-Australia, then Test cricket will be well and truly dead. T20 cricket at the olympics would be an excellent start. I understand that this would create difficulties (i.e the likely fragmentation of West Indian cricket as a result and problems with a GB team), but these problems are not insurmountable. Be brave, and expand! Whilst a fixture in the future between Niue Island and the Turks and Caicos Islands may never draw much international attention or money, this is grassroots sport. It has to happen! Even the idiots at FIFA understand that....

Two tier test championship over four years - 7 teams top division and 5 teams bottom (based on rankings at end of 2015-19 Intercontinental Cup). Requirement to play 2 tests home and away against everyone else in your division over the four years with the freedom to add tests to those (e.g. 3 additional tests for Ashes) and a freedom to arrange tests with teams from the other tier (e.g. 3 tests Windies vs England). Relegation/Promotion of bottom/top single team from each division after four years. 11th and 12th teams would be highest ranked at end of this Intercontinental Cup (Likely Ireland and Afghanistan). Central funding from ICC to cover basic costs of hosting at least the compulsory two tests of all series! Any extra tests could be funded by host board. Adam Drew

The pettiness of the BCCI in preventing India vs Pak tests is simply unforgivable. Sport should be above politics. Schedule 5 tests for the UAE and get on with it. The Indian Supreme Court's

recommendations need to be taken taken on in full. It is apparent to anyone that Cricket in India is run for the benefit of the administrators rather than the game. Whilst this unfortunately is also the case in many other countries, India's financial power means that this is the board that most urgently needs total reform. More funds need to be spread around to the associates/affiliates to grow the game (and not to Zimbabwe as a way of buying votes); there is plenty to go around.

Two tiers of eight teams, home & away series of 3 tests, set over 4 years, with top ranked team hosting series final. Only one team promoted relegated each four years. All matches given test-status. Equal monetary distribution as long as administrative requirements are met. Abolish bilateral T20, do it soccer-style with just a world cup every 4 years (no qualifiers needed currently for top 10 ranked teams due to dearth of competitive cricket nations).

If the schedule was structured with 3 month northern and southern seasons, 6 week north and south domestic T20 seasons, in a 2 or 3 year championship, that would allow 3 months usable for any or all of the following; player off season, marquee tournaments for traditional rivals not in the same division, regional cups (Asian T20), ODI or T20 World Cups.

One of the reasons of why ICC Test Championship has not materialized so far is that the conflict of personal interests of different boards of cricket playing nations. Different countries may have different priorities and constraints - financial security, concern of tiered labeling, fear of public outcry, vested interests, and so on. So, unless the ICC Test Championship's vision is aligned for all the countries, it may be difficult to execute it. The focus should not be on the format or structure of championship, it should be on the "vision and the process to realize that vision for the long-term gains from such a step" that should bind different boards and the governing body. Two, it is understandable that ICC and cricket boards may be at loggerheads because of their priorities as I said earlier. So, an independent body of former experts whom everyone respects and trusts should be formed exclusively to plan, discuss, and run the championship. These should be the players who endured test cricket on the field for a long time. For example by - Dravid, Naseer Hussain, Kallis, Sangakkara, Michael Clarke, and others.

All 3 forms in which cricket is played today are important and provide meaningful theatre for players to show their skills. Instead of trying to make a specialized test championship may be we should think of a championship that is awarded every 2 years which includes all 3 forms. Multiple test matches must be played in different parts of the world at the same time to keep the interest of TV audiences. It will also save time to allow the domestic T20 leagues to flower.

Without expansion, test cricket will wither and only the Ashes will be contested.

The Champions Trophy is a waste of time, sort out a Test Championship.

I think one thing people need to remember is that test cricket is far more unforgiving than limited overs. While crazy upsets happen frequently in t20, in tests the better team over 5 days will normally win. So nobody wants to watch one sided test matches. Viewing figures this winter were poor because there was no joy to be had in watching Australia repeatedly demolish the Windies within 3 days. Therefore, seeing as Bangladesh have been a test team for more than a decade and are only now starting to become competitive in the longest format (despite huge success in white ball), great care needs to be taken in introducing other Associates. Everyone loves seeing the Netherlands beat England at wt20, but no one will pay to watch Sri Lanka rack up 620/4d against Afghanistan.

Top six teams should play in series that have at least 3 matches.

Inclusion is essential. uncompetitive fixtures are unavoidable in such inclusions but they can be restricted to be minimal

- The top layer of long-form cricket should be domestic first class FRANCHISES, not international teams, to avoid too much pressure to win being put on one team eg India. - In any type of franchise cricket, there must be an allowance for promotion/relegation. - There should be alternating SEASONS for long-form and short-form cricket. It is simply asking too much of players to keep adjusting to different formats within the same season like now. - Following the last few seasons of lop-sided contests in Tests favoring the home team, making time for acclimatisation in long-form cricket must be given utmost priority. - Meaningless matches with no context must go immediately. - In any type of franchise cricket, players must be allowed to play for only one franchise. The IPL can get the ball rolling on this by being the first competition to adopt this rule.

5 day test each team plays one day . 5 th day is the decider. Teams have the option of batting .5 day extra in either the 1st or 2nd innings. Udrs should be there. Powerplay to be introduced. 100 overs per day.

Cricket must be expanded for the game to survive and continue to capture public attention.

A knock-out and final system does not suit the character of Test cricket. A championship similar to the EPL is far more appropriate. A 4 year championship allows World Cup and Olympic cycles to be synchronised with that of a Test Championship.

Fair revenue distribution formula should be on of the ICC priority.

A test championship should be the pinnacle of Cricket just like FIFA World Cup. We can have this Championship running for 4 years (starting from qualification to Group stages and so on) and on every 4th year we can have the knockout stages of this championship producing a clear winner. Then start the next cycle. There should definitely be relegation promotion system present. Afterall all nothing in this world should be taken for granted.

The current way of scheduling bilateral test cricket appears fine to me. Allow each country to have one 5-test marquee series per season, and schedule 2 or 3-test match series against other teams with near-equal frequency over 2 seasons. For "Associate members", a parallel Tier 2 league can go on concurrently. Include the two best teams from the Tier 2 league into Tier 1 at the end of 2 seasons. Let there be 12 test teams every season. Bottom 2 teams can be relegated to the Tier 2 division before you start the next 2 season cycle. If there is such cricket being played already, as a fan I implore the ICC to market it better. We need a strong Tier 2 platform to spread cricket globally!

Two-Test series should be abolished. A series should consist of at least three matches. More should be done to encourage teams touring England to have at least one first-class warm-up match against Ireland and at least one ODI against the likes of Ireland, Netherlands and Scotland. A clear structure for allowing teams to progress to playing Test cricket is more important than any Championship. More has to be done to help develop these (and indeed the lower-ranked Test) teams by giving them fixtures or else their status is meaningless.

If we are not expanding the number of teams, we are digging the hole for Test cricket to be buried in. As an Indian fan, i may not like it when an Afganistan or an Ireland runs us close, but when they do it against every other country it gives me great happiness to see the underdog winning. I believe the same applies for fans of every country. Are the current lower tier Test teams like WI, Zim, Bangladesh better than the associates? How do we know? Can we have games between them (3-4 day matches would be sufficient)? because if you ask me, the gulf between Australia and zim/bangla is worse than the ones between these teams and some of the associates.

Cricket needs to focus on extending its reach as I am not sure it can survive in a global world without wider high level participation in the longer term.

Separate tournament(s) should be held for weaker teams every quarter and the so called full member nations should participate in them. Not all full member teams need to participate, but the lower 2-3 teams as per the rankings should participate.

Tests are the pinnacle of our sport and deserve something to bring it into the spotlight and enhance its growth. I would love for that to be a championship among the elite.

This would be a totally new venture and whatever format it is (hopefully) started in should be regarded as experimental and open to change in future championships. The leading associate members should be included, though their matches against full members can hardly be regarded as Tests.

Marquee series are only worth playing if both sides are competitive.

I believe that status should be earned and once earned not taken away. The best way to encourage test cricket is for introducing a Test Championship under the ICC, and using a points system that encourages breadth of playing nations whilst still allowing marquee series to occur. The points system should promote current performance across a two year cycle, reward the clearly better teams but allow for a crowded midtable tussle for spots into the Championship so that all Test's take on special meaning.

At least ICC should pick an eleven of best associate players and have them play test series against the current champion (leading in ranking)

ICC rankings only say so much. Top 3 teams should play it out for the championship title in a Tri-Nation tournament at the end of every 2-year season.

Test cricket is the best form of cricket and every cricketer should be allowed to play it. There is nothing wrong in one sided matches. Hell, even Ashes matches and India v Australia matches turn out to be horribly one sided at times.

Isolationism doesn't work in the long term, expansion and allowing aspirations to be fulfilled will.

Test cricket needs to be the pinnacle of the game, therefore, it needs to be treated as such by the ICC and this status not just be given lip service. Cricket needs to be an equal opportunities sport, meaning that all nations are judged on their abilities and all nations have the same potential for growth and improvement. As such, all monies involved in cricket should be split equally amongst all members, this includes countries like Afghanistan and Zimbabwe. I would like to see how these nations fare with the same funding as England and Australia, for example.There must be more opportunities for smaller nations, like Ireland and Afghanistan to play test cricket; if this means losing established test nations like West Indies and Zimbabwe so be it. Even if England were to one-day lose test status and have to improve their standard of

play to regain it, that is fine. Cricket is the game and its popularity is bigger, deeper and greater than individual playing countries. Quality test cricket is what is needed, not quantity. As a fan of this form of the game I will not pay for mediocrity. Test squads should not have to be rotated - this is something that is applicable for lower forms of the game, like ODI and 20/20. I would rather see five quality test matches a year than the 15+ that are of lesser quality. I will pay heavier subscription prices to watch this via the internet than pay a Sky subscription for dross. Linked to this, there needs to be much more stringent rules on pitches; a five-day batting marathon just isn't what test cricket is about. For lesser forms of the game then pitches like roads are acceptable. Not so for test cricket. Flat, low, ungrassed pitches, accounting for climatic differences, have no place in test cricket; this is just another sign of mediocrity. As an Englishman, I love the Ashes series but not every season. Every four years, the same timings of the rugby union Lions' tours is sufficient. Any more and it starts to become unfair to other nations and the series looses its prestige. Schedule correctly; three test matches and a million limited overs games obviously isn't supporting test cricket. Having said this, if there were test matches for countries like Ireland and Afghanistan then 2-3 test matches per series is fine. Any less and the matches become meaningless. A two-tier system of test-playing nations seems perfectly logical. I fail to see what benefits the FTP actually provides, except advanced viewing notice for broadcasters. My last point; cricket needs to be largely free or cheap to access. I love test cricket yet I miss around half of England's games, not through lack of interest (although, again, who wants to see test cricket played on dull, predictable surfaces?) but through lack of access. This decision is not based on finances; I can afford to pay for Sky, I just won't because of moral reasons; I don't agree with the decision to have all of England's cricket matches broadcast through one supplier fair. Continuing this forward, it is obvious that test cricket will suffer. Have faith in your fans. They are loyal but they feel very let down by cricket administrators who seem further and further away from the game and us.

A test championship should be based on a home and away basis and should be kept as short as possible (eg 50 over WC taking too long). This will mean losing out on 4-5 test series engrossing till the end from time to time but both can run separately. Keep the world cup separate from bilateral series and FTP program and run it every 4-5 years. Also, strong pitch checks should be kept for WC games being held home and away. The essential thing is to keep it competitive. Perhaps like the fielding restrictions kept for 50 over games, something similar can be kept for tests as well.

The Test Championship should be structured in such a way that the Ashes should be continued to be played as 5 Test series and other series between major countries such as India, England, Australia, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, West Indies, New Zealand and South Africa should have at least 3 Test matches played home and away over a period of 4 years and series involving Bangladesh and Zimbabwe 2 Tests. These series should all be given equal weightage and serve as qualifying

for the final championship. If a series is not played between any two teams it should be calculated as if it is a drawn series which means that if top teams do not play Bangladesh or Zimbabwe they would lose points. Then the final Championship may be played between the top three teams based on the standings at a predetermined date. It could be a all play all (once or twice) tournament with a final or the winner of a 2 Test home and away series between the 2nd and 3rd team meeting the top ranked team in another 2 Test home and away series. Whichever way it would involve only maximum 40 playing days which could be completed within 2 months.

The most frustrating thing about test cricket at the minute is that despite the falling attendances and lack of context we are playing more of it than ever before. Scaling back the schedule whilst fining a way to make series more meaningful would surely be better for both fans and players.

I feel a well organized test championship is essential to the future of 5 day cricket - to bring back it's relevance and following

There is a need for a Test Championship. We should have a test championship decided over two years. The championship and the current bilateral series system can co-exist (like tennis--so assume Davis Cup to be the test championship and the other tournaments to be the current bilateral series set up). Ten test playing nations to start with. Drawn into two groups of 5. They play on a home and away basis. So 8 league games for each team over a period of two years plus a semi final and final if they make it. Parallelly, a second tier championship must run in a similar format. This second tier championship for non test playing nations would have a first class status only. For any team to qualify as a test playing nation, they must finish in the top two in the second tier for three consecutive tournaments (So, an Ireland and Afghanistan can both become test nations in 6 years--2+2+2 if they finish in the top 2 in three consecutive tier 2 championships). No demotion from first tier at all. So all test playing nations keep their status permanently. Every 6 years, teams like Ireland and Afghanistan can get test status but they need to really stand head and shoulders above the others to reach 3 championship finals in a row. So everyone's happy in the bargain and we can have a Test Championship!

The tournament should have stages. Over the first two years there should be two groups of five, each team plays two home series and two away drawn at random (maybe two or three test series). In the third year semi final series should take place home and away, then the final in the fourth year. In the second two year period there should be a qualification process or playoffs (with full test status) for the next cycle. This would create context for lower teams, provide a route for associates to progress and keep time in the calendar for marquee series.

I was born with cricket in my DNA. Since the age of 5 I've following the game religiously. But as things stand ICC is unable to get their decision making right. Unless they make a change to how the game is governed, no decision would see the day light. A board comprising of elite member boards have run the game like UN Security Council with 3 having the power to veto whatever they want. That has to change, if not well things would only get worse and one day some investment consortium would take the smaller nations away from ICC. Period.

In order to add competitveness and importance across the board (Test, ODI, T20) to my mind the best format exists within the Women's Ashes series. Not only does this reward skill across different formats it gives greater meaning (in terms of points awarded) to Test cricket. If this were to be adopted -- with a league or group system over a fixed period of time -- I think it would provide greater interest, importance and relevance to all forms of cricket.

1v8, 2v7 etc. on the same weekend, then semi and final at lords/mcg/Eden gardens a month later each

The test rankings should be point based with an away win worth twice as much as a home win. An away draw equal to a home win except where caused by weather (eg recent South Africa Bangladesh tour would give both teams zero points - to stop poor tour schedules) . A Drawn away series would earn points equal to a home series win (eg New Zealand recently in the UAE, England this would encourage the big three to have at least 3 test series). A two test series with two wins would get bonus points equal to a 3 test series (eg Pakistan vs Australia in the UAE) There should be no toss in cricket with the visiting team choosing whether to bat or bowl. Something needs to be done to address the balance of series and home advantage (this will have least affect in England where overhead conditions are the most critical element but would help avoid Nagpur and Kingston type pitches hopefully). Something needs to be done to reflect the fact that New Zealand were the number one test side (cricket side in all formats) for the last 18 months (and clearly had the strongest away performance) until their loss to Australia at home this year. India was only briefly the number one side under Anil Kumble. South Africa became the number one side in about 2006/7 (when Warne etc retired) and only lost that status briefly to England before giving it up to New Zealand about 18 months ago. It could perhaps be argued that India were number one for a few months at some point in the last 10 years but India's away record other than in Sri Lanka has been very poor. The point system until now has been flawed and certainly has not reflected a teams ability to win away from home. I would not have a top four team play off just the top two teams to minimise the impact on schedules. There is no point having a play off of the top two sides over a 3 test series (neutral venue or 3 at home 3 away) until the flawed ranking system is fixed. The current ranking should be Australia, New Zealand, Pakistan, England, India, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, West Indies, Ireland, Zimbabwe, Afghanistan. In addition bonus points could be added for close

wins/draws. For example a draw with less than 30 runs needed or 3 wickets 1 point, 20 runs 2 wickets 2 points, 1 wicket or 10 runs 3 points. Similarly for losses eg the recent Adelaide New Zealand - Australia game or better still Adelaide West Indies-Australia or Melbourne England-Australia or Edgbaston England-Australia or the South Africa - India draw. The no points scenario for a draw when a full days play is lost would encourage the addition of a reserve day to help generate more results. The test championship would need to be decided every 2 years which is about the limit for a side at number one status at present given the general decline in the standard of cricket globally over the last 20 years (directly proportional to the rise firstly in one day cricket and the rapid decline in standard that matches the unfortunate advent or T20 cricket). World test cricket peaked between 1978-1992 with WI, Pakistan, NZ all having their best sides of all time over this period and Australia, England and India having strong sides. Something needs to be done to get test cricket back to the highly competitive status it enjoyed in the 1980s. Rankings would be decided by the results of other series so that sides do not necessarily need to play each other over a 2 year period. The aim should be for all sides to meet home and away over a 4 year period ideally for 3 test series or 2 at worst. Certainly Australia could play games over winter in Cairns, Darwin, Rockhampton, Karratha, Broome etc. New Zealand could perhaps play games in Northern Australia against other teams especially affiliates out of season. The European teams would struggle most of all to meet the packed test schedule. Perhaps England could play games in the UAE during the winter months.

All cricket needs to be available to all. It is the duty of those at the top to support those coming up. The contraction of the world game will only lead to its demise.

#1 It is imperative that cricket grow geographically. If it does not, it will wither. #2 Test cricket is the highest/best expression of the game.

'Make the changes if it seems wise, but no need to change just for the sake of it!

Series like The Ashes could still be played if the teams were in different divisions

Please save the best format of cricket

As an immediate measure. The no 1 ranked team at the end of every year should play against rest of the world that team in 2 short series home and away both. Just makes the ranking meaningful and I'm sure in a neutral venue such games will get crowds.

Though there remain lot of uncertainties, I think we could learn from the way cricket, LAs especially, have evolved over the years. If administrators and external agencies work together,

we might at least be able to see some concrete steps towards a more competitive test cricket structure.

Assimilation of non-test nations' teams into a Test nation's domestic first class competition. For e.g. Afghanistan into India/Pak

Let's have the league stage dependent on FTP games and then short series between top 6

Given its fragile current condition, the absence of marquee series like the Ashes or India vs Australia could be even more disastrous to the sustenance of interest in the game

I would like to see A knock-out Test Championship with Home-Away Matches (1 each, mostly teams would make Home team suited pitches, however, in case of a draw T20 match played by a Test team players) played simultaneously by all competing teams.

Any test championship will be of interest only if played among the top test nations. The public loves competitive matches and might not tune in for a contrived event like this. I don't understand what is the ICC looking for-- increasing revenues with this championship, make test cricket the number one format again, expand the game to more regions? They seem to want all of these but a test championships might not get them any of these! It is better they have a two tier structure with the best teams playing each other so we don't have to endure mismatches. The current Ranji Trophy in India is an ideal format in which the table toppers from the lower tiers do get a chance to compete can be expanded to a 3-4 years cycle with home and away series and the playoffs also home and away. I would definitely want to watch something like that.

Play less cricket, including Test series. Limit the number of ODIs a country can play a year. Try and play domestic T20 series together. Free up space in the calendar so more international players can play domestically like in other team sports.

Fans want meaningful matches and broad pool of talent--think football (soccer). Leagues or relegation system seems to make sense to account for the difference in the quality of sides and allow for both competitive matches and opportunities for sides that are emerging. An ideal system would accommodate both.

Expand game in T20s - 14 teams and ODIs - 12 teams in World Cups. Have 8 teams with Full Test status with promotion and relegation in 2 tiers in a Two year test championship with a league based format having a final series with 2 test matches (home and away) but without

affecting marquee test series and traditional rivalries in Test matches special status due to relegation and promotion.

Cricket should strive to emulate football to emerge as a global game. A judicious mix of T-20, ODI and Test cricket, played with relevance and with structures that give every nation a chance to qualify for premier events of the game is the way this game can truly blossom the world over. An ideal worth striving for. With expanding bases and some unprecedented victories (like India's in 1983 world cup) will really help the game develop new financial bases and enrich it in every way possible.

More important than a Test championship is for the ICC to have a bursary, so that all Test players can be paid a very competitive amount: so that a player should not go to T20 just for the financial incentive. I have no problem with T20: it has its own skills and a lovely market, and very apt for expansion into more geographies. But Test cricket is the highest quality: a Test player should make more money than a T20 player. That will attract many good players to Tests, increasing quality and audience. Of course, innovations like day-night Tests are welcome.

A test championship is necessary to keep cricket exciting. Make it based on performance and not prior team ranking nor financial status