

Dr George Christos
1 Kathleen Street
Bassendean WA 6054
Australia
Tel 61-8-9378 1611
29 December 2008

International Cricket Council (ICC)
Al Thuraya Tower 1, 11th floor
Dubai Media City
Dubai
United Arab Emirates
(letter sent by email to enquiry@icc-cricket.com)

RE: Intellectual property rights over 20/20 ('smatch') cricket

To whom it may concern,

This letter requires urgent and considered consideration. It relates to my intellectual property rights over 20/20 cricket. I wrote to the ICC through a website form about 2 years ago regarding this matter but never received a response. If you are not the appropriate recipient of this letter, please forward it to the correct person.

Prelude (my involvement in one-day cricket):

The ICC (and other cricket nations, etc) will be aware that in the late 1990's and early 2000's, whilst I was working in at the Mathematics Department at Curtin University, Perth, Western Australia, I made submissions for a 'rain-rule' for one-day cricket matches (50 overs) affected by rain. My method was called by some the 'wicket-averaging method'. My method was considered by the ICC (and many other cricket boards) in competition with the Duckworth-Lewis (DL) method. The DL method was adopted by the ICC mainly because it had already been trialled by the England and Wales Cricket Board (EWCBC), and was subsequently, and reluctantly, accepted by other national cricket boards, simply to go along with the decision made by the ICC. For the record, I still believe my idea is superior and much simpler for the public and players to understand and play with, as well as being cost free, unlike the DL system. The idea behind my method is that the target is always set by the run-rate score (that is the basic idea behind one-day cricket, namely, who scores the most number of runs from a fixed number of balls), but if the number of overs is reduced, the number of available batsmen/wickets is also reduced, by one wicket for every 5 overs lost. As an example of how this works, consider the infamous match between Australia and the West Indies, in 1989, when the original old run-rate rule was in use, Australia made 226 runs off 38 overs, with somewhere around 100 runs in the last 10 overs, when they were told the match had been shortened. When rain further intervened the West Indies were eventually set the target of 108 runs off 18 overs with all 10 wickets in hand. The West Indies easily won the match, but the situation was clearly unfair. Under my method, the West Indies would have had to chase (the run-rate score of) 89 runs in 15 overs with just 3 wickets in hand, or 119 runs in 20 overs with just 4 wickets in hand. I do not know what the DL method would have done in this situation, but I suspect that the West Indies might have been chasing about 220 runs off 18