



**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE EBU SELECTION COMMITTEE  
HELD AT 40 BERNARD STREET, LONDON WC1,  
ON WEDNESDAY 11<sup>TH</sup> FEBRUARY 2004**

<b>Present:</b>	Chris Dixon	Chairman
	Richard Fleet	Vice-Chairman
	Roger Amey	
	Raymond Brock	
	Pat Davies	
	Denis Robson	EBU Chairman (until item 10)
	Bob Rowlands	
	Mel Starkings	Appointed member (until item 4)
	Gerard Faulkner	Vice-President
	Tony Friday	Vice-President
	Nick Doe	Secretary
<b>In attendance:-</b> (for item 10.1)	Colin Simpson	
	Geoffrey Wolfarth	

- |                                 |              |                   |
|---------------------------------|--------------|-------------------|
| <b>1. Apologies for Absence</b> | Philip Mason | EBU Vice-Chairman |
|                                 | Paul Bowyer  | Appointed member  |

The Chairman welcomed Mr Starkings to his first meeting of the Committee. He also expressed his thanks to the Vice-Chairman for standing in for him whilst he had been away.

**2. Minutes of Previous Meeting (15<sup>th</sup> October 2003)**

**2.1 Accuracy**

Mr Fleet raised three matters. He considered that the last paragraph of item 7.5 did not accurately reflect what had transpired. He recalled that Mrs King had made the suggestion which, at the Chairman's instigation, was not pursued. The Committee, however, did not consider that the minute needed to be changed. Mr Fleet also considered that the last sentence of paragraph 9.1 was potentially misleading, and the Committee agreed his suggested amendment, as follows:-

“...Stages II and III, and tabled that relating to Stage III. The Committee considered this to be helpful, and noted that the players, to whom it had been made available, had also liked it.

His final point related to the last paragraph of item 10.5. The Committee agreed that the words “up to two” should be omitted.

The Committee also agreed with Mr Faulkner that the word “consequence” should be substituted for “function” in the last sentence of item 8.

Subject to these amendments the minutes were agreed to be a true record and were signed by the Chairman.

## **2.2        *Matters arising***

2.2.1        *World Championships, Montreal 2002 (item 5.2.1)*

2.2.2        *European Open Championships, Menton 2003 (item 5.2.3)*

Mr Doe reported that the letters had been acknowledged, and noted that Mr Harris (to whom a copy of the letter to the EBL had been sent) had expressed the view that such matters were in general better dealt with by asking him to raise them at an EBL Executive meeting. The Committee noted that on this occasion the EBL had asked for feedback, and did not think that sending a letter could be criticised.

A propos representations to the supranational bridge organisations, Mr Brock asked whether the Committee was aware of the shortcomings of the current international calendar, and noted that the Committee had expressed its reservations when the changes had been made.

2.2.3        *Other Action Points (Appendix 2)*

These would be considered at the appropriate points on the agenda.

2.2.4        *Incident in the trials (raised under Any Other Business) (item 18)*

Mr Fleet asked whether any further action had been taken. Mr Doe said that the Committee had made its views known but he had not been aware that any further action had been expected. The Committee decided that the previous minute should be drawn to the attention of the director concerned, and of all directors appointed to be in charge of trials, to reinforce the Committee’s policy that Conditions of Contest for trials should be enforced strictly and breaches reported to the Committee for consideration of possible further action. No further action was, however, justified on this occasion.

## **3.        *Constitutional matters and Committee composition***

### **3.1        *Bye-law changes***

The Committee noted that the Bye-law changes necessary to formalise the new arrangements with regard to Junior matters, and deal with other minor matters, had been passed at the January Council meeting.

### **3.2        *Resignation of a Committee member***

The Committee noted the resignation of Mr Hackett, who intended to play in the Seniors Trials. The Chairman had written to Mr Hackett, and the Committee endorsed the Chairman’s comment in the letter that Mr Hackett’s contribution to the work of the Committee had been immense and that his extensive knowledge of bridge in the world arena had been of considerable assistance.

### **3.3        *Appointment of Youth representatives***

The Committee noted that under the terms of the new Bye-law 25.2, the Board had appointed Messrs Bowyer and Starkings to be members of the Committee for the purpose of the Committee’s work relating to the selection of teams for junior representative events, the preparation and training of junior players and any other matters relating to junior players which are customarily the responsibility of the Committee. The Committee noted that they were to have votes on any matter relating to those aspects of the Committee’s work for which they had been appointed, but not on other matters.

### **3.4 Co-option of player representatives**

The Committee noted that all players who had played in the Open and Women's Trials had been invited to make written representations on the format of trials, to attend in person for the item on that subject, or to nominate other players as possible player representatives. As a consequence, Messrs Simpson and Wolfarth were expected to attend for item 10, the only person nominated by others as a representative, namely Mr Hackett, being unavailable.

Mr Fleet wished it noted that whilst he supported the elimination of conflicts of interest, he found it odd that Mr Bowyer, who was an entrant to Open Trials, could have a vote on Junior matters, whereas Mr Hackett had been put in a position where he had had to resign from the Committee altogether in order to be eligible to enter Seniors Trials, and thus could not vote on any matters even where there was no conflict of interest. He asked for confirmation that the Committee's Terms of Reference supported this distinction. Mr Doe confirmed that the restrictions on entry to trials contained in the Terms of Reference approved by Council apply to elected members only.

## **4. Junior matters**

*[Secretary's note – the discussions on this item did not follow the order of the published agenda, and these minutes follow the order of the discussion rather than that of the agenda. Paragraph numbers within item 4 have been altered accordingly.]*

### **4.1 Squad arrangements**

The Committee noted papers from Mr Doe and Mr Starkings which set out various information, in particular the Board's decision, in conjunction with their appointment to the Committee, to appoint Mr Bowyer as Squad Manager for the Under-25 Squad and Mr Starkings as Squad Manager for the Under-20 Squad, although the intention was that they would work closely together. The Chairman invited Mr Starkings to present his views of how the new arrangements would work.

Mr Starkings said that he and Mr Bowyer conceived their role as being to present information to the Committee and take instructions from the Committee. It was not an ideal situation to take over only a matter of months before the next Junior European, or with the subsequent Junior European being only one year later rather than two, but they would do their best.

Mr Starkings said that he hoped the Committee had it in mind to appoint NPCs for the European Youth Championships at the current meeting, so that the captains could then work closely with those members of the squads who were in contention in the run-up to the selection of the teams. He had spoken to all the pairs concerned, and considered that there was little doubt as to the pairs who should be considered to be in contention. It was the intention that work would continue with the pairs not in serious contention for the 2004 European, in preparation for the next cycle. The Committee approved.

### **4.2 Team officials**

Mr Starkings drew the Committee's attention to the need for officials accompanying junior teams to have passed the necessary Criminal Records Bureau checks. He hoped that it would be possible to build up a pool of suitable people, some of whom he thought would be prepared to accompany teams at their own expense. He considered that at a European Youth Championships it was appropriate for there to be a Team Manager with authority in addition to the two NPCs and Coach, and that it was arguable that a third official along similar lines should also be appointed for Junior Camrose weekends. He also thought that for the Carrousel Cup it was appropriate for two officials to accompany the team, and that if possible one of these should be the appointed NPC for the under-25 team at the European Youth Championships.

There had been problems with discipline amongst the players in the past, but he was confident that the players would respond well to greater discipline if it were imposed in the right way.

### **4.3 European Youth Championships 2004**

The Committee considered the position of a pair one of whom was still in contention for selection for the England Open team for the European Championships and the Olympiad. He had apparently told his junior partner that if he were so selected he would not be available for the European Youth Championships. The Committee considered this to be a sensible decision, but it caused some problems because the selection for the Open team would not be known for some weeks, and until then the position of the player's junior partner was difficult. The Committee did not think it appropriate to rule the pair out of contention until the composition of the Open team was known.

The Committee considered the appointment of officials for the Championships [*and Messrs Dixon and Starkings withdrew briefly, Mr Fleet taking the Chair*]. The following appointments were made:-

NPC for under-25 team – Chris Dixon

NPC for under-20 team – Mel Starkings

Team supporter – Megan Starkings

The appointment of a Coach was deferred, and Mr Doe was asked to obtain further information concerning availabilities.

### **4.4 Carrousel Cup, 's-Hertogenbosch 2004**

[*Messrs Dixon and Starkings remained absent for consideration of the officials.*]

The following were selected to represent England:-

Michael Byrne and Alex Morris

Ben Green and Duncan Happer

Ed Levy and Andrew Woodcock

NPC – Chris Dixon

Coach / Assistant NPC – Mel Starkings

The Committee noted that Mr Starkings had been planning to attend the event at his own expense if not appointed in any official capacity, but considered that an offer should be made to pay his expenses.

### **4.5 Future Junior Trials**

The Committee noted with approval the Squad Managers' proposal that as in previous years the top two pairs in each age group in the trials should be guaranteed automatic selection for the Junior Camrose and Peggy Bayer, and also noted the expectation that the top five in the under-25s were likely to be selected for something.

### **4.6 Proposal for a Women's Under-25 European Championship**

The Committee noted that the European Bridge League had asked NBOs for their reaction to a proposal to introduce such a Championship, either in 2004 or in 2005, and the Board's response that it was too short notice to introduce one in 2004, but that the EBU would be likely to support it if it was introduced later. Views were expressed on both sides of the question. Whilst in the short term the proposal might be disruptive of existing partnerships, a number of which were mixed, in the longer term it might encourage the development of all-female partnerships, and keep more young women in the game who currently tended to drop out if they could not make the team. The Committee was content to keep its options open.

The need to establish some mechanism for selecting the Junior Women's team for the 2005 European Youth Championships, assuming that the proposal went ahead, was noted. The publicity concerning Junior Trials should mention the possibility.

#### **4.7 World Junior Individual 2004**

The Committee noted the existence of this new event, but did not consider that it was appropriate for the Committee to select the players who were to go (there were no quotas).

#### **4.8 Junior Channel Trophy 2003**

The Committee noted that due to the unavailability of some of the selected players, there had been some changes to the under-20 team originally selected. The results were noted, as shown in Appendix 1 (A and B), and Messrs Starkings and King were thanked for their reports.

#### **4.9 Junior Camrose and Peggy Bayer Trophies 2004**

The results were noted, as shown in Appendix 1 (C and D). The Committee congratulated the teams on the successful retention of both trophies, and Mr Starkings was thanked for his report on the Junior Camrose. The Committee noted Mr King's indication that his report was not yet ready due to the non-receipt of match records from the organisers, which it was understood was likely to be rectified shortly.

The Committee considered correspondence concerning the alleged bad behaviour of certain members of the England Peggy Bayer team, and noted a request from BGB for a report from Mr King as NPC. It was agreed to write formally to Mr King to request such a report in addition to the outstanding NPC report. Meanwhile, the Squad Managers' intention to talk to all squad members about the importance of good behaviour, without implication of guilt on this occasion, was noted with approval.

### **5. Future planning**

#### **5.1 Funding of international teams**

Mr Fleet reminded the Committee that he had asked for a discussion on this topic because he considered that there were questions of priorities to be addressed in the era of professional sponsored teams. If a sponsor was able to afford to pay members of a team to play, then it was arguable that he could and should be expected to contribute to the expenses of sending the team to the event for which it had been selected.

Another issue was the payment of *per diem* allowances. It was arguable that these were not justified, as the players would have had to be responsible for their own subsistence if they had remained at home, although it was acknowledged that subsistence at certain venues was very expensive. The money saved could perhaps be used to pay a coach, whose task at a major championship was quite onerous.

The general view of Committee members was that it was too complex to enquire in detail into the circumstances of each member of the team. At one end of the scale some players might be in receipt of payments from a sponsor (of the existence, but not amount, of which the Committee would be made aware under current conditions). At the other end some players might be in the position of having to take unpaid leave from their employment in order to play. However, the need to ensure that the Union obtained value for money for the available funding should be kept under review on a continuing basis.

The Committee agreed that whilst a sponsor might consider a team to be "his" team whilst it played its way through the trials, once it was selected it became the Union's team, and should be expected to comply with the Committee's stipulations in priority to any the sponsor might wish to impose. If the sponsor wished to enhance the arrangements made for the team, he was welcome to make a formal proposal to the Committee, but the Committee did not think that private arrangements should be contemplated.

## **5.2 Budget**

The Committee noted that Mr Bavin had submitted various requests to the Board on the Committee's behalf, and the response was awaited.

## **5.3 EBU Development Plan**

The Committee noted the reference in the Plan to obtaining sponsorship to improve funding of the Union's international activities.

The Committee also noted the reference to expecting top players to put something back into the game at grass-roots level, such as by masterclasses. It thought that any such requirement would come as a surprise to the players, and noted Mr Robson's comment that such matters included in the Plan were at this stage in the nature of a "wish list".

## **6. World Championships (Venice Cup), Monte Carlo 2003**

### **6.1 Results**

The results were noted, as shown in Appendix 1 (E).

### **6.2 Reports**

The Committee thanked Mr Arthur for his NPC's report, and also noted some comments from Mr Mould (the Coach) which cast doubt on the adequacy of the players' preparation. The Committee considered that both the Conditions of Contest for Trials, and the formal invitations and documentation issued to the team members following selection should include a stipulation that selection was subject to adequate commitment on the part of the players to a programme of training and preparation prior to the event.

The Committee noted that one pair in the team appeared to have fallen out during the Championships, with arguably very damaging results to the team's prospects at a crucial stage. As it appeared from the NPC's report that one of the players had been substantially responsible for the problem, the Committee agreed that the Chairman should write to the player concerned expressing concern and asking for comments, without suggesting that the Committee proposed to take any further action.

## **7. Open Trials and Camrose Trophy**

### **7.1 Progress of trials**

The results of Stage IVA (semi-finals) were noted, as shown in Appendix 1 (F).

### **7.2 Arrangements for Stage IVB (final)**

The Committee noted that the Chairman had approved on its behalf some changes to the timetable, jointly proposed by the two captains in order to accommodate one of the players who had difficulty getting time off work.

### **7.3 Withdrawal of a pair from the Camrose match against Republic of Ireland**

The Committee noted that a pair had proposed to arrive at the venue in the early hours of Saturday morning, with play due to start at 11 am, as a result of a commitment to play a match on the Friday evening. Consultations between the NPC and the Vice-Chairman had led to a decision to call in the reserves in place of the pair concerned. It was agreed that no further action was necessary.

#### **7.4 Camrose Trophy results to date**

The results to date were noted, as shown in Appendix 1 (G). Messrs Williams and Hackett were thanked for their reports. Some concern was expressed at the VP fines suffered by England in the match against the Republic of Ireland as a consequence of the actions of one pair.

#### **7.5 Future format**

The Committee noted that the new format (two weekends only, each with all five teams present, with each team completing 64-board matches against two of its four opponents on each weekend) was to be introduced from next season. The Committee continued to consider the change a retrograde step, and thought that the published timetable of matches was seriously flawed. It noted that, contrary to a previous proposal, Unions were limited to a team of six for each weekend, but not necessarily the same team for both weekends.

The Committee considered it important to give the players official notice of the change.

### **8. Women's Trials and events**

#### **8.1 Format of the trials**

The Committee noted that as a result of the break-up of one of the partnerships in a team that had entered the trials, it had been necessary to circulate Committee members between meetings for a decision on whether to accept a late entry comprising two players from each of two teams originally entered, and on the format to be adopted in the light of the fact that there were only three teams wishing to play. The decision had effectively boiled down to one between pre-selecting one pair from the new team, and leaving the other two teams to play off against each other for the remaining places in the team; or playing a triangular trial. The decision had finally been made to opt for the latter course, although not before the pair concerned had asked for a meeting with the Chairman to indicate their unwillingness to accept pre-selection.

Several members of the Committee were unhappy that the players had somehow become privy to internal Committee discussions which should have been confidential, and considered that the procedures followed by the Chairman in attempting to reach a decision without a meeting were flawed. It was unfortunate that this had led to the appearance that the Committee had changed its mind as a result of pressure from one pair. The Chairman said that he had not sought the meeting with the players, but had seen no reason to deny their request for one. He had then tried to consult all the members of the Committee in an attempt to reach a pragmatic solution, and he was prepared to apologise to the Committee if it considered that the way in which he had dealt with the situation had been wrong.

The Committee considered that the lessons to be learned were that closing dates should be set further in advance, to enable a special meeting to be convened if necessary, and that Committee members should take particular care to keep internal discussions confidential.

*[Secretary's note – the remainder of item 8 and item 9 were deferred until after item 10, to allow the attendance of the player representatives at the appointed time.]*

#### **8.2 Results**

The results were noted, as shown in Appendix 1 (H).

#### **8.3 Performance analyses**

The Committee noted detailed analyses prepared by the Chairman. He confirmed that a large part of the material was based on his assessment of a practical par on each board. To some extent it was experimental and there were some aspects which were subjective.

#### **8.4 Lady Milne Trophy**

##### **8.4.1 Selection of England team, reserves, NPC and reserve NPC**

The following were selected to represent England:-

Sally Brock and Kitty Teltscher  
Tracy Capal and Catherine Draper  
Heather Dhondy and Nicola Smith

Reserves – Cath Jagger and Sarah Teshome

NPC – David Burn

##### **8.4.2 Arrangements and other issues**

It was noted that the event is to be held in Ballymena, Northern Ireland, on its new date, namely 16<sup>th</sup> to 18<sup>th</sup> April.

#### **8.5 European Teams Championships**

##### **8.5.1 Selection of England team, reserves, NPC and reserve NPC**

The following were selected to represent England:-

Sally Brock and Kitty Teltscher  
Michelle Brunner and Rhona Goldenfield  
Heather Dhondy and Nicola Smith

Reserves – Tracy Capal and Catherine Draper

It was agreed to defer consideration of the appointment of officials pending consultation with the players, now that the full playing composition of the team was known. Miss Davies' offer to speak to all members of the team was accepted with thanks.

##### **8.5.2 Arrangements and other issues**

It was noted that further details of the arrangements would be available shortly.

#### **8.6 World Teams Olympiad**

##### **8.6.1 Selection of England team, reserves, NPC and reserve NPC**

The following were selected to represent England:-

Sally Brock and Kitty Teltscher  
Michelle Brunner and Rhona Goldenfield  
Heather Dhondy and Nicola Smith

Reserves – Cath Jagger and Sarah Teshome

It was agreed to defer consideration of the appointment of officials for the reasons already noted.

##### **8.6.2 Arrangements and other issues**

It was noted that the World Bridge Federation apparently intended to proceed to hold the event in Istanbul despite the fact that security concerns had been expressed in some quarters. No English players in contention for selection had expressed any such reservations.

#### **9. Seniors Trials and Events**

The Committee noted that four teams had entered the trials, and decided to exercise the right it had explicitly reserved, namely to cancel the proposed play-off. The winners of the round-robin would therefore be the winners of the trials.

## **10. Format of trials for 2004/05 and 2005/06**

The Chairman welcomed Messrs Simpson and Wolfarth to the meeting.

The Committee noted that there is no European Teams Championship or other major championship in 2005. Whilst there will be a European Open Championship, the Committee was unanimously of the view that there should be no trials for an official team for this championship, and that accordingly the Open Trials in 2004/05 should be for the Camrose Trophy alone, and the Women's Trials for the Lady Milne alone. In view of the criticism from the players last year concerning the short notice of the format of the trials, the Chairman hoped that it would be possible to go on to consider the format for 2005/06 as well as for 2004/05.

### **10.1 Open**

The Chairman said that the players had been generally supportive of the format used for 2003/04, apart from the short notice and some criticisms on the subject of qualifications for Stage II and exemptions to Stage III.

Mr Simpson said that as a professional player he fundamentally agreed with the format used for 2003/04 insofar as selection for major championships was concerned. He thought that it stood the Union in good stead in terms of achieving a top-5 finish in the European Championships and consequent qualification for the Bermuda Bowl. However, for professional players, there had been a large number of weekends during which their commitment to trials had precluded alternative, paid, engagements, and the trials were to be followed by another four weeks of major championships. It did cost the professionals a lot of money to seek the honour of representing their country. He considered that England had considerable strength in depth from which teams could be selected which would expect to win the Camrose. In a year when the Camrose was the only target, his view was that it would be better to allow teams of six which might include playing sponsors. Otherwise, he thought it likely that a number of the top players would not play.

The Chairman drew attention to the Committee's duty to endeavour to select teams to win events. He did not consider that the Committee was anti-sponsor, but thought that it was right for the Committee to establish conditions where a playing sponsor was subject to the same conditions as any other player. Mr Simpson's view was that there is a substantial amount of professional opposition to be encountered in a European Championship, and the Committee was sadly mistaken if it considered that English amateur players were in a position to compete effectively against them.

Mr Wolfarth said that as an aspiring player and occasional sponsor, he agreed with the concept of the level playing field. He would go further and have no exemptions at all in the trials. He said that he had played in the European Open Championships in Menton, where the English teams had tended to do badly. He attributed this to lack of stamina in admittedly appalling conditions. He was quite happy for the Committee to follow Council's policy of picking teams to win, but thought that the Committee also had a responsibility to look to the future and encourage aspiring talent. In a year where the Camrose was the only target, there was an opportunity for aspiring players to compete, and if the professional players did not wish to play in such years, so be it. He considered that the important thing was for the trials to include as much competition as possible.

Mr Wolfarth also drew attention to an aspect of the format for 2003/04 which he considered open to possible abuse, namely the provision that qualified players could play with team-mates of their choice.

The Committee thanked Messrs Simpson and Wolfarth for their contribution, and made the following decisions about the format of Open trials:-

#### **2004/05**

- ◆ Two weekends of teams trials.
- ◆ Teams of four only.

- ◆ A maximum of sixteen teams.
- ◆ Teams to apply with details of achievements: if more than 16 applications, the Committee to invite sixteen teams to play.
- ◆ If sixteen play, the bottom four to drop out after one weekend, but all results to be carried over to the second weekend.
- ◆ If fewer than 16 applications, all (or all bar one to avoid an odd number) would be invited to play; the Committee to consider after numbers were known whether any teams should drop out after the first weekend.
- ◆ The winners to be guaranteed one Camrose weekend as a team, other Camrose selections to be made from the remaining triallists.

### **2005/06**

In principle the same format as 2003/04, but the Committee will consider a number of matters of detail at the next meeting, including:-

- ◆ Possible change to teams throughout
- ◆ Possible revisions to the qualifications for Stage II, including consideration of use of the Gold Point ranking list for this purpose, and reserving to the Committee a right to waive the qualifications.
- ◆ Possible changes to exemptions to Stage III.

Committee members were asked to communicate any particular suggestions to Mr Doe so that they could be incorporated into a paper for consideration at the next meeting. It was agreed that details of the format would be published as far in advance as possible.

### **10.2 Women**

The Committee decided that there should be a two-weekend pairs trial for the Lady Milne in 2004/05, with the top two pairs guaranteed selection. Apart from the proposition that the venue for at least one of the weekends should be outside London, the details were left for further consideration at the next meeting.

The Committee considered that it was difficult to decide on a format for 2005/06 in view of the disappointing number of entrants in 2003/04. It considered it desirable to have a format under which it was possible for a different team to play in the Lady Milne and the European Championships, but the numbers did make this difficult. It was decided to consider the matter again at the next meeting. Committee members who had detailed proposals were invited to submit them to Mr Doe in advance of the next meeting, so that they could be incorporated into a paper for discussion.

The Committee considered whether it was appropriate to offer a team which earned qualification for the World Championship, by virtue of its finishing position in a European Championship, automatic selection for the World Championship. It noted that whilst a guarantee had sometimes been offered in the past, the most recent Conditions of Contest had not included such a guarantee, partly because the gap between the European and World Championships was now well in excess of a year. The Committee considered that it was right to maintain flexibility by not offering a guarantee.

### **10.3 Seniors**

Mr Faulkner asked whether the database used for the mailshot to Seniors about the 2004 trials had included the players who had been successful in the Gerard Faulkner Salver (Seniors Knockout). Mr Doe's recollection was that they had not, and he pointed out that the targeting of mailshots of this nature was by its nature a somewhat rough and ready business. The Committee felt that the principal means of communication with potential triallists should be via the website and in English

Bridge, with a letter as an additional courtesy to people thought to be potentially interested. It considered that communication by the first two means could be improved, in particular by longer notice.

Mr Faulkner considered that there was a considerable untapped market for potential entrants for Seniors Trials, and it was agreed to schedule a further discussion at a later date, as no trials were needed in 2004/05 due to the absence of any international championship.

**10.4**        *Timetable*

It was agreed to select appropriate dates for the trials for 2004/05 from the larger number of dates previously set aside, and to consider the question of the timetable for 2005/06 at the next meeting.

**11.**        **Committee Procedures and Documents**

**11.1**        *Existing drafts*

The Committee noted that Mr Brock had been the only Committee member to make detailed comments, and agreed that the final versions should be produced by the Chairman in consultation with Mr Brock.

**11.2**        *Documents for Home Internationals*

Due to lack of time the matter was deferred.

**12.**        **Panel of non-playing captains**

Due to lack of time the matter was deferred.

**13.**        **Friendly internationals and invitations**

Due to lack of time the matter was deferred.

**14.**        **Future meetings**

The date of the next meeting was fixed for Wednesday 10<sup>th</sup> March at 1 pm. [*Secretary's note – 40 Bernard Street being unavailable for that date, the meeting will take place at the Imperial Hotel*].

**15.**        **Any other Business**

None.

## Appendix 1 – Results

### A. Junior Channel Trophy (under 25s) (item 4.8)

	First Round Robin				Second Round Robin				Total
	B	E	N	F	B	E	N	F	
BELGIUM		25	25	14		14	25	14	<b>117</b>
ENGLAND	4		12	21	16		18	15	<b>86</b>
NETHERLANDS	1	18		18	3	12		25	<b>77</b>
FRANCE	16	9	12		16	15	4		<b>72</b>

England team:-

Michael Byrne and Alex Morris  
 Ben Green and Duncan Happer  
 Ed Levy and Andrew Woodcock  
 NPC – Mel Starkings

### B. Junior Channel Trophy (under 20s) (item 4.8)

	First Round Robin				Second Round Robin				Total
	N	F	B	E	N	F	B	E	
NETHERLANDS		22	23	25		19	14	25	<b>128</b>
FRANCE	8		18	25	11		12	12	<b>86</b>
BELGIUM	7	12		16	16	18		9	<b>78</b>
ENGLAND	5	5	14		0	18	21		<b>63</b>

England team:-

John Atthey and Laura Macdougall  
 Ian Green and Sarah Pinchbeck  
 Minesh Shah and Hugo Steckelmacher  
 NPC – Phil King

**C. Junior Camrose Trophy (item 4.9)**

	First Round Robin					Second Round Robin					Total
	E	W	NI	S	RI	E	W	NI	S	RI	
ENGLAND		18	20	21	15		21	22	16	22	<b>155</b>
WALES	12		20	14	23	9		17	12	18	<b>125</b>
N. IRELAND	10	10		9	20	8	13		20	20	<b>110</b>
SCOTLAND	9	16	21		11	14	18	10		9	<b>108</b>
REP OF IRELAND	15	7	10	19		8	12	11	21		<b>103</b>

England team:-

Michael Byrne & Alex Morris  
 Leigh Chapman & Dave Cropper  
 Ed Levy & Andrew Woodcock  
 NPC – Mel Starkings

**D. Peggy Bayer Trophy (item 4.9)**

	First Round Robin					Second Round Robin					Total
	E	NI	S	W	RI	E	NI	S	W	RI	
ENGLAND		15	18	13	25		21	22	25	25	<b>164</b>
N. IRELAND	15		16	15	18	9		23	16	24	<b>136</b>
SCOTLAND	12	14		22	23	8	7		15	22	<b>123</b>
WALES	17	15	8		25	2	14	15		6	<b>102</b>
REP OF IRELAND	2	12	7	2		1	6	8	24		<b>62</b>

England team:-

Philip Andrews & Michael Graham  
 John Atthey & Laura Macdougall  
 Ollie Burgess & Sarah Pinchbeck  
 NPC – Phil King

**E. Venice Cup (item 6.1)**

**Round-Robin**

1	China	318.0	VPs	(average = 255)
=2	USA I	309.0		(18 teams played)
=2	USA II	309.0		
4	Netherlands	285.0		
5	Germany	282.0		
6	Chinese Taipei	273.5		
7	Canada	267.0		
8	Sweden	255.0		
9	Indonesia	253.0		
<b>10</b>	<b>England</b>	<b>251.0</b>		

**Quarter-finals**

China beat Sweden by 266 – 187 IMPs

USA I beat Chinese Taipei by 271.5 – 205.5 IMPs

USA II beat Canada by 234 – 175 IMPs

Netherlands beat Germany by 232 – 195 IMPs

**Semi-finals**

China beat Netherlands by 279 – 202 IMPs

USA I beat USA II by 251.5 – 179 IMPs

**Final**

USA I beat China by 229.3 – 210 IMPs

**F. Open Trials Stage IVA (item 7.1)**

ARMSTRONG (John Armstrong and Danny Davies, David Gold and Tom Townsend) beat MOULD (Paul Bowyer and Martin Jones, Gary Hyett and Alan Mould) by 274 – 193 IMPs (Mould conceded with one 16-board set (out of 8) remaining).

SIMPSON (Phil King and Andrew McIntosh, David Price and Colin Simpson) beat DE BOTTON (Jason Hackett and Justin Hackett, Gunnar Hallberg and Nick Sandqvist) by 334 – 292 IMPs.

**G. Camrose Trophy (item 7.4)**

**First weekend**

**England v Republic of Ireland**

IMPs			VPs		
E		RI	E		RI
63	-	32	17.5*	-	9*
84	-	26	25	-	5
61	-	53	16	-	14
<b>Total</b>			<b>58.5</b>	-	<b>28</b>

**England team** Paul Bowyer and Martin Jones  
 Gary Hyett and Alan Mould  
 Phil King and Andrew McIntosh  
 NPC – John Williams

\*England fined 1VP for slow play, 1VP for late arrival, 0.5 VP procedural penalty; Ireland fined 1 VP for slow play

**Wales v Scotland**

IMPs			VPs		
W		S	W		S
80	-	73	16	-	14
69	-	54	17	-	13
71	-	22	23	-	7
<b>Total</b>			<b>56</b>	-	<b>34</b>

**Second weekend**

**Northern Ireland v England**

IMPs			VPs		
NI		E	NI		E
39	-	71	9	-	21
59	-	78	12	-	18
87	-	76	17	-	13
<b>Total</b>			<b>38</b>	-	<b>52</b>

**England team** John Armstrong and Danny Davies  
 Espen Erichsen and Artur Malinowski  
 Gary Hyett and Alan Mould  
 NPC – Paul Hackett

**Scotland v Republic of Ireland**

IMPs			VPs		
S		RI	S		RI
45	-	64	12	-	18
87	-	30	25	-	5
39	-	91	6	-	24
<b>Total</b>			<b>43</b>	-	<b>47</b>

**Third weekend (England sat out)**

**Northern Ireland v Scotland**

IMPs			VPs		
NI		S	NI		S
84	-	101	12	-	18
48	-	98	6	-	24
52	-	66	13	-	17
<b>Total</b>			<b>31</b>	-	<b>59</b>

**Republic of Ireland v Wales**

IMPs			VPs		
RI		W	RI		W
44	-	71	10	-	20
116	-	58	25	-	5
44	-	48	14	-	16
<b>Total</b>			<b>49</b>	-	<b>41</b>

**Table after three weekends (in order of average VPs per match)**

	VPs 1 <sup>st</sup> weekend	VPs 2 <sup>nd</sup> weekend	VPs 3 <sup>rd</sup> weekend	Table after 3 weekends		
				Played	VPs	Ave VPs
ENGLAND	58.5	52		2	<b>110.5</b>	55.25
WALES	56		41	2	<b>97</b>	48.50
SCOTLAND	34	43	59	3	<b>136</b>	45.33
R. of IRELAND	28	47	49	3	<b>124</b>	41.33
N. IRELAND		38	31	2	<b>69</b>	34.50

**H. Women's Trials (item 8.2)**

	DHONDY	BRUNNER	TESHOME	WINS	IMPS	POS
DHONDY		235 – 256	305 – 186	<b>1</b>	<b>+98</b>	1
BRUNNER	256 - 235		194 – 222	<b>1</b>	<b>-7</b>	2
TESHOME	186 – 305	222 – 194		<b>1</b>	<b>-91</b>	3

Teams:-

Brunner – Michelle Brunner and Rhona Goldenfield, Tracy Capal and Catherine Draper

Dhondy – Sally Brock and Kitty Teltscher, Heather Dhondy and Nicola Smith

Teshome – Cath Jagger and Sarah Teshome, Anne Rosen and Gillian Salt

**Appendix 2 – Action Points**

<b><i>Item</i></b>	<b><i>Action</i></b>	<b><i>Responsible</i></b>
<b><i>2.2.4</i></b>	Drawing minutes to Trials TDs' attention	Nick Doe
<b><i>4.9</i></b>	Letter to Mr King	Nick Doe
<b><i>6.2</i></b>	Letter to Venice Cup player	Chris Dixon
<b><i>8.5/6</i></b>	Players' views on team officials for the Women's European Championship and Olympiad	Pat Davies
<b><i>10</i></b>	Format of trials for 2005/06	All Committee members
<b><i>11</i></b>	Notes for Guidance	Chris Dixon / Raymond Brock