



**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE EBU SELECTION COMMITTEE  
HELD AT AYLESBURY OFFICES ON THURSDAY 3<sup>RD</sup> JUNE 2004**

<b>Present:</b>	Chris Dixon	Chairman
	Richard Fleet	Vice-Chairman
	Roger Amey	
	Paul Bowyer	Appointed member (for items 1-3)
	Raymond Brock	
	Pat Davies	
	Bob Rowlands	
	Mel Starkings	Appointed member (for items 1-3)
	Nick Doe	Secretary

<b>1.</b>	<b>Apologies for Absence</b>	Gerard Faulkner	Vice-President
		Philip Mason	EBU Vice-Chairman
		Denis Robson	EBU Chairman

**2. Minutes of Previous Meeting (10<sup>th</sup> March 2004)**

**2.1 Accuracy**

With the exception of the correction of a typographical error in a player's name in the results Appendix, the minutes were agreed to be a true record and signed by the Chairman.

**2.2 Matters arising**

**2.2.1 Peggy Bayer Trophy (item 2.2.2)**

The Committee noted that no NPC Report had been received from Mr King, despite a formal written reminder. Whilst this was regarded as unacceptable, as the Committee was hampered in its selection decisions for the European Schools Championship for lack of information on the most recent under-20 representative event, it was content to pursue the matter no further in view of Mr King's removal from the Panel.

The Committee noted that BGB apparently proposed to take no further action in respect of the allegations of bad behaviour. Mr Starkings indicated that his talk on the subject of players' responsibilities in this area seemed to have been received in the right spirit by those principally concerned. The Committee also noted that Mr Kambites had written again on the subject of behavioural issues within the squads, and had received an appropriate response.

### 2.2.2 *Seniors Trials (item 8.6)*

Mr Doe reported that the request for a partial refund of entry fees did not appear to have come from any of the teams concerned. The view had been taken that it was not appropriate to make any refunds, as being contrary to precedent, and unjustified in view of the terms of the letter to the players. In the event no requests for refunds had been received from the players and no refunds had been made.

### 2.2.3 *Committee Procedures and Documents – documents for Home Internationals (item 10.2)*

Mr Doe reported that he had this in hand, with a view to the documents being ready for the next Home International season.

### 2.2.4 *Any other matters arising (including action points)*

A number of matters were noted, and where appropriate details are included elsewhere in these minutes. All the action points had been dealt with as necessary.

## 3. **Junior matters**

### 3.1 *Reports from Squad Managers on pairs in contention for selection*

Brief reports from Messrs Bowyer and Starkings had been circulated in advance, and they expanded on their recommendations. Both expressed themselves satisfied with the degree of preparation which it had been possible to undertake with the pairs concerned, whose commitment and general attitude had been exemplary. The Committee noted that both teams had performed with credit in the Spring Foursomes.

The Committee noted that both Squad Managers had made reference in their verbal reports to the results of internal squad competitions, and thought that it would be helpful if such results were made available to the Committee in future.

Mr Starkings confirmed that he had had various discussions with the player whose position had been considered in some detail at the previous two meetings. Whilst the invitation to participate in the training with a view to being considered for selection had ultimately been declined, not least because the partnership concerned was no longer playing together, Mr Starkings had been encouraged by the constructive way in which the player had responded.

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

The Committee noted the results, as shown in Appendix 1 (A), and thanked Mr Dixon for his report. The event appeared to have constituted excellent preparation, and had provided Mr Dixon with a good opportunity to get to know the players likely to constitute the team for the European.

### 3.3 *European Youth Championships, Prague 2004*

#### 3.3.1 *Selection of England under-25 team and reserves*

The following were selected to represent England:-

Michael Byrne and Alex Morris  
Ben Green and Duncan Happer  
Ed Levy and Andrew Woodcock

The Committee noted that the only pair realistically in contention to be selected as reserves were not intending to play together in future, and whilst they were willing to be selected, they were not able to guarantee to be available at short notice. In the circumstances the Committee decided not to select a reserve pair. The possible options open to it would have to be explored as a matter of

urgency should the need arise. The Committee did not rule out the possibility of bringing in an individual or sending a team of five if one of the selected players had to withdraw.

### *3.3.2 Selection of England under-20 team and reserves*

The following were selected to represent England:-

Philip Andrews and Michael Graham

John Atthey and Laura Macdougall

Jon de Souza and Paul Wilson

Reserve pair – Minesh Shah and Hugo Steckelmacher

### *3.3.3 Arrangements for the Championships*

Mr Doe reported that provisional hotel bookings had been made and the other arrangements would be put in hand now that the composition of the teams was known.

The Committee noted that European Youth Championships were traditionally organised on a full board basis, and this year would be no exception. It was not therefore normal to grant the players a per diem. It was important, however, to ensure that the players were adequately provided with water, soft drinks, coffee etc., particularly if the weather was hot, and it was not known whether the cost of these would be covered by the organisers. Rather than grant the players a per diem which might prove not to be necessary, the Committee preferred the captains to be given an appropriate allowance or to claim for expenditure actually incurred.

The Committee noted that Mr Muller, the coach to both teams, had expressed a wish for personal reasons to travel to Prague on the Monday, two days later than the rest of the under-25 party. Mr Starkings was prepared to travel out earlier than he otherwise would have, to deputise as coach for the first two days. Alternatively Mr Dixon as NPC was happy to cover coaching duties for that period if necessary. The Committee agreed to Mr Muller's request, and expressed a preference for Mr Starkings to cover, although if that proved logistically difficult or particularly expensive, it was content to be without cover.

In passing the Committee noted that the inaugural Girls Championship had attracted 12 teams, which was perhaps a surprisingly high figure. There were 26 entries for the Junior Championship (an increase of four on Torquay 2002), which would make it quite a gruelling event, with 60 boards to be played most days. Entries for the Schools Championship were unchanged at 15.

## **3.4 *Report from Squad Managers on other training activities***

Mr Bowyer noted that he had planned a preparation weekend for the under-25 team at the end of June, which clashed with a sports exhibition at Earls Court in which the EBU had been invited to participate, and for which it had been decided that it would be appropriate to involve members of the junior squads. Whilst this was not ideal, he considered that he could combine attendance at the exhibition with some worthwhile training.

It had been suggested that it might be possible to seek an invitation to the Chairman's Cup in Malmö as a further preparation event for the under-25 team, but the Committee did not wish to pursue the suggestion as it was not felt that playing in any further events was the priority for training at this stage.

## **3.5 *Other issues***

Mr Bowyer noted that the Junior Trials were uncomfortably close to the European Youth Championships. In terms of preparation for the Championships, it was not necessarily particularly appropriate for team members to play in the trials, but the trials would undoubtedly be weakened if members of the team did not play. With hindsight it had been a mistake to offer the usual guarantees about selection for the Junior Camrose weekend to the top two pairs in both age groups in the trials. It was agreed that it was worth considering making future guarantees more flexible,

e.g. to guarantee each of the top two pairs selection for at least one of the Junior Camrose and the Channel Trophy. As there was no question of going back on the guarantees for this year which had been announced, it was agreed that the team members should be consulted for their reaction to the difficulty, but the Committee was certainly prepared to consider selecting for the Channel Trophy and the one remaining place in the Junior Camrose players who were members of the team for the European, even if they did not play in the trials.

The Committee also noted that, in contrast to the under-25s, where all the players selected for the European would still be eligible for the next European, all three pairs selected in the under-20 team for the European contained one player who would be too old for the under-20s in the next European. It was therefore almost inevitable that the team members who were young enough would wish to play in the trials with new partners. Despite the fact that this was not ideal, it was agreed that it could not be helped, although there were lessons for future scheduling (made more problematic by the fact that the dates of European Youth Championships are often not known very far in advance).

The Committee noted that there would traditionally be a World Junior Championship in the year following a European Youth Championship. It was not yet known how the WBF schedule was to be adapted to the new EBL schedule (under which the European Youth Championships are to be held in odd, rather than even numbered years from 2005). It was also noted that an inaugural World Schools (i.e. under-20) Championship is to be held in July 2004. Whilst it appears that this is by invitation only, it raises the possibility of an under-20 event being added to the World Junior Championships, with qualification from the European Schools Championship in the same way as for the under-25s.

The Committee thanked Messrs Bowyer and Starkings for the very considerable efforts which they had obviously made since their appointment, which appeared to have resulted in better-prepared teams than for any recent European Youth Championships.

#### **4. Budget**

##### **4.1 *Matters outstanding from previous discussion***

The Chairman reported that following the last meeting he had produced a paper for the Board, setting out the Committee's views. The response had been that whilst the Board was happy to allocate funding on a case-by-case basis as the need was demonstrated, it was not prepared to put an overall budget for team preparation in place of the sort of amount desired by the Committee. Mr Doe explained that he believed that the Chairman's paper had been written on the understanding that the Board had seen or would see the earlier paper presented to the Committee which included more detailed plans. Due to a misunderstanding that earlier paper had not gone to the Board at its March meeting, but it had now been seen by the Board (which had confirmed its decision at its May meeting having seen the earlier paper).

The Chairman expressed the view that whilst the situation was not perhaps ideal, it was an acceptable basis for moving forward.

Mr Fleet asked for clarification of the Treasurer's comment in the Board minutes that "internationals were showing a heavy loss". Did this mean that internationals had exceeded budget by a considerable sum, or was it merely a perhaps unfortunate way of saying that a lot of money was spent on internationals? If the former, then perhaps the budgeting process needed to be improved. Mr Doe undertook to seek clarification of the comment.

Mr Brock indicated that the process would be made easier if teams were selected further in advance than is currently the case.

## **4.2 Funding of Rosenblum and McConnell Cups**

The Committee noted that these events are expected to become fully transnational. In that case the Committee decided that the EBU should not fund the events *per se*. However, if they proved suitable as training for teams who had qualified for Bermuda Bowl or Venice Cup, funding might be sought under that heading. However, it was noted that the Rosenblum and McConnell are held up to fourteen months ahead of the following Bermuda Bowl and Venice Cup, so their value as training events might not be that significant.

## **5. European Teams Championships, Malmö, 2004**

### **5.1 Open series**

The Committee noted that John Armstrong and Danny Davies had had to decline their invitation due to work commitments on the part of the latter, and the first reserves (David Price and Colin Simpson) had been brought in. Mr Brock's potential difficulties over availability had also been resolved, and he would captain the team.

### **5.2 Women's series**

There was nothing of significance to note.

### **5.3 Seniors series**

The Committee noted that at the recent practice match the behaviour of one of the players had given cause for concern, and the possibility of withdrawal had been mentioned by both the player concerned and his partner. The Chairman had asked for specific confirmation of their position in time for the meeting, and he had been informed that they would play.

This gave rise to issues which needed to be addressed in determining the wording of Conditions of Contest for future trials (*see item 9.2*).

### **5.4 Preparation and training**

The Chairman reported on the practice match between four England teams which had been held the previous weekend. All three pairs from the Women's team and two from the Open, Seniors and Junior teams had participated, and the event had been well-received by the players. The Juniors had won narrowly from the Women's and the Open teams.

### **5.5 Practical and financial issues**

There was nothing of significance to discuss, everything being understood to be well in hand.

## **6. World Teams Olympiad, Istanbul 2004**

### **6.1 Open series**

The Committee noted that the deadline for acceptance of the invitation extended to the pair whose participation was in doubt had not yet passed. There was no positive indication of whether the invitation would be accepted, but both reserve pairs were aware of the situation and ready to be called upon if necessary. Mr Brock had accepted the invitation to captain the team.

### **6.2 Women's series**

There was nothing of significance to note.

### **6.3 Seniors series**

The Committee noted that after the last meeting representations had been received from certain members of the team that the nomination on which the selections had been based had not been intended to apply to the World Teams Olympiad. A request had been made that the pair selected as

reserves be promoted to the team in place of the selected third pair. The Chairman had taken the view that if the Committee had made the selections on the basis of a misunderstanding, as was alleged, then the requested change should be made provided that all eight players concerned were in favour. However, an objection had been received from one of the players. He had therefore arranged for Committee members to be circulated for a decision, and a number of members had considered it appropriate for the matter to be discussed at this meeting.

The Committee decided that it had made its selections in good faith, and should not change them.

#### **6.4            *Preparation and training***

The Committee noted that it was hoped that team members might play together at Brighton, and another practice match was also under consideration. The Committee was pleased to note that the Women's team had (in contrast to last year) been enthusiastic about the preparation activities proposed.

#### **6.5            *Practical and financial issues***

The Committee understood all matters to be in hand.

### **7.            *Lady Milne Trophy, Ballymena 2004***

The Committee noted the results, as shown in Appendix 1 (B). Mr Burn was thanked for his NPC report. Whilst it was disappointing not to have retained the trophy, it did appear that the England team had generally played well, but a strong Scotland team had played particularly well in the second Round-robin to snatch a narrow victory.

### **8.            *Home international timetable***

#### **8.1            *Junior Camrose weekend***

The Committee noted that with effect from 2006 the event was to be moved back about three weeks to mid-February. This would avoid the clash with exams which affected some players. It was understood that the Welsh organisers of the 2005 event had been asked by BGB whether it was feasible to make the change for 2005, and that a response was awaited.

#### **8.2            *Overall cycle for hosting of events***

The Committee noted discussions which had taken place since the recent BGB meeting, which appeared likely to lead to transitional arrangements to a new cycle which would be acceptable to all the participating Unions. It had no objections to what was now being proposed.

#### **8.3            *Camrose draw for 2005***

The Committee noted that the draw had been made, as follows:-

First weekend (hosts Scotland) – England's opponents Northern Ireland and Scotland; other matches Scotland v Republic of Ireland, Republic of Ireland v Wales, Wales v Northern Ireland.

Second weekend (hosts Northern Ireland) – England's opponents Republic of Ireland and Wales; other matches Northern Ireland v Scotland, Scotland v Wales, Republic of Ireland v Northern Ireland

### **9.            *Future Trials***

#### **9.1            *Gold Point qualifications***

The Committee discussed some points raised by Mr Fleet and concluded that it was better to use the existing structure of the Gold Point scheme, acknowledging it to be a somewhat rough and ready

guide to form, than to try to make adjustments which would tend to be cumbersome to administer. The Committee did, however, consider that the Gold Point scheme would be a better measure of form if it were to include results from trials, which are amongst the strongest events in the calendar. Given that the objection to issuing Master Points for selected events seemed to have been abandoned (by the award of Green Points for the Tollemache and the Home Internationals), and that most trials were now open entry events anyway, the Committee agreed to seek the approval of the Tournament Committee for the award of Green Points for Trials.

### **9.2            *Any other outstanding issues of format***

Mr Doe raised a number of questions which the Committee answered as follows:-

- Screens would not be used for trials where there was no target event played with screens.
- The existing clauses in Conditions of Contest relating to disclosure of professional arrangements would be retained for trials for Home Internationals as well as those for major championships.
- The required speed of play in trials without screens would be settled according to Mr Bavin's advice (the Committee noting that the speed of play required in the Camrose Trophy had been slightly increased with the move from 10- to 16-board stanzas).

The Committee decided that it was desirable to include an overriding discretion not to admit players to trials or not to select them for events if the Committee considered that behaviour or other problems made them unsuitable to represent England. However it was conscious of human rights and restraint of trade issues and considered that legal advice should be obtained, which Mr Doe undertook to arrange.

The Committee noted that all target events at which trials are aimed are scored by Victory Points. A proposal that trials should continue to be scored by net IMPs rather than Victory Points was carried by four votes to two. A proposal that the maximum loss in a match should be restricted to match the current restriction on a maximum win was defeated by three votes to two. Accordingly, trials (notably round-robin stages) will continue to be scored by net IMPs subject to a maximum win but no maximum loss.

### **9.3            *Progress in issuing Conditions of Contest***

Mr Doe reported that he had made considerable progress and should be able to issue the 2004/05 Conditions before long.

### **9.4            *Venues***

The Committee considered correspondence from London critical of the holding of increasing numbers of trials in Solihull rather than London.

The Committee was not aware of any suitable venue in London, other than the Young Chelsea Bridge Club, which was available at a reasonable price. Howie's Bridge Club, at which the recent practice match had been held, was suitable only for trials with no more than four tables. The Committee considered that the Young Chelsea (which London favoured) was not particularly suitable for reasons of size, quality of accommodation, car parking and availability of reasonable hotel accommodation. However, the Committee recognised that the West Midlands Bridge Club at Solihull is less easily accessible to players who rely on public transport. It would be appropriate to poll this year's triallists on their views on venues, whilst noting that the trend to hold separate series of trials simultaneously at one venue argued for a larger venue such as the West Midlands BC.

Mr Doe was asked to respond appropriately to London, setting out the issues and mentioning the consultation of players.

The Committee noted the desirability of being able to book the whole of a particular venue for trials.

The Committee decided to schedule the knock-out stages of the 2005/06 Open Trials in London.

**10. Friendly Internationals and invitations**

The Committee noted the results of the Bonn Nations Cup, as shown in Appendix 1 (C). Mr Townsend was thanked for his report. The Committee was not inclined to agree with his conclusion casting doubt on the value of the event as preparation for a European Championship.

**11. Date of next meeting**

Tuesday 16<sup>th</sup> November at 12 noon at Aylesbury.

**12. Any other business**

**12.1 Dates for Women's trials**

The Committee noted a request from a player that if for any reason it proved necessary to reduce the 2004/05 trials to a single weekend, that it should be the second of the two advertised weekends. The Committee saw no reason not to accede in the unlikely event of a reduction.

**12.2 End of Committee Year**

The Committee thought it would be helpful for Committee members to be reminded of the expiry dates of their respective terms of office.

*[Secretary's note – the terms of office expire as follows:-*

*2004 – Mr Rowlands (plus the vacant position arising from Mr Hackett's resignation; also Messrs Bowyer and Starkings who are appointed annually)*

*2005 – Messrs Amey, Dixon and Fleet*

*2006 – Mr Brock, Miss Davies]*

## Appendix 1 – Results

### A. *Carrousel Cup*

#### *Round-robin*

	VPs
<b>1 England</b>	<b>367</b>
2 Poland	339
3 Netherlands Schools	329
4 Denmark	323
5 USA	314
6 Norway	284
7 Germany	276
8 Netherlands Juniors	254

#### *Knock-out*

##### *Semi Finals*

England 80 – Netherlands u-20 97

Poland 156 – Denmark 93

##### *Final*

Netherlands u-20 128 – Poland 91

##### *Play-off*

England 197 – Denmark 76

*[scores in IMPs]*

#### *England team*

Michael Byrne and Alex Morris

Ben Green and Duncan Happer

Ed Levy and Andrew Woodcock

NPC – Chris Dixon

Coach – Mel Starkings

**B. Lady Milne Trophy**

<b>1<sup>ST</sup> ROUND ROBIN (MATCHES 1 – 5)</b>							
	<b>E</b>	<b>W</b>	<b>NI</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>RI</b>	<b>VPs</b>	<b>RANK</b>
ENGLAND		18	12	19	25	74	1
WALES	12		18	12	23	65	2
N. IRELAND	18	12		16	11	57	3
SCOTLAND	11	18	14		11	54	4
REP. OF IRELAND	5	7	19	19		50	5

<b>2<sup>ND</sup> ROUND ROBIN (MATCHES 6 – 10)</b>							
	<b>S</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>RI</b>	<b>W</b>	<b>NI</b>	<b>VPs</b>	<b>RANK</b>
SCOTLAND		22	18	24	25	89	1
ENGLAND	8		21	12	22	63	=2
REP. OF IRELAND	12	9		20	22	63	=2
WALES	6	18	10		20	54	4
N. IRELAND	5	8	8	10		31	5

<b>OVERALL RESULT</b>							
	<b>S</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>W</b>	<b>RI</b>	<b>NI</b>	<b>VPs</b>	<b>RANK</b>
<b>SCOTLAND</b>		33	42	29	39	143	1
ENGLAND	27		30	46	34	137	2
WALES	18	30		33	38	119	3
REP. OF IRELAND	31	14	27		41	113	4
N. IRELAND	21	26	22	19		88	5

**England team**

Sally Brock and Kitty Teltscher  
 Tracy Capal and Catherine Draper  
 Heather Dhondy and Nicola Smith  
 NPC – David Burn

**C. Bonn Nations Cup**

**Qualifying**

*(Red Group (ten teams))*

1	Netherlands	170
2	Poland	150
3	Belgium	140
4	Estonia	139
5	England	137

**Final**

Denmark beat Netherlands by 69 IMPs to 28.

The remaining teams played further Swiss matches. England finished in equal ninth place out of 20 teams overall.

**Appendix 2 – Action Points**

<b><i>Item</i></b>	<b><i>Action</i></b>	<b><i>Responsible</i></b>
2.2.3	Documents for Home Internationals	Nick Doe
3.5	Junior Trials – consultation with players	Paul Bowyer
4.1	Clarification of comment in Board minutes	Nick Doe
9.1	Reference to Tournament Committee	Nick Doe
9.2	Conditions of Contest – legal advice	Nick Doe
9.4	Venues – correspondence and consultation with players	Nick Doe