



**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE EBU SELECTION COMMITTEE  
HELD AT 40 BERNARD STREET, LONDON WC1  
ON WEDNESDAY 20<sup>TH</sup> APRIL 2005**

<b>Present:</b>	Chris Dixon	Chairman
	Richard Fleet	Vice-Chairman
	Roger Amey	
	Raymond Brock	
	Pat Davies	
	Gerard Faulkner	
	Mel Starkings	Appointed member (for items 1-5)
	Nick Doe	Secretary

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

**2. Minutes of the previous meeting (16<sup>th</sup> November 2004)**

**2.1 Accuracy**

Mr Fleet raised a number of matters. It was agreed to substitute the words “a regular invitation” for “an invitation” in the first sentence of item 4.4.2, and to correct three minor typographical errors.

Mr Fleet believed that the Committee had specified that pairs must play in most if not all sessions of the trials sessions to be incorporated into junior training weekends (item 8.4, last sentence), rather than merely noting a suggestion to that effect. The Committee was content to leave the minute unchanged but to revisit the subject at the appropriate time.

Mr Fleet did not believe that the Committee had agreed that it should have maximum discretion in the context of Conditions of Contest for Trials, but the general view was that the minute was accurate.

The Committee considered correspondence from Mr Kambites suggesting that what had been reported to the Committee as the result of a discussion at a meeting of the Youth Squad Development Team (item 8.6, penultimate sentence) was inaccurate. After some discussion, the Committee was satisfied that the minute of what had been reported to the Committee was indeed accurate. It noted that the matter had been raised at the January Council meeting, and that Council had noted the following statement of the position:-

With regard to disciplinary matters it was confirmed that three levels of responsibility exist, as follows:

1. Squad Activities – it is the responsibility of the Squad Managers to maintain discipline and they have the authority to exclude players, if need be, from Squad activities.

2. Selected Teams – the Selection Committee has the authority to remove a player from a Team and will exercise this power in consultation with our legal adviser, Squad Managers' and the Board, as appropriate.
3. Competing Teams – should action be required when a team is at a competition the NPC has the authority to remove players from the team.

The Committee wished to place on record that it was conscious of the EBU's responsibility towards juniors, particularly those under the age of 18, but it was perfectly happy with that statement of the position. It noted that decisions could be made at short notice if necessary. The Chairman offered to write to Mr Kambites, and it was agreed that he should do so.

Subject to the amendments referred to in the first paragraph above, the minutes were agreed to be a true record and signed by the Chairman.

On a point of order raised by Mr Faulkner it was agreed that all mobile phones should be switched off during Committee meetings, although it was felt sensible to exempt the Secretary from this in case Aylesbury office needed to contact him during the meeting in connection with Committee business.

## **2.2 Matters arising**

### **2.2.1 Committee procedures and documents – documents for Home Internationals (item 4.3.1)**

The Chairman reported that he had asked Mr Doe to put this on hold in view of the possibility of further changes to the format of the events.

### **2.2.2 Team preparation – possible invitation for juniors to the Lederer Memorial Trophy (item 4.4.2)**

Mr Doe reported that he had raised the possibility with the organisers, although so far without response. It was agreed that a low-key reminder was in order.

### **2.2.3 European Championships 2004 – Women's Series (item 4.4.4)**

The Committee noted that there had been no response to the letter which had been sent, although it had been framed in terms which had not really called for any response.

### **2.2.4 EBL Seminars – Seniors (item 4.4.6)**

The Committee noted that its previous understanding that there was to be a seminar dedicated to Seniors events appeared to have been incorrect. A number of Seminars had taken place at which the EBU had been represented, but the content relating to Seniors had been minimal and so the question of a specific Seniors representative had not arisen.

### **2.2.5 Proposed EBL Knock-out event for Junior teams (item 5.5)**

The Committee noted that nothing further had been heard of this proposal.

### **2.2.6 European Champions Cup (item 9.2)**

The Committee noted that the Tournament Committee had not been inclined to create a suitable qualifying event. The matter would have to be considered again on an ad hoc basis should an invitation be received.

### **2.2.7 Open trials 2004**

The Committee noted that Mr Bavin was aware of the request not to appoint the Tournament Director concerned to trials, and the request to review his status would be considered when the Appointments Committee met, which it had not yet done.

### **2.2.8 Any other matters (including Action points) not featuring elsewhere on the agenda**

Mr Faulkner asked what steps had been taken to appoint a National Youth Officer. It was agreed that whether to appoint such an official or merely to designate persons to attend NYO meetings at Junior Championships on a more ad hoc basis was a matter for the Board, and that the matter should be flagged up for consideration.

There were no outstanding Action Points not featuring elsewhere on the agenda.

### **3. Junior Events – Review of past events**

#### **3.1 Junior Channel Trophy – under-25 event**

The results were noted, as shown in Appendix 1 (A). Mr Bowyer was thanked for his report.

#### **3.2 Junior Channel Trophy – under-20 event**

The results were noted, as shown in Appendix 1 (B). The Committee congratulated the team on its victory and thanked Mr Starkings for his report.

#### **3.3 Junior Camrose Trophy**

The results were noted, as shown in Appendix 1 (C). The Committee congratulated the team on its victory and thanked Mr Bowyer for his report.

#### **3.4 Peggy Bayer Trophy**

The results were noted, as shown in Appendix 1 (D). The Committee congratulated the team on its victory and thanked Mr Starkings for his report.

### **4. Junior events – selection for forthcoming events – European Youth Championships 2005**

#### **4.1 Junior (under-25) series**

The following were selected to represent England:-

Ollie Burgess and Andrew Woodcock  
Michael Byrne and Alex Morris  
Ben Green and Duncan Happer  
NPC – Chris Dixon  
Coach – Paul Bowyer  
Team supporter – Megan Starkings  
Reserve pair – Andrew Bamford and Mark Goddard

#### **4.2 Schools (under-20) series**

The following were selected to represent England:-

John Atthey and Chris G Owen  
Ed Jones and Dave Rogers  
Joe Mela and Shivam Shah  
NPC – Mel Starkings  
Coach – Paul Bowyer  
Team supporter – Megan Starkings  
Reserve pair – Anthony Cowan and Jon Matthews

#### **4.3 Girls series**

The following were selected to represent England:-

Laura Macdougall and Sarah Whitehead  
Suzanna Morton and Elizabeth Roberts  
Susan Stockdale and Bryony Youngs  
NPC – Mel Starkings (if the Girls and the Schools events are played consecutively or involve no more than a minimal overlap; otherwise John Williams)  
Coach – Paul Bowyer

Team supporter – Megan Starkings

Reserve pair – none

#### **4.4 Arrangements for the Championships and any other issues**

The Committee was rather concerned to note that the arrangements for the Championships were still not apparently finalised, although “tentative” dates and a venue (Riccione, near Rimini, Italy) were known.

The Committee discussed whether it was sufficient to send four officials in total to cover the three events, and concluded that it was, although some flexibility in roles might be needed, especially if there was an overlap between the Girls and the Schools events.

*[Secretary’s note – since the meeting the tentative dates and venue have been confirmed. The schedule does not include any significant overlap between the Girls and the Schools event, although it is uncertain what is proposed should the number of entries exceed expectations].*

### **5. Junior events – other matters**

#### **5.1 World Junior Championships 2005**

The Committee noted that England are first reserves for the World Championships, to be played in Sydney in August. Because of the circumstances in which the reserves from Europe may be called in, unofficial advice is that it is very likely that an invitation will be forthcoming. As the Board has allocated funding for a team should an invitation be forthcoming, the Committee preferred to select a team on a provisional basis, subject to receipt of an invitation.

The following were selected to represent England:-

Ollie Burgess and Andrew Woodcock

Michael Byrne and Alex Morris

Ben Green and Duncan Happer

NPC – Alan Mould

Coach – to be confirmed

Reserve pair – none

#### **5.2 Trials and squad activities – future arrangements**

Mr Starkings reported that the open arrangements for squad composition were working well. He was currently structuring training weekends with a competitive event on the Saturday, whose scores would be published, and coaching on the Sunday. He had announced that the competitive event within the May training weekend would form part of the trials, and the winners would be selected for something (there was flexibility to do this without giving formal selection guarantees for events for which the Committee would make the selections, because there were friendly events planned against Scotland and Ireland). He planned to designate weekends in September and October as including further trials.

The need for more formalised arrangements for a Girls Squad for the 2005-7 cycle was noted. The Committee felt that the administrative arrangements could usefully be combined in some way with those for the existing squads, and there was some scope for some merged training, although some separate training would undoubtedly also be necessary in the light of the wide ability range.

It was agreed that the possibility of further publicity in *English Bridge* for squad activities would be explored.

### **6. Budget**

The Committee noted the budgets for 2005/06 which had been approved by the Board, and understood that there was still some flexibility to seek approval for expenditure on training for specific events, which was likely to receive sympathetic consideration.

Mr Fleet considered it unhelpful for the budget to be presented with the inclusion of what he considered to be an arbitrary and inaccurate “management charge”. This view attracted general support.

The Committee considered its policy on provision of uniforms. In the context of a long championship it was clearly necessary to provide a number of changes of playing uniform and to make provision for laundry. The Committee believed that the cost of laundry had never traditionally been covered by per diem allowances. It had no strong views as to whether per diems should be extended to cover laundry or whether expenditure incurred should be claimed for as a separate expense, but the question certainly needed to be addressed. It was important that players invited to represent England should receive detailed information about expectations concerning expenses that can be claimed back.

## **7. Committee Procedures**

### **7.1 Conflicts of interest – close relatives**

Mr Faulkner, who had asked for a discussion, said that the matter had been raised by Mr Rowlands when a member of the Committee. Although past problems with conflicts of interest concerning active international players who were members of the Committee appeared to have been successfully addressed, Mr Rowlands had proposed that anyone with a close relative proposing to enter a trial or in line for selection should be excluded from the Committee. Mr Faulkner did not consider that it was necessary to go so far, but there was a case for Committee members so affected to absent themselves from the whole of a meeting at which matters affected by the conflict were to be discussed.

There was general agreement that it was not really satisfactory for Committee members to attend a meeting but to have to leave the room when matters affected by a conflict of interest were discussed. It was acknowledged that it was not always easy to draw the line and to define circumstances in which a Committee member should or should not be present. It was agreed that the best way to address the matter would be to set the order of business in such a way as to deal with matters affected by any conflicts at the start of the meeting, and to arrange for the Committee member affected to arrive at a specified later time.

Two other possible difficulties were raised. The first was that problems were not necessarily confined to Committee members with close personal relationships, but might extend to those with professional or business relationships. The second was that players with close relationships with Committee members have effective access to information not available to other players (NPC reports being perhaps the best example). It was noted that this could be addressed by making NPC reports available as a matter of course to all the members of the team, but no decision to this effect was made.

It was agreed to try the idea of dealing with matters affected by possible conflicts as the first item of business. The effectiveness of this, and the possible incidence of other problems, would be monitored, and the subject revisited if necessary. The general belief was that current members of the Committee were sensitive to the question of conflicts of interest and how they were perceived.

## **8. Bermuda Bowl and Venice Cup 2005**

### **8.1 Possible qualification for the Venice Cup – Selection arrangements**

*[Mr Brock withdrew for this item]*

The Committee noted that the number of qualifiers for the Venice Cup had been increased from five to six, which meant that England were now first reserves rather than second. Although there was still some doubt as to the precise circumstances in which the reserves would be called upon to participate in the Championship, it was known that there was some doubt as to the participation of one of the NBOs whose Women’s team had finished above England at the European Championships in Malmö. It was therefore prudent to assume that there was a significant

possibility that England would be invited to participate. The Committee agreed to select a team on a provisional basis, subject to receipt of an invitation.

The following were selected to represent England:-

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

NPC – Alan Mould

Coach – Chris Duckworth

Reserve pair – Catherine Jagger and Sarah Teshome

## **8.2 Bermuda Bowl preparation**

The Committee noted that it was proposed to stage a midweek match against strong international opposition at the Brighton Summer Congress, and two pairs from the team selected for the Bermuda Bowl were committed to play. It was agreed that the failure of the other pair to respond was regrettable, and Mr Brock was asked to press for a response. It was possible that sponsorship might be available which would lead to the expansion of the event from two teams to four and/or to the event becoming an annual one.

Mr Brock reported that apart from playing in events no preparation was planned, as it was very difficult to get the team together. The Committee had reservations about the value in terms of preparation of doing nothing except playing in events, and considered that other preparation might prove useful. It thought it appropriate to try to make some arrangements, and to record any difficulties which might arise with the availability of the players.

## **9. Seniors events – review of future strategy**

The Committee noted that the number of boards played in international Seniors events tended to be smaller than the number played in Open and Women's events, as a result of a WBF policy to restrict play in Seniors events to a maximum of 48 boards a day – a policy which the Committee considered unnecessary, but understood was very unlikely to be reconsidered. In the circumstances the Committee (aware of the financial pressures) was not minded to press for additional funding for international Seniors events.

In the circumstances the Committee did not think that the expense of holding dedicated trials could be warranted. The Committee decided to cancel the trials planned for the Seniors event at the 2006 European Championships. Instead it would plan to use the existing EBU Knock-out event for Seniors (the Gerard Faulkner Salver) as the selection process. The winners of the event would be invited to represent England, or failing them, in succession, the losing finalists or semi-finalists. Arrangements would be put in place for the selection of a third pair and for selection in the event that two teams of equal status (i.e. losing semi-finalists) were eligible and available, or if it was not possible for the final to be played before the deadline for selection.

The Committee was happy for the details to be finalised by the Chairman and Secretary in consultation. It would be appropriate to check that the Tournament Committee had no objection to the competition being used in this way.

Mr Faulkner declared an interest and drew the Committee's attention to the fact that he and Mr Amey play in the same team in the competition. It would be necessary to address the question of eligibility in the light of the Committee's terms of reference. The Committee considered that playing in an open event which was not primarily a trial, which happened to be used as a selection tool for a largely unfunded international event, was a very different thing from entering a dedicated trial. The Committee considered that members of the Committee who were otherwise eligible should not be precluded from earning selection as of right, but they should not be eligible to be selected otherwise. A recommendation would be made to the Board to amend the Committee's terms of reference to ensure that playing in the event did not compromise their membership of the Committee.

## **10. Future Trials**

### **10.1 Review of restrictions on entering more than one series**

The Committee revised its policy concerning players seeking selection in both Open and Seniors categories in the light of the decisions already made about selection for Seniors events. In the foreseeable future it was likely that the Open trials would be completed some time in advance of the completion of the Gerard Faulkner Salver for the year. The winners of the Open trials would be invited to represent England in the Open team, and would have the option of accepting, and thereby losing eligibility for the Seniors, or declining if they wished to maintain eligibility for the Seniors.

At present there are no knock-out stages for Women's trials, so the existing policy preventing players from playing in the knock-out stages of more than one series of trials is not of any practical effect. The Committee confirmed that it has no wish to prevent female players seeking to represent England in both the Camrose and Lady Milne Trophies, and the trials for these events do not clash. A year ago the Committee had decided to schedule the Women's European Championship trial on the same dates as Stage III of the Open trials. For obvious reasons this forced female players to make a choice between the Open and the Women's series in seeking selection for the European Championships. The Committee acknowledged that it also had the effect of preventing players who sought selection for the Women's series of the European Championships from also seeking selection from the Camrose Trophy. The Committee was not inclined to change its previous decision in this respect.

*[Secretary's note – as the precise position with regard to its earlier decision was not made clear at the meeting, Committee members were consulted after the meeting by email and telephone, and the above minute reflects the result of that consultation. All Committee members eligible to vote were consulted, and there were no dissenters.]*

### **10.2 Conditions of contest**

Mr Doe apologised that he had only been able to table (rather than circulate in advance) the revised draft Conditions of Contest for the Open trials which had been produced following discussions with Mr Faulkner. Mr Faulkner wished it recorded that he considered that there had been a serious breakdown in proper management at Aylesbury in failing to address what appeared to be chronic problems with the Secretary's workload.

Two matters were highlighted for decision by the Committee. The first was an overriding discretion for the Committee to decline a player admission to trials, to decline to select a player to represent England, or to deselect a player once selected, if in its opinion there has been any behaviour which renders the player concerned unfit to represent England. The Committee agreed with the principle of such a provision, subject to suitable wording being devised. The second was a provision that players are selected on condition that they demonstrate a satisfactory degree of commitment to whatever programme of training and preparation the Committee puts in place. It was agreed to include such a provision.

It was agreed that the final details would be settled between the Chairman and Mr Faulkner. Other Committee members with comments which they wished taken into account were asked to send the to Mr Doe as soon as possible.

It was agreed that the entry fees should be settled by Mr Bavin.

### **10.3 Venues**

The Committee noted the current status of the National Bridge Centre project. In view of uncertainties as to cost and the availability of suitable hotel accommodation, it did not wish to move the venues of any of the 2005/06 trials to Kettering. The venues for the 2006/07 trials would be considered at a later date, when no doubt the position with regard to the Kettering venue would be clearer.

## **11. Open events – review of past events – Camrose Trophy 2005**

### **11.1 Results**

The results were noted, as shown in Appendix 1 (E). Messrs Williams and Brock were thanked for their reports.

### **11.2 New format**

The Committee noted the comments made by the NPCs in their reports and considered feedback from a number of other interested parties. It believed that the new format was no longer a serious test of bridge, and did not think that the money committed to England representation in the Camrose was sensibly spent.

The Committee agreed that it was better for comments on behalf of the EBU to be submitted via the EBU's delegate to BGB (John Neville). Of the suggestions made to avoid the long sit-outs necessitated by the 5-team format, the Committee preferred the idea of inviting the holders to field a second team. Whether or not this was done, the Committee was convinced that the disjointed nature of the current format should be addressed by ensuring that matches between any two teams were played in consecutive stanzas. It also noted that a gap of 15 minutes between stanzas had proved inadequate, and whilst this was partly because of the layout of the venue concerned, an increased gap should be considered.

### **11.3 Future selection strategy**

The Committee considered that the relatively short trials had not resulted in the teams perceived to be the strongest finishing at the top. This had been borne out by the disappointing performance of the teams selected to represent England. Given that the new format meant that the Camrose was, in the Committee's view, much reduced in status in comparison with major international events, there seemed to be a case for holding trials only biennially, namely for years in which there was a European Championship. This would enable those trials to be held earlier and allow a longer build-up to the Europeans, and perhaps the reintroduction of some form of squad system.

It was agreed to include the format of future trials as a major agenda item at the next meeting.

## **12. Women's events – review of past events – Lady Milne Trophy 2005**

### **12.1 Results**

The results were noted, as shown in Appendix 1 (F). The England team was congratulated on its convincing victory.

The Committee noted comments from one of the senior players which advocated building on the success of the younger players and nurturing talent for the future by introducing some form of continuity for successful teams, e.g. an exemption to a play-off for future selection.

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

### **13.1 Bonn Nations Cup 2005**

The Committee noted that an invitation for "the England National team" had been received. Due to an unfortunate quirk of the calendar (the date of the event is linked to that of Easter, which was very early this year), the event starts on the day after the final of the Schapiro Spring Foursomes. The four pairs comprising the Bermuda Bowl team and reserves had been invited to give availabilities, but only one of the pairs had been available. The invitation had therefore been declined with regret and a full explanation of the reasons.

It now appeared from an unofficial approach from the organisers that they were prepared to accept a team of lesser standing. In view of the fact that time was very short, and any players likely to feature in the Committee's thoughts would undoubtedly be affected by the clash with the Spring Foursomes, the Committee did not think that it could respond positively.

### **13.2 Commonwealth Bridge Championship 2006**

The Committee noted that the Board had allocated funding of £5,000 to sending a team to this event, to be held in Melbourne in March. Whilst accepting that it was the prerogative of the Board to decide to send a team, and the function of the Committee to select one, the Committee wished to place on record that it considered the event to be a meaningless one, and the proposed funding a complete waste of money, which it would much have preferred to be allocated to funding of participation in Seniors events at major Championships.

If the Board did not wish to reconsider the funding, the Committee was minded to invite applications and select a team from those who applied.

### **13.3 Amsterdam International Tournament**

The Committee was pleased to note the receipt of an invitation to what had previously been known as the Schiphol tournament, after a gap of two years or so. As on previous occasions there was a partially funded invitation for “one of your strong teams” and a further invitation, unfunded except for free entry and some meals, for a second team. There was money in the budget to upgrade the first invitation to full funding, but not for the second team. The Committee selected the following to represent England as the first team:-

David Gold and Tom Townsend  
David Price and Colin Simpson

The Committee very much wished to be able to accept the second invitation, and send the team which had been selected to represent England in the Junior series of the European Youth Championships. The Chairman undertook to speak to the Treasurer to ascertain whether funding might be available for this purpose.

## **14. Date of next meeting**

Wednesday 6<sup>th</sup> July at 1pm at Aylesbury offices.

*[Secretary's Note – the venue was not specifically discussed, but the decision of the previous meeting was to hold the Committee's Summer meeting at Aylesbury.]*

## **15. Any other business**

### **15.1 Possible Challenge Match against Scotland**

Mr Fleet suggested that, in the light of the devalued status of the Camrose Trophy, a challenge to Scotland for a match between the England and Scotland teams for the 2006 European Championships was an idea worth pursuing.

## Appendix 1 – Results

### A. Junior Channel Trophy – under-25 event

	B	N	E	F	RR1	RR2	TOT
BELGIUM		9 + 25	10 + 19	25 + 14	44	58	<b>102</b>
NETHERLANDS	21 + 5		17 + 13	16 + 19	54	37	<b>91</b>
ENGLAND	20 + 11	13 + 17		12 + 13	45	41	<b>86</b>
FRANCE	4 + 16	14 + 11	18 + 17		36	44	<b>80</b>

England team

Andrew Bamford and Mark Goddard  
 Michael Byrne and Alex Morris  
 Ben Green and Duncan Happer  
 NPC – Paul Bowyer

### B. Junior Channel Trophy – under-20 event

	E	F	B	N	RR1	RR2	TOT
ENGLAND		20 + 25	18 + 15	22 + 17	60	57	<b>117</b>
FRANCE	10 + 5		22 + 11	20 + 19	52	35	<b>87</b>
BELGIUM	12 + 15	8 + 19		16 + 17	36	51	<b>87</b>
NETHERLANDS	8 + 13	10 + 11	14 + 13		32	37	<b>69</b>

England team

John Atthey and Chris G Owen  
 Michael Graham and Shivam Shah  
 Ed Jones and Dave Rogers  
 NPC – Mel Starkings

### C. Junior Camrose Trophy

	E	S	RI	W	NI	RR1	RR2	TOT
ENGLAND		15 + 25	10 + 12	15 + 25	25 + 25	65	87	<b>152</b>
SCOTLAND	15 + 4		17 + 25	18 + 20	23 + 21	73	70	<b>143</b>
R. OF IRELAND	20 + 18	13 + 5		18 + 19	24 + 15	75	57	<b>132</b>
WALES	15 + 3	12 + 10	12 + 11		13 + 15	52	39	<b>91</b>
N. IRELAND	1 + 3	7 + 9	6 + 15	17 + 15		31	42	<b>73</b>

England team

Andrew Bamford and Mark Goddard  
Ben Green and Duncan Happer  
Andrew Murphy and Tom Slater  
NPC – Paul Bowyer

**D. Peggy Bayer Trophy**

	E	NI	RI	W	RR1	RR2	RR3	TOT
ENGLAND		17 + 15 + 16	25 + 22 + 21	23 + 25 + 25	65	62	62	<b>189</b>
N. IRELAND	13 + 15 + 14		6 + 18 + 12	16 + 22 + 22	35	55	48	<b>138</b>
R. OF IRELAND	3 + 8 + 9	24 + 12 + 18		15 + 18 + 25	42	38	52	<b>132</b>
WALES	7 + 1 + 3	14 + 8 + 8	15 + 12 + 0		36	21	11	<b>68</b>

Scotland were not represented.

England team

John Atthey and Chris G Owen  
Michael Graham and Shivam Shah  
Bingyuan Yang and Songtao Ye  
NPC – Mel Starkings

**E. Camrose Trophy 2005**

	RI	S	NI	E	W	Final table			
						W	D	L	VPs
R. of IRELAND		30	32	38	42	4	0	0	<b>142</b>
SCOTLAND	28		45	35	32	3	0	1	<b>140</b>
N. IRELAND	28	15		31	42	2	0	2	<b>116</b>
ENGLAND	22	25	29		30	0	1	3	<b>106</b>
WALES	18	28	18	30		0	1	3	<b>94</b>

England teams

v Scotland and Northern Ireland

Peter Crouch and Neil Rosen  
Gary Hyett and Alan Mould  
Brian Senior and Geoffrey Wolfarth  
NPC – John Williams

v Republic of Ireland and Wales

Catherine Draper and Jeremy Willans

David Gold and Tom Townsend

David Price and Colin Simpson

NPC – Raymond Brock

**F. Lady Milne Trophy 2005**

	E	RI	W	S	NI	RR1	RR2	TOT
ENGLAND		11 + 16	13 + 25	25 + 25	23 + 23	72	89	161
R. OF IRELAND	19 + 14		12 + 10	16 + 14	15 + 22	62	60	122
WALES	17 + 5	16 + 20		18 + 16	14 + 21	65	56	121
SCOTLAND	4 + 3	14 + 16	12 + 20		14 + 25	44	64	108
N. IRELAND	7 + 7	15 + 8	16 + 9	16 + 5		54	29	83

England team

Heather Dhondy and Nicola Smith

Catherine Jagger and Sarah Teshome

Susan Stockdale and Bryony Youngs

NPC – John Williams

## **Appendix 2 – Action Points**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Responsible</b>
<b>2.1</b>	Letter to Mr Kambites	Chris Dixon
<b>2.2.2</b>	Lederer Memorial Trophy – reminder	Nick Doe
<b>5.2</b>	Future arrangements for Girls squad	Aylesbury management
<b>5.2</b>	Publicity in <i>English Bridge</i>	Squad managers / Nick Doe
<b>6</b>	Laundry allowances	Max Bavin
<b>8.2</b>	International match at Brighton (arrangements / invitations)	Aylesbury management
<b>8.2</b>	International match at Brighton (England team responses); other preparation	Raymond Brock
<b>9</b>	Use of Gerard Faulkner Salver for Seniors selection – details	Chris Dixon / Nick Doe
<b>10.2</b>	Conditions of Contest	Chris Dixon / Gerard Faulkner / Nick Doe
<b>11.2</b>	Feedback on new Camrose format	Nick Doe / John Neville
<b>13.2</b>	Commonwealth Bridge Championship	Board
<b>13.3</b>	Amsterdam International Tournament	Chris Dixon