



**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE EBU SELECTION COMMITTEE
HELD AT 40 BERNARD STREET, LONDON WC1
ON WEDNESDAY 22ND FEBRUARY 2006**

Present:	Gerard Faulkner	Chairman
	Richard Fleet	Vice-Chairman
	Pat Davies	
	Steve Eginton	
	Sandra Landy	
	Clive Owen	
	Denis Robson	EBU Chairman
	Bob Rowlands	
	Mel Starkings	Appointed member (for items 1-5)
	Nick Doe	Secretary

- 1. Apologies for Absence** Paul Bowyer Appointed member
Philip Mason EBU Vice-Chairman

2. Minutes of Previous Meeting (15th November 2005)

2.1 Accuracy

It was agreed that the statement in the last sentence of item 4.2.2 had been made by Mr Eginton rather than Mr Rowlands, but that Mr Rowlands had added that the Committee should stick to decisions once they had been approved by the Board and noted by shareholders. It was also agreed that the statement by Mr Mason in the last paragraph of item 4A had been supported by Mr Rowlands. With these amendments the minutes were agreed to be a true record and signed by the Chairman.

The Chairman informed the Committee that the minute at the end of item 4A, which suggested that shareholders had voted at the elections on the basis of inadequate information, had been criticised by more than one shareholder at the shareholders' meeting.

2.2 Matters arising

2.2.1 Seniors events (item 4.2.3)

Mr Doe informed the Committee that the Tournament Committee had agreed to seed four teams in the 2006/07 Gerard Faulkner Salver, and had been happy that the seeding be undertaken by any method the Selection Committee considered appropriate. The Committee considered that the seeding should be undertaken by whatever method was normal for knock-out events, which Mr Doe confirmed was Gold Points.

2.2.2 *Future Trials - venues (item 4.2.4)*

The Committee noted correspondence critical of the fact that it appeared that the Committee's policy with regard to venues did not appear to have been adhered to, with the result that more trials had taken place in London than the Committee had intended. The suggestion had been made that a suitable alternative to holding trials in the Midlands would be to hold one weekend of a two-weekend trial in London, and the other in the North of England.

The Committee agreed that alternative venues in both the Midlands and the North should be investigated. It did not wish to schedule trials at Kettering. It considered that, despite criticisms in the past, the Young Chelsea Bridge Club was a satisfactory venue for such trials as were to be held in London, although it clearly could not accommodate the larger trials with screens.

2.2.3 *Data Protection and access to contact details (item 19.1)*

Mr Doe agreed to issue a reminder to those Committee members who had not responded.

3. *Terms of Reference, Committee procedures and conflicts of interest*

The Committee considered draft revised terms of reference, and agreed that the Channel Trophy should be included as an addition to the list of named events for which it was expected to select teams.

The Chairman reminded the Committee of the history of the provisions with regard to conflicts of interest, and in particular the distinction between material or financial conflicts of interest, where Committee members were excluded from discussions, and conflicts of interest relating to family members, where they were merely excluded from voting.

He reported that he had had some discussions with Mr Owen since the last meeting, and had concluded that it was appropriate for Mr Owen (whose son is a member of the under-25 squad) to be present for all discussions relating to under-20 matters, and also to be present for discussions on under-25 matters unless the Chairman ruled otherwise on any particular occasion. The Committee was strongly in favour of an accommodation of this nature, but preferred for the Chairman's discretion to be to include rather than to exclude. A proposal from Mr Fleet, seconded by Mr Rowlands, that the relevant provision in the draft be amended to read:-

No elected member may participate in the voting on any item in respect of which any close relation (child, spouse, sibling, parent) is involved, nor in the discussion on any such matter unless the Chairman so rules.

was approved nem con.

Subject to two further amendments of a minor nature, the Committee was happy to commend the draft terms of reference to the Board for adoption.

The Committee considered a suggestion from Mr Rowlands that it was inappropriate for members of other EBU Committees to criticise Committee decisions in public, but was content not to pursue the matter.

The Committee recommended to the Board that it positively require candidates for election to Standing Committees to disclose any possible conflict of interest, via the pen portraits which candidates are invited to prepare for the benefit of shareholders.

4. *Player contracts / Codes of Conduct*

The Committee considered the Notes for Guidance, which had been revised in accordance with the procedure agreed at the previous meeting. It felt that a good job had been done. One amendment of a minor nature was agreed. The Chairman reported that progress had been reported to shareholders at the recent meeting, and that a slightly amended version of the original Gloucestershire resolution had been carried.

A proposal from the chair that the Notes for Guidance for players, NPCs and coaches should be formally adopted in their revised form, and that the contract for junior squad members should be brought into use, was carried unanimously.

5. Junior events

5.1 Junior Channel Trophy – under-25 event

The results were noted, as shown in Appendix A item 1. Mr Eginton was thanked for his report.

5.2 Junior Camrose Trophy

The results were noted, as shown in Appendix A item 2, and the team was congratulated on its success. The Committee was pleased to note that the organisers had sent an email complimenting the England team on their behaviour at the event.

The Committee noted that a member of the under-25 squad who had not been selected for the event had acted as one of the commentators for the internet broadcast. It appeared that some of his comments had given offence, not just to fellow-members of the squad who had been selected for the event, but to members of other Unions as well. Mr Eginton agreed to speak to Mr Bowyer on his return to the country so that any action considered appropriate could be taken in the context of the squad. Mr Eginton confirmed that the player concerned was already aware that his actions had done himself no favours.

The Committee noted that the internet commentary had been on display to the Vugraph audience on site. It was agreed to draw to BGB's attention the fact that the BBO software gives the facility to switch off the commentary, with the recommendation that organisers be encouraged to do this where appropriate.

5.3 Junior Channel Trophy – under-20 event

The results were noted, as shown in Appendix A item 3. Mr Starkings was thanked for his report.

5.4 Peggy Bayer Trophy

The results were noted, as shown in Appendix A item 4, and the team was congratulated on its success. Mr Starkings was thanked for his report.

The Committee noted Mr Starkings' comment that the closing banquet was an anachronism which appeared to encourage some players to over-indulge in alcohol. The Committee thought that there was scope for revising the schedule to allow for an earlier finish, with a lower-key closing buffet and Sunday evening departure. It was agreed to commend this suggestion to BGB.

5.5 Any other issues

The Chairman reported that no objections had been raised at the shareholders' meeting to Mr Bowyer's proposal to use the Junior Camrose to give international experience to players who were considered good future prospects. The Committee agreed with Mr Fleet that whilst this might mean that the best available team was not always selected, the aim should still be to select a team capable of winning the event.

The Committee noted that under-25 trials dates were to be finalised once the position with regard to possible Open trials had been determined.

The Committee also noted a comment from Mr Bowyer that the number of female participants in squad activities was very low, and none of the female players were currently playing in all-female partnerships. The view expressed by Mrs Landy, that the institution of the Girls event at the European Youth Championships was likely to be positively damaging to the progress of young female players, and thus to the future of the women's game, was noted with some sympathy, and Mr Robson agreed to draw it to Mr Harris's attention.

The Committee noted that a World Junior Pairs and Camp are to be held in Slovakia in July. Whilst those events are not directly a matter for the Committee, it was pleased that the players

were aware of the events, and that the Educational Trust would be likely to provide some funding. It noted that Mr Morris has asked the Board to consider EBU funding limited to the entry fees.

The Committee noted Mr Starkings' report on the progress of mini-trials for under-20s, and in particular that the event in August might be broadened by the inclusion of players from other Home Unions. It understood that the funding situation for participation of the other Home Unions in European Youth Championships was giving cause for concern.

6. Open events – review of past events

6.1 European Champions Cup, Brussels 2005

The results were noted, as shown in Appendix A item 5, and comments from two of the players were also noted.

6.2 Bermuda Bowl, Estoril 2005

The results were noted, as shown in Appendix A item 6, and Mr Brock was thanked for his report.

The Committee noted that the players had encountered some difficulties in changing air tickets, and considered that it should be possible in future to provide better advance information about the requirements for this.

The Committee noted that it appears, from the report of an appeal involving England, that international appeals committees have a tendency to treat players before them with an unwarranted lack of consideration and courtesy. It agreed to mention the matter to Mr Bavin in his capacity as Chief TD of the WBF.

The Committee considered that it was unfortunate that the play-off for third place is such a short match. It thought that it would be much better to award two bronze medals, or failing that to have a play-off of a meaningful length.

Mr Fleet highlighted the apparent lack of pre-event preparation. It was agreed that the new contracts should assist in achieving commitment to advance preparation.

6.3 Camrose Trophy 2006

The Committee noted the results of the first weekend, as shown in Appendix A item 7. Mr Brock was thanked for his report.

The Chairman took the opportunity to remind Committee members of the importance of the confidentiality of the Committee's proceedings, notably – but not exclusively – in relation to NPC reports and selection deliberations. On the other hand it was not objectionable for an NPC to discuss with a playing member of a team comments concerning that player which he proposed to include in his report to the Committee.

6.4 Camrose Trophy format

The Committee noted comments in the NPC report and from one of the players, and continued to be extremely unhappy about the devaluation of the event in bridge terms. It was disappointing that the amount of money saved seemed small in comparison to the damage caused to the event. It noted that a number of suggestions had been made for a possible sixth team, but there were two possible objections to this. First, it did not address what appeared to be the principal problem with the new format, namely the abandonment of head-on matches. Second, a six-team format would not allow each team to play half its opponents on one weekend and half on the other – converting the event to a round robin on each of two weekends would do further damage and might be the precursor to a reduction to just one weekend.

The Committee decided that it should continue to make its views felt, even if there might be little prospect of a return to the previous format. It was not inclined to recommend a withdrawal from the event, although the possibility of using it as a proving-ground for developing players might be considered.

The Committee noted a request from some of the players to press for the introduction of screens. It felt that such a change stood little chance of being adopted, largely because of the numbers of spectators who preferred to watch in the Open room, particularly at venues outside England.

7. Open events – selection for forthcoming events

7.1 Open trials 2005/06

The results of the knock-out stages were noted, as shown in Appendix A item 8. Mr Simpson's team was congratulated on its success.

7.2 European Teams Championship, Warsaw 2006 – selection of England team, reserves, NPCs and reserve NPCs

The following were selected to represent England:-

John Armstrong and John Holland
David Gold and Tom Townsend
David Price and Colin Simpson

Reserve pair – Jason Hackett and Justin Hackett

NPC – John Williams

Coach – David Burn

8. Women's events – review of past events

8.1 Venice Cup, Estoril 2005

The results were noted, as shown in Appendix A item 9, and Mr Mould was thanked for his report.

The Committee noted that once again an England team had performed satisfactorily in a Round Robin, but had fallen at the first knock-out hurdle.

9. Women's events – selection for forthcoming events

9.1 Trials

The results of the European Championship Trial were noted, as shown in Appendix A item 10.

9.2 European Teams Championship, Warsaw 2006 – selection of England team, reserves, NPCs and reserve NPCs

The following were selected to represent England:-

Michelle Brunner and Rhona Goldenfield
Heather Dhondy and Nicola Smith
Cath Jagger and Sarah Teshome

Reserve pair – Sally Brock and Margaret James

The Committee agreed to defer consideration of the appointment of officials until it had been able to consult with the selected team.

[Secretary's notes:-

(1) The reserve pair has declined the invitation.

(2) Following the consultations Alan Mould has been invited to captain the team, with Christine Duckworth as coach.]

10. Future trials

10.1 Open trials 2006/07

The Committee considered the representations which had been made, and decided to hold trials on the following basis:-

- ◆ Teams of four players only;
- ◆ A double round-robin over two weekends;
- ◆ A maximum of eight teams;
- ◆ Applications to be invited, to be accompanied by details of the bridge achievements within the last two years of the partnerships within the team ;
- ◆ The teams to be invited to play by the Committee;
- ◆ Of the four dates set aside, two would be chosen as soon as possible on the basis of the availability of venues.

[Secretary's note – the dates are now confirmed as 9th-10th September and 14th-15th October, both at the West Midlands Bridge Club, Solihull.]

The closing date would be 19th June, to allow for consideration of the entries at the next meeting.

The Committee agreed to give further consideration to the possibility of establishing a scheme of selection for future Camrose-only years based on achievements over a period.

10.2 Internet vugraph

The Committee noted that the knock-out stages of the Open trials had been broadcast on the internet, and considered that this was a positive development, and that future trials should be similarly broadcast where practicable.

It noted that there had been some difficulties over timings. This had arisen because the players had to be permitted the full time allowed, but understandably wished to play straight through if they played faster than the time allowed; conversely, the vugraph organisers wished to be able to stick to timetables published in advance. The Committee approved the following solution:-

- ◆ With regard to major meal breaks, the captains would be invited to agree whether or not these should be dispensed with. A decision would be made by no later than a week in advance of the trial, and would not thereafter be altered;
- ◆ For stanzas played in succession without a major meal break, an accelerated timetable would be published for the purposes of the internet broadcast. This would assume that the players would play faster than the time allowed. If the players took the full time allowed, the next stanza would start "late" in terms of the published internet timetable, which the vugraph organisers found much less of a problem than stanzas starting early.

10.3 Venues

There was nothing further to add to the discussion at item 2.2.2.

10.4 Miscellaneous issues

The Committee noted that in response to a request from a participating pair the Chairman had authorised the draw for the Women's European Championship trial to be done in advance. It was agreed that this should be the norm for all future trials.

The Committee noted that the regulations concerning seating rights for the semi-finals of the Open Trials had been criticised. Whilst the provisions were not perhaps ideal for matches played in six stanzas, they were deliberately modelled on those used by the WBF in the knock-out stages of the Bermuda Bowl (which included matches played in six stanzas), and the Committee did not wish to make any changes.

The Committee decided that for future double round robin teams trials, the provisions regarding seating rights would be replaced by the use of pre-drawn seating positions for the first round robin, with a compulsory change of opponents for the second.

The Committee noted that the lack of any regulations concerning seating rights for the Women's European Championship Trial had been criticised. Whilst it could understand that some players might prefer to sit, or not to sit, on the same side of the screen as a particular opponent, provisions for seating rights had never been considered necessary for a pairs trial, and the Committee did not think it necessary to introduce any. If difficulties arose, pairs would be instructed to submit blind line-ups to the TD.

11. Matters for general discussion

The Committee noted that it had not hitherto been presented with what it regarded as sufficient information with regard to the budget for the EBU's international activities, and it also felt that the figures could be presented in a more user-friendly form. It was interesting that not only had shareholders requested additional budget information, but that in soundings taken of the players on a number of subjects by Mr Eginton, considerable interest in the Committee's budget had been apparent. It was agreed to schedule a discussion of budgetary matters at the next meeting.

The Committee considered some points raised by Mr Rowlands on the subject of women players wishing to play in Open events. It considered that the best way forward was to take legal advice on the question of whether it was possible, should the Committee so wish, to hold simultaneous trials for simultaneous events, thus forcing women players to choose at an early stage whether to seek selection in the Open or the Women's category. The Committee could then discuss what it wanted to do, in the light of proper information as to the legal position.

The Committee discussed feedback from an informal survey of players conducted by Mr Eginton, together with a paper from Mr Eginton in which he made a number of suggestions aimed at improving the international competitiveness of England teams. The Chairman congratulated Mr Eginton on the initiative he had shown, and hoped that it would demonstrate to the players that the Committee was interested in what they had to say.

The Committee was receptive to the idea of pursuing a number of the proposals made by Mr Eginton, which included:-

- ◆ better use of available information to provide analysis of international performances;
- ◆ greater concentration on the preparation of England teams, including the use of available online facilities to minimise financial outlay.

Although a number of the proposals were attractive to the Committee, concern was expressed at the cost implications. It was unlikely to be possible to implement substantial parts of the proposals without considerable outlay, and the Committee doubted that the Board or shareholders would be likely to approve expenditure unless a substantial proportion could be covered by sponsorship. The Committee considered that the EBU did not generally have a good record when it came to attracting sponsorship, but it hoped that a suitable effort could be made to attract funding for the purposes of trying to improve international competitiveness, and requested that the Board's Sponsorship Committee should look at the proposals.

It was agreed that it was not realistic to discuss the proposals further without some work being undertaken to cost them. Mr Eginton agreed to initiate discussions with Messrs Bavin, Smith and Neville on the subject. The Committee's hope was that the likely costs could be identified reasonably quickly, so that the Committee could then go on to discuss what it was realistic to try to introduce into the selection and preparation process for the 2008 European Championships.

Correspondence from Mr Hasenson was noted, and Mr Robson volunteered to send a suitable response.

12. Date of next meeting

Tuesday 4th July at 12.30 pm, in London (the precise venue to be determined).

13. Panel of non-playing captains

The Committee reviewed the composition of the Panel, and agreed to the following changes:-

- ◆ Chris Dixon (formerly an ex officio member) to be added to the Panel;
- ◆ Raymond Brock (formerly an ex officio member) to be added to the Panel if willing;
- ◆ David Bakhshi, Andrew McIntosh and Colin Simpson to be invited to join the Panel;
- ◆ Tony Sowter to be removed from the Panel.

The Committee thought that it would be helpful to record the skills required of an NPC, namely:-

- ◆ good organisational skills;
- ◆ a reasonable knowledge of the game;
- ◆ the ability to gain the respect of the players;
- ◆ the ability to handle a team of six players who might be expected to have strong personalities; and
- ◆ a reasonable degree of availability (particularly for long championships and advance preparation for them).

14. Friendly internationals and invitations

14.1 Corn Cairdis

The results were noted, as shown in Appendix A item 11.

14.2 Invitation from the Netherlands

The Committee decided to invite the teams selected for the European Championships (including officials), and noted that most of those involved had already confirmed their availability.

14.3 Bonn Nations Cup

The following were selected to represent England:-

David Gold and Tom Townsend
David Price and Colin Simpson

The Committee was sympathetic to a request to consider alternative accommodation, but thought that an attempt to sort out the problem with the accommodation offered (short beds for tall players) should be made via the organisers first.

15. Any other business

None.

Appendix A – Results

1. Junior Channel Trophy – under-25 event (item 5.1)

	B	N	F	E	RR1	RR2	TOT
BELGIUM		25 + 9	21 + 12	16 + 19	62	40	102
NETHERLANDS	5 + 21		14 + 18	22 + 17	41	56	97
FRANCE	9 + 17	16 + 12		15 + 15	40	44	84
ENGLAND	14 + 11	8 + 13	15 + 15		37	39	76

England team

John Atthey and Chris Owen
 David Collier and Mark Reeve
 Ben Green and Duncan Happer
 NPC – Steve Eginton

2. Junior Camrose Trophy (item 5.2)

	E	S	RI	W	NI	RR1	RR2	TOT
ENGLAND		19 + 21	16 + 17	17 + 25	25 + 24	77	87	164
SCOTLAND	11 + 9		19 + 21	17 + 14	12 + 25	59	69	128
R. OF IRELAND	14 + 13	11 + 9		22 + 16	22 + 16	69	54	123
WALES	13 + 2	13 + 16	8 + 14		5 + 19	39	51	90
N. IRELAND	1 + 6	18 + 2	8 + 14	25 + 11		52	33	85

England team

John Atthey and Chris Owen
 Michael Byrne and Alex Morris
 Simon Cope and Stuart Haring
 NPC – Steve Eginton

3. Junior Channel Trophy – under-20 event (item 5.3)

	F	E	N	B	RR1	RR2	TOT
FRANCE		20 + 21	11 + 21	22 + 25	53	67	120
ENGLAND	10 + 9		17 + 19	17 + 23	44	52	96
NETHERLANDS	19 + 9	13 + 11		16 + 16	48	36	84
BELGIUM	8 + 5	13 + 7	14 + 14		35	26	61

England team

Ed Jones and Dave Rogers
 Ben Paske and Tom Paske
 Tom Rainforth and James Thrower
 NPC – Mel Starkings

4. Peggy Bayer Trophy (item 5.4)

	E	NI	RI	S	RR1	RR2	RR3	TOT
ENGLAND		8 + 25 + 23*	21 + 25 + 14	17 + 25 + 16	46	75	53	174
N. IRELAND	22 + 2 + 0		25 + 14 + 13	24 + 13 + 25	71	29	38	138
R. OF IRELAND	9 + 0 + 16	4 + 16 + 17		19 + 21 + 9	32	37	42	111
SCOTLAND	13 + 0 + 14	6 + 17 + 0	11 + 9 + 21		30	26	35	91

Wales were not represented.

England team

Ed Jones and Shivam Shah
 Nicola Macdougall and Alex Morton
 Bingyuan Yang and Songtao Ye
 NPC – Mel Starkings

5. European Champions Cup (item 6.1)

Round Robin (Group A)

1	<i>Parioli (Italy)</i>	VPs
		93
2	Schaltz (Denmark)	82
3	Chlodnia (Poland)	72
4	<i>Allfrey (England)</i>	70
5	Gromov (Russia)	68
6	Carcy (France)	57

5th-8th place play-off (semi-final)

Näsby (Sweden) 191 - 124 Allfrey (England)

England team

Alexander Allfrey and Andrew McIntosh
 David Bakhshi and Andrew Robson

6. Bermuda Bowl (item 6.2)

Round-Robin

1	Italy	368	VPs	(average = 315)
2	USA 2	348		(22 teams played)
3	USA 1	347		
4	Sweden	344		
5	India	344		
6	Argentina	339.5		
7	Egypt	339		
8	Brazil	334		
9	Japan	328		
10	Netherlands	323		
11	China	323		
12	South Africa	317		
17	England	305		

Quarter-finals

Italy beat India by 272 – 192.3 IMPs

USA 2 beat Argentina by 250 – 198 IMPs

USA 1 beat Brazil by 243 – 141 IMPs

Sweden beat Egypt by 268 – 157 IMPs

Semi-finals

Italy beat Sweden by 205 – 131 IMPs

USA 1 beat USA 2 by 211 – 172 IMPs

Final

Italy beat USA 1 by 268 – 250 IMPs

England team

David Gold and Tom Townsend
 Jason Hackett and Justin Hackett
 David Price and Colin Simpson

7. Camrose Trophy 2006 (first weekend) (item 6.3)

	RI	NI	W	E	S	Table after one weekend			
						W	D	L	VPs
R. of IRELAND			38	44		2	0	0	82
N. IRELAND				30	47	1	1	0	77
WALES	22				37	1	0	1	59
ENGLAND	16	30				0	1	1	46
SCOTLAND		11	23			0	0	2	34

England team

v Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland

John Armstrong and John Holland

David Gold and Tom Townsend

Paul Hackett and Tony Waterlow

NPC – Raymond Brock

8. Open Trials (item 7.1)

Semi-finals

HACKETT (John Armstrong and John Holland, Paul Hackett and Tony Waterlow) beat DE BOTTON (Jason Hackett and Justin Hackett, Artur Malinowski and Nick Sandqvist) by 229 – 141 IMPs.

SIMPSON (David Gold and Tom Townsend, David Price and Colin Simpson) beat WOLFARTH (Espen Erichsen and Brian Senior, Nevena Senior and Geoffrey Wolfarth) by 217 – 172 IMPs.

Final

SIMPSON beat HACKETT by 257 – 212 IMPs.

9. Venice Cup (item 8.1)

Round-Robin

1	France	423	VPs	(average = 315)
2	China	383.3		(22 teams played)
3	Germany	383		
4	USA 2	374		
5	USA 1	366		
6	England	346		
7	Netherlands	329.5		
8	Canada	312		
9	Austria	310		
10	Egypt	306		
11	Australia	303		
12	Japan	302		

Quarter-finals

France beat Canada by 229.5 – 72 IMPs

Netherlands beat China by 250 – 219 IMPs

Germany beat England by 210 – 123.7 IMPs

USA 1 beat USA 2 by 237 – 135 IMPs

Semi-finals

France beat USA 1 by 262 – 150 IMPs

Germany beat Netherlands by 241 – 164 IMPs

Final

France beat Germany by 191 – 136 IMPs

England team

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

10. Women's European Championship Trial (item 9.1)

	1st weekend		2nd weekend		Overall	
	Total	Rank	Total	Rank	Total	Rank
Heather Dhondy and Nicola Smith	102	2	214	1	316	1
Catherine Jagger and Sarah Teshome	74	4	98	=2	172	2
Sandra Penfold and Nevena Senior	126	1	19	4	145	3
Michelle Brunner and Rhona Goldenfield	-37	5	98	=2	61	4
Anne Rosen and Catherine Seale	78	3	-218	7	-140	5
Sally Brock and Margaret James	-78	6	-112	6	-190	6
Susan Stockdale and Bryony Youngs	-265	7	-99	5	-364	7

11. Corn Cairdis (item 14.1)

ENGLAND	v County		v Club		v Officials		Total
County	19	20	9		25		73
Club	8		14	8	12		42
Officials	14		13		16	16	59
							174

IRELAND	v County		v Club		v Officials		Total
County	11	10	22		16		59
Club	21		16	22	17		76
Officials	1		18		14	14	47
							182

England team

County

Graham Allan and Steve Lee
John Jones and Mac Nurmohamed

Club

Keith Bennett and Bob McRobert
Steve Howell and Marian Rudd
Sheila Lanham and Madeline Lawson

Officials

Sally Bugden and Nick Doe
John Carter and Denis Robson

Appendix B – Action Points

Item	Action	Responsible
2.2.2 / 10.3	Trials – future venues	Aylesbury administration
2.2.3	Committee directory	Secretary
3	Terms of reference – submission to Board	Secretary
5.2 / 5.4	Junior Camrose / Peggy Bayer – submissions to BGB	Secretary (via John Neville)
5.5	Junior trials dates	Secretary (in consultation with Paul Bowyer)
5.5	Comments re Girls Championship	Denis Robson (to David Harris)
6.2	Comments re international appeals committees	Secretary (to Max Bavin)
6.4	Comments re Camrose format	Secretary (via John Neville)
10.1	Dates and venues for 2006/07 Open Trials	Secretary
11	Costing of proposals	Steve Eginton, Aylesbury administration
11	Response to Mr. Hasenson	Denis Robson
13	Changes to Panel of NPCs	Secretary