

Proposed meeting will be via email link at 8:30 Eastern Standard Time

Leigh and David will meet at 6 Vincent Court, Campbelltown at 9:00 CST.

DS COMMENTS IN PURPLE

KCM in Blue

LG/DL in Red

MW in Green

Summary and resolutions in italics.

Sorry I haven't been involved earlier – but have only just arrived back from UK.

1. Director for 2003 AYC given ABF tough stance on limiting payment to their scale of \$250 per day
LG & DL Agreed that we don't want anyone other than MMcM directing the Youth Week. Note that a lot of peripheral expenses are included in the package. (Also, if the ABF pull the plug on Matthew, I will start detailing my own expenses for being there instead of writing them off).

Brad Coles later agreed that Matthew is a must. Point taken that if Matthew is not director, the convenors will have to do more and be paid more.

I may be misreading the tone of the above 'red' comments butDon't forget that the ABF aren't too keen on the whole thing to begin with. Throwing up additional convenors expenses and effectively digging our heels will only antagonise the ABF. It is best to treat them with kid gloves at times. I'd hate to see the seeds of the tournaments rebirth jeopardised by unnecessary posturing.

I had not seized on the point that Mathew's fee included Board Duplication costs so I will take that up with the ABF. In any event I have a \$2000 annual discretion and will apply it to make sure that Mathew is available for 2003. I do agree that a gently gently but firm approach is sensible.

Agree with above McM is must.

The AYC is unanimous in the view that Matthew is the ideal director for the Australian Youth Week and should be retained at whatever rate can be reasonably negotiated.

Resolution: DS to continue negotiations with the ABF and, if necessary, pick up any shortfall from the discretionary fund.

2. Timeline plan for the AYC including

brochure DL will organise brochures to be available with SF stuff.

program Programme will be very similar to 2002 but LG thinks we should put the International challenge at the end of the Youth Week.

SA Youths spoken to did not agree that this was a good idea. The main argument is that only a few have to arrive on Saturday for the I/C, giving others an extra day to get into Canberra – compelling argument.

I have no strong view here. Perhaps an email poll of the most likely culprits to turn up should make the decision. If there is no cost effect to us (hiring space etc) give the players what they want.

Like KCM I have no view that I would deem to impose on anybody. I leave it to DL in conjunction with the convenors to deal with this issue and come up with a non-controversial solution. Whatever happens I would like the program promulgated no later than 30th June 2002 allowing people to make plans for other trips and holidays around the event etc.

I have a view that it should be as per 2002. But I think a poll is fairest – re KCM’s comment about playing the Men’s Pairs/recovering from hangover – the over 25s already had TWO days to do this (Teams finishes on Weds – recover Thurs – Men’s Pairs Fri). A third might be a bit much.

The dates for the AYW are set for 2003. A preliminary programme should be available by the VCC meeting. The rest of the time-line should be adhered to without drama.

Resolutions: DL to be responsible for programme and brochures.

MW to prepare a simple player poll and send to DL for distribution to youth players on email. (I think that an opinion sought by a fellow youth will gain a broader and more comprehensive response)

circulation of information

Brochures, emails, NOT and ABF and Youth Newsletters

Both LG and DL wish to retain the 2002 format As does KCM

Agree but the 2002 circulation was late and perhaps could have been earlier and more effective. Can DL set a timeline in conjunction with the convenors for the circulation of the various pieces of information, signing of venues, engagement of directors etc etc.

We MUST take a critical and non Gill approach to entry fees where the fees better reflect people’s capacity to pay. I suggest we consider a tiered rate as follows:

Full time school and university students

Part time university students and Unemployed

Full time employed

And that the entry fees reflect a reasonable capacity to pay at these levels. The ABF charges around \$0.60 per board and we should perhaps set a board target for future events with a factor for each of the above – say

Full time school and university students and unemployed	40%
Part time university students who are also employed	60%
Part time workers	75%
Full time employed	100%

I open the floor to discussion on the per board cost but let me open a number at \$0.50. For a 24 board pairs session this would equate to

Full time school and university students and unemployed	40%	4.80
Part time university students who are also employed	60%	7.20
Part time workers	75%	9.00
Full time employed	100%	12.00

Perhaps there should be a daily maximum of \$20 or something similar.

I agree in principle that we should be increasing prices – and it makes sense to have the 4 gradations set out above. However prices should be in multiples of \$5 where possible.

Maybe this is too big an increase from the ridiculous levels which have traditionally applied so maybe we need to start at \$0.35 per board and flag that it will increase in the coming years to \$0.50.

We can also offer reduced table fees in the case of genuine need being the inability to otherwise play.

Perhaps David Lusk could do an estimate of what the cost would be for each class for each event.

Anyway we have an obligation to the ABF and future players to ensure that the event is more financially responsible.

It seems to be generally agreed that the entry fees to the event has been too heavily discounted in the past. Unfortunately, there was no brochure that I ever saw for the 2002 event, but fees were as follows:

AYC events \$30 per player for 4 – 4.5 sessions, students half price. This equates to about \$7.50/\$3.75 per session.

Youth Camp: \$12 per day, \$6 per session.

Resolution: DL to work on fee structure using 2002 figures and above guidelines. To be available by VCC meeting.

3. ANC - what teams are participating and what can we do about those that are not

ANC - do we want or need a colts team and if so who

Butts/McDonald are working on a combined QLD/TAS team and will let me know how that pans out. DL will monitor. Colts team will be the next choice. If all players of a 6th team came from players who were eligible to play in states not sending a team I would be open to debate on the merits of letting them play in the event proper. I would not be in favour of it but would definitely be happy to enter dialogue. Also getting players from non competing states in will let them see how much fun it is and may just give them the bug to take control in their states and get enough players for future years.

Certainly a combined state team for the reasons put forward by KCM are best.

Such a team cannot be eligible for the champion title. The only real question is whether scores against that team should be counted. I think they should NOT be counted but can be persuaded otherwise.

I tend to think scores should count – but no strong feeling.

We are unanimous in the view that the bye should be covered at all costs. The combined QLD/TAS team has support. In default, we will invite a colts team.

Most of us have the view that all scores should count. I think that a combined team (QLD/TAS) should be eligible to make the finals but that a colts team should not.

4. Start a register of people known to be teaching and promoting youth bridge and ensure we maintain contact with them

DL has started a register and has asked for input from states.

Another reminder... please do not forget privacy laws when getting and giving this info..

I more than most are painfully aware of the privacy issues. Under no circumstances should any database information which we have be released to ANYBODY without discussion. My staff are under instructions that giving out database information may result in instant dismissal – that will tell you how much I understand the \$30,000 penalty for an individual and \$150,000 for a corporation found to be in breach.

I will be the only person with access to this information.

5. Youth committee for 2003

Too early to call.

If my current feelings towards the ABF continue it is possible that I may be looking to step down from the YC in 2003. Also, having done it for 3+ years is probably more than I deserve for my sins. If anybody feels that they want the job or knows somebody who does then I would be quite prepared to discuss the issue. I am reluctant to retain the position by default.

The other members of the committee need to consider the position that DS will not continue as Convenor indefinitely. We are therefore forewarned and will do ourselves a favour if we seriously consider a successor.

6. 2005 AYC - going nowhere and how can we get it back on track

I assume this should read WYC?

Figures and requests are in the hands of the ABF. They are aware that a decision is urgent but should not be made in haste.

What are the figures?? Do we know how much the net and or gross costs would be??

I have made it clear to the ABF that they need to commit around \$A125,000 towards the event. I have 'told' them that they could run an Australia wide Gold Point event for the next three years and raise the bulk of the money. Unfortunately they would like me to underwrite the exact amount, how when where and why before they will commit. The REAL problem? They tolerate youth bridge, they support it financially but I suspect that they are not really committed to it as a concept.

Nothing to add.

The ABF has enough information to have a reasonable idea of the extent of the commitment in financial terms. We have made it clear that it would be an important step for Australia to take. It is in their hands now and I guess that we have to sit and wait.

DL can provide KCM with budget information if he wants it.

7. Promotion of Friends of Youth Bridge letter to targeted people and development of target list

LG and DL felt that there may be some benefit to making the Friends funds state-based. That way, each state may be able to do their own fund-raising and perhaps be in a position to contribute when action is needed on a national basis. Only NSW is playing ball with this at the moment and that is unfair. This needs further discussion.

I agree about further discussion. I don't think a purely state based thing works that well ... smaller states (especially those with no youth programmes at the moment) would basically get no funding. It is the basic principle of tax and revenue raising that the majority subsidise the minority. The trick is to make sure it isn't too exploitative on the majorities whilst helping the minorities (e.g. if NSW didn't supply ABF with money the ABF would go broke)

Sorry but I think that the concept of the FofYB Fund has been lost by all. This fund was established by and for the discretion of the ABF Youth Committee to meet the costs of youth bridge which cannot reasonably be met by the ABF. It has NOTHING I repeat NOTHING to do with state associations. G-d bless them if they want to raise funds for youth bridge. I will not (to the extent that I have any say) allow the state associations to have any say over anything to do with the administration of the FofYB fund. This fund is between the ABFYC and the players it has nothing to do with bridge administration.

I think DS' view is the correct one. It should be money which the ABFYC controls.

I want to deal with the anomaly that NSW is likely to be responsible for raising well above its share of funds for the FOAYB. The SA Youth Development Committee (of which DL is only one member) were in favour of fund-raising but could not take the broader national perspective. Thus they have had two fund-raisers which have yielded just over \$2000 and have others planned. This money is retained by the SA YDC for its own purposes. The only way that the FOAYB benefits from this is that SA players will/may not need the sort of assistance that other juniors will because they have a fund of their own. One reason that we had so many SA players in Canberra this year was the small subsidies given to players. It at least covered their entry fees into the event.

I would like to point out that the SABF does not control the fund. Expenditure is at the discretion of the SA YDC.

8. Report to ABF regarding designated events for 2003 and budget request for subsidies. Consider a new Youth event during Uni and school holidays if this can be found

2003 events at international level still unclear. WBF website only deals with 2002.

Some events already put forward to ABF (WYC and Hamilton) but presumably there is a PABF event and who knows what else. DL and DS may need to work on this & the budget.

Perhaps you can contact somebody at the ACBL or WBF to get information on the 2003 events. We know that there will be a WJC, a PABF and New Zealand so we should let the ABF know this as a minimum and keep our options otherwise open in respect of other events.

NSW Saturday 28 September 2002 - Sunday 13 October 2002

SA Saturday 28 September 2002 - Sunday 13 October 2002

ACT Saturday 28 September 2002 - Sunday 13 October 2002

WA Saturday 28 September 2002 - Sunday 13 October 2002

NT Saturday 28 September 2002 - Sunday 6 October 2002

TAS Saturday 7 September 2002 - Sunday 22 September 2002

QLD Saturday 21 September 2002 - Sunday 6 October 2002

VIC Saturday 21 September 2002 - Sunday 6 October 2002

Uni Qld 28th September 6th October 2002

UNSW 28th September 6th October 2002

Sydney 28th September 6th October 2002 ???

Monash 28th September 6th October 2002

Deakin 28th September 6th October 2002

On this basis an event starting Saturday 28th and finishing some time say Monday or Tuesday would work fine. Any ideas when where and how and whether we should. Maybe a triathlon?

Both LG and DL agreed that a triathlon in Adelaide over three days would be quite good. Perhaps a bit of Tuesday as well but that is sensitive to numbers. 28 – 30 Sep looked good and we would modify the programme so that no-one would miss the AFL grand final.

WHAT ABOUT THE NRL FINAL... JUST BECAUSE YOU TWO DON'T KNOW WHAT A DECENT FOOTBALL GAME LOOKS LIKE DOESN'T MEAN THE REST OF US DON'T!!!

It seems like we have to work on 3 weekdays during that week. Obviously too late this year but what about taking a poll at the AYC to see if there is any interest. I thought the sunnier climate in QLD would be an attraction maybe running it in Surfers using the Surfers bridge club if it was available.

I think this is a good idea – and I think Adelaide is the right venue (within reach for Perth). I don't think that either the AFL or NRL grand final is a reason to not hold it on a particular weekend but maybe I'm wrong.

The concept is clearly acceptable and the AFL/NRL finals have deflected us from the main theme. Nobody has suggested that Adelaide is a bad venue for this event. Let's just start the ball rolling with some publicity and see how many want to be involved. The entry fees can be kept to a minimum because there will be a limited cost to the running of the event.

Before we proceed, I need SABA approval (hopefully a formality), an idea of entry fees, and a few other guidelines. Perhaps MW can include some questions in the poll to gauge interest and format.

9. Update on team for Montreal. Rumour of cancellation has not been verified on net or any other source but Dennis Yovich.

No-one has substantiated the rumour, so it is assumed that the event is still on.

The selection panel unanimously selected Hay-Nunn and Wislmore-Wyner. The ABF Youth Committee needs to endorse the team ASAP and we will submit it to the ABF for acceptance. No ratification is needed because this is a 'private venture'.

I have exactly 0% objection to the aforementioned pairs being ratified/accepted/endorsed.

I have no objection to anybody discussed above or below. Are we limited to one team? If not then why not allow a second team without subsidy.

I think that we should seek ratification even if not required – best to ask the question than worry about whether we need to.

Two important points: 1) If they will take 6, should we send Geromboux and Ware as well? (Still waiting on that one, two months after enquiring).

I'd say if they can't get back to us in two months they can't be keen and we don't send them. Sending 4 rather than 6 seems better for the cost structure.

Since the ABF have saved \$2500 on the WUT, can we wangle another 1-1.5K from them for this event? DS has the best chance of swinging an argument for this.

Maybe we could ask the ABF to swap these funds to the 2003 AJC in January. This would make us odds on to meet any budget requirements the ABF set.

I will ask the question if they will allocate half of the \$2500 saved to Montreal so we can increase the size of the team SUBJECT TO SOMEBODY CONFIRMING THAT WE CAN SEND A TEAM OF 6.

All fine – whats happening re Gold-Wan – are they getting a second event? Ahh – I see this is below . . .

Resolved that Hay-Nunn and Wislmore-Wyner become the team for Montreal. The issue of a six player contingent is still unresolved. We can't leave this one hanging for too long and it's frustrating when those organising the event can't even promulgate a simple statement on team size.

Action: DL will inform the ABF that we would like 6 players approved.

DS will lobby the ABF for at least 1.5K in addition to the 2.5K already allocated.

DL will inform all players of their current status with respect to the team.

10. Teaching materials – increased demand is a good sign.

There have been 5 requests in recent times. 2 in Adelaide, 1 in QLD and two in country NSW.

Which clubs in NSW country took materials. NSWBA has stuff they can offer as well. Does Dave McDonald know of these clubs?? Please advise??

We should implement a follow up procedure to ensure that we keep contact with these people and keep providing them with whatever they need. I have plenty of used cards I can send anybody who needs them.

Tarlinton from Dubbo is not on email, so local support may be valuable. I have met Jenny King from Orange and she has my email address. Dell Dawson in Rockhampton is in frequent email contact and Moira Smith, Stephanie James and John Foreman are members of the SABA, thus in frequent contact. Michael Kent is on email.

DL will pass appropriate information regarding Tarlinton and King to DMcD

Any Other Business.

Team for Montreal do we need 6 (if allowed)

Can we increase the subsidy since no WUT?
Hamilton?? 4 or 6 (no answer re 1976 players).

The decision as to whether we are interested in now sending 6 players to Hamilton is an urgent one. I have asked NZ if they have a problem with 2 born-in-1976 players and am still awaiting a reply. Gold-Wan are technically owed an event as they agreed to take Montreal because the other 4 wanted Hamilton. 6 players would increase the cost and may not be on if NZ reject the older two. LG did not discuss this, except to say that he and Kenneth would like to go.

Ugly situation to have to resolve. Chase up NZ and see what they say. Can we use WUT money here to subsidise third pair if they go. I am still not entirely happy with sending ineligible players to events. It creates too bad a precedent (sorry Leigh). If it was up to me I would vote against sending people who are too old. If G+W are eligible and we are just fixing our error by sending them to NZ, then okay.

I leave this thorny one to you to resolve David except I agree that we should avoid sending ineligible players. How do we avoid this ineligible problem in the future???

By being aware at the time of selection of the different limitations for different events. At the time of Canberra it is explained that the top 3 eligible pairs form the Australian team for event x. The top n pairs with different requirements form the team for event y. This would require a small change to the format of the playoff (for pairs 2-5). Instead of a 64 board match on the Sunday – play 6 * 12 board matches (same as previous 3 days) – with each pair playing with each pair against each pair (if you see what I mean). With perhaps some carry-forward.

The current situation needs prompt resolution. I read that there is no objection to sending six players to Hamilton but the ABF may provide only 2/3 subsidy to each player.

DL will email Robin Young once more about the ages.

For the future, 2003 may be a difficult one to resolve. The WYT will probably allow players born on or after 1977 but other events, particularly the PABFC may well insist on 1978 or later. We will almost certainly send some kind of colts team to NZ, since there are two major events for the selected team. I suggest that we primarily select the 2003 team for the WYT and make it clear that the same team will play in the PABFC only if all are eligible. NOTE: Since the PABFC will be used to select Zone 6 representatives for the WYT, chances are that the condition of born on or after 1977 will apply to that event as well.

NEXT MEETING: VCC. We need to resolve a meeting schedule around session times.

Suggested as follows:

Saturday evening: Meet over dinner

Sunday morning: Meet before play

Monday afternoon: Meet after presentations (if necessary)