

GLoucestershire County Bridge Association

Minutes for the GCBA committee meeting held online on Thursday 2nd February 2023

In attendance were Ian Sidgwick (President), Andrew Bull (Secretary), Ben Ritacca (Treasurer), Hylary Kingham, Patrick Shields, Alan Stanfield, Roger Williams, Richard Butland, Paul Denning, Jan Bailey and Peter Waggett (REC chair).

1. The minutes from the previous meeting were accepted; Andrew will circulate the final version along with Ben's slides showing his proposed Reserves Policy (as discussed last month).
2. The proposed policy will be discussed at a face-to-face meeting at Cheltenham Bridge Club on March 6th at 6pm (with the intention of allowing people who can't attend face-to-face to attend online).

Representative Bridge in Gloucestershire

3. Having recently taken over as chair of the Representative Events Committee (REC), Peter asked about the various responsibilities for running Midlands County League matches (particularly when played face-to-face), and the following was agreed upon:
 - a) Team selection: the REC
 - b) Board duplication etc: the Tournament Director (Patrick)
 - c) Room booking: the REC, using the form provided by Cheltenham Bridge Club (which should also cover catering).
 - d) Updating results on the EBU website: Paul volunteered to do this.
4. It was confirmed that the charge for face-to-face matches will be £10 per head.
5. The team managers of the counties involved decide between themselves if a match is to be played face-to-face. The plan for next year is that counties will play neighbouring teams at the start and end of the season (in Autumn/Spring), to try to make playing face-to-face more popular.
6. The issue of eligibility to play for the county was raised.
 - a) Currently, anyone registered with the EBU as having Gloucestershire as their county of primary allegiance is eligible, whether or not they live or play in the county (or have ever done so). In practice, only pairs with at least one member living/playing in Gloucestershire are considered.
 - b) There was discussion as to whether the primary aim behind the selection of Gloucestershire teams is to give local players a chance to represent the county, or to be as strong as possible. The focus to date has been on the latter.
 - c) Peter noted that picking players who do not live locally causes some issues for matches being played face-to-face, and suggested a rule that players should live or play in the county should be phased in. This suggestion had not been supported by the other REC members at their meeting; the GCBA committee was fairly evenly split as to whether this was a good idea.
 - d) It was suggested that we could try to balance the above aims, or we could have different focuses for different competitions (e.g. the MCL and the Tollemache). Peter asked for the aims to be specifically set out for the REC to work with.
 - e) The REC has been asked to provide a list of options for the GCBA committee to discuss further at our April meeting.
7. The purpose of GCBA's Monday night games was discussed, given that there is now much more scope for people wanting to find stronger competition to find it in online play. It was suggested that it could be useful if the GCBA games were arranged to give evidence to the REC of who the strongest players in the county were.

GLOUCESTERSHIRE COUNTY BRIDGE ASSOCIATION

Other matters

8. Ian will produce an update of the risk assessment review. It was noted that this covers the GCBA's legal liabilities, rather than operational risks.
9. Patrick will provide an article for the next newsletter regarding the rearranged Junior bridge fund-raiser. There will also be an article on the beginners' lessons arranged by GCBA.
10. Cheltenham Bridge Club are changing the style of their honours boards to include players' full names. Meanwhile, various of the GCBA honours boards on display at the club are now out of date, with some of the being for competitions which have not been played recently.