



**Singapore Contract Bridge Association  
Special General Meeting 2006  
Friday, 27<sup>th</sup> October, 2006, at 8:05 pm  
SCBA Clubhouse**

Attendees:

1	Mr Steve Robinson (SR)	Committee: President
2	Mr Wong Choo Wai (CW)	Committee: Vice President
3	Dr AK Heng (AK)	Committee: Honorary Treasurer
4	Ms Chan Yiu Lin (YL)	Committee: Honorary Secretary
5	Dr Derrick Heng(DH)	Committee: Member and NUSS rep
6	Ms Lam Zeying (ZY)	Committee: Member
7	Ms Choon Cheng Seet (CC)	Committee: Member
8	Mr Zhu Junyi	SCBA member
9	Mr Xing Likun	SCBA member
10	Mr Ron Savage	SCBA member
11	Mr Sng Tze Cheow	SCBA member and Marketing Manager
12	Ms Lilio Ho	SCBA member and Club Manager
13	Mrs Greta Chai	SCBA member
14	Mr Edwin Lau	SCBA member
15	Ms Soh Siew Luie	SCBA member
16	Mr Tan Wei Teck	SCBA member
17	Mr Kejia	SCBA member
18	Mr Jason Chew	SCBA member
19	Mr Mark Tiong	NUS representative
20	Mr L.L. Wong	SCBA member
21	Mr Chua Gang	SCBA member
22	Mr Poon Hua	SCBA member
23	Mr Gerald Tan	SCBA member
24	Mr C.C. Loo	SCBA member (student)
25	Mr Kelvin Ng	SCBA member (student)

Item	Discussion	Action
1	<p><b>Amendments and approval of the AGM 2006 minutes:</b> There were a few corrections to the minutes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Mr B.K. Tham is a Chinese Swimming Club representative, not an SCBA member.</li> <li>2) Mr Zain Moledina was not representing Singapore Recreational Club, instead he is just an SCBA member</li> <li>3) For item 2.9, the last sentence should read, "Mr Liu mentioned that the most effective way is to get the young teachers to teach bridge"</li> <li>4) For item 2.12, the first sentence should read, "In order for Mr Chester Chai's suggestion to work as in item 2.11, Mr Liu I Nan believed that the Marketing Manager should know/ play bridge and suggested that it is best to wait for such a candidate, rather than appoint a non-bridge player.</li> </ol>	

- 5) For item 6.8, the first sentence should read, "Mr Liu commented that all participants came from the same school.

With no further corrections, Mrs Greta Chai proposed the minutes be adopted. This was seconded by Dr A.K. Heng. The minutes were adopted unanimously.

## 2 **Constitutional amendments**

- 2.1 As 30 voting members did not turn up for the Special General Meeting, voting could not proceed for the constitutional amendments.

## 3 **National Team selection**

- 3.1 DH proposed that SCBA no longer be bound by any previous General Meeting resolution regarding selection procedures for National representative teams. This was seconded by AK.

Mr Liu I Nan said that the Council is the supreme authority on NSA matters and can over-ride the General meeting on such matters, and that the National Team selection should fall under the Council purview. He asserted that DH's proposal is not necessary, as Council at its formation (when the previous constitution was amended to allow for formation of the council) was no longer bound by any previous SCBA decision on NSA matters. Hence, there was in fact no necessity for SCBA to have abided by the alternating teams and pairs trials format resolution since the formation of the council.

DH replied that it is better that the resolution be passed, in order to clarify matters, as others may have a different interpretation of the situation.

Mr Tan Wei Teck questioned why the Council has powers regarding national selection matters, and suggested that these powers should not lie with the Council. SR replied that historic events of the origin the Council came about to move in the direction of an independent NSA, since currently SCBA is the NSA, a bridge club, and the largest bridge body in Singapore. To remove these powers from the Council would require constitutional amendments and was not recommended as it would result in similar problems prior to the formation of the Council.

DH said that the SCBA committee will hear what the members have to say and put this forth at the Council meeting. As long as the members' views are not unreasonable, there is no reason why the Council should not accept their points.

Mrs Greta Chai queried on who is in the Council. SR replied that it consists of the President, Vice President, and Honorary Secretary of SCBA, together with the Corporate members as defined by the Constitution.

- 3.2 DH explained the details of his proposal on the two-stage selection procedure, as well as what would be done specifically for the 2007 trials. A discussion on

the benefits and merits of the different options ensued. Below are the key suggestions/ concerns:

- 1) Mr Liu I Nan raised the issue that there are a small pool of bridge players and selectors to choose from. While the idea of having a selection committee is good, it is not likely to be implementable. Mr Tan Wei Teck said that the better bridge players are likely to be going for the selection, so cannot be in the selection committee. He expressed preference for team or pair trials only. Mr Poon Hua clarified that his proposal for the selection committee was for Youth teams only and not for Open or Ladies due to small pool of selectors.
- 2) Mr Kelvin Ng queried on the criteria for the selection committee. SR replied that this would be players who have previously been on national teams, who are not playing for the current year's national team. The coach could also be on the selection committee. There would likely be 3 or 5 members in the selection committee. The selection committee would mainly look at the players results during the trials, but other criteria include discipline and how they get along with team members. Mr Tan Wei Teck suggested renaming the selection committee to a "Discipline committee".
- 3) Mr Xing Likun said that the selection committee must consider the opinion of the top 2 pairs, when selecting the third pair. Suggestions were made to allow the top 2 pairs to choose the 3<sup>rd</sup> pair. Mr LL Wong opined that the 3<sup>rd</sup> pair should be determined by the bridge results during trials, unless the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> pairs are very close in results.
- 4) Mr Kejjia brought up citizenship issues, saying that the maximum of 2 permanent residents (PRs) was not always the case. CW mentioned that this criterion follows that set by the Sports Council. Mr Sng Tze Cheow queried that if the top 3 pairs are PRs and bottom 3 were Singaporean, how would the team be chosen. DH replied that it would be pairs 1, 4 and 5.
- 5) Mr Xing Likun queried about the 8 week training session, suggesting it be shorter (1 month) so there will be a longer training time, as a team. Mrs Greta Chai said that 1 month is 4 training sessions and this is not enough. Mr Liu I Nan said that the undesirability of a 2-stage procedure is the gap between the first and second stage. He preferred this gap to be short, so there is a longer time for the players to merge into 1 team.
- 6) Mr Tan Wei Teck suggested that the 1<sup>st</sup> stage selection could be major team events, like the Singapore Open Teams, which act as a pre-qualifying stage. This will help to promote the bridge events too. Qualification will be made by top placement at these events (eg. Top 3).

Mr Liu said while this suggestion is good that in some cases this 1<sup>st</sup> stage pre-qualification should be waived, for example for players who are not residing in Singapore. Mr Edwin Lau said that if this option is chosen, it can only come into action for 2008, since players have not been made aware of the pre-qualification selection. Mr Chua Gang said that the list of pre-qualifying events must be clearly stated. SR said that the pre-qualifying events should be both team-based and pair-based, but for the team-based events, the same partnership must play together for the 2<sup>nd</sup> stage selection. Mr Edwin Lau suggested some flexibility and the pair must play at least 50% of the games with the specific partner. Mr Kelvin Ng suggested that the 1<sup>st</sup> stage selection look at individual results. Mr Tan Wei Teck suggested that as long as the team remains as one team, partners can switch amongst each other. Both SR and Mr LL Wong had doubts on the strength of such a team.

- 7) Mr Wong Choo Wai said that past national teams selections may have resulted in a team that does not consist of the top 3 pairs, and this is important from a national point of view. Mr Edwin Lau said that national interest is fine if the national association pays for the expenses of such competitions, but as the individual players have to pay for the majority of the cost, they should be allowed to team up with who they want. Mr Liu Inan believed that a functioning team that gets along with each other may be better than a team consisting of the top 3 pairs.
- 8) Mr Liu Inan asked for the dates of the trials for PABF 2007. SR replied that this is likely to occur in January 07. Mr Liu suggesting bringing it forward to the previous year. This would be difficult due to ASEAN 06, but may be considered for future years.
- 9) DH made the point of not putting fine details of the selection into the resolution, in order to keep some flexibility and allow operational changes from year to year. Mr Liu said that while in principle he had no disagreement with this, it left many grey areas, and a lot was left up to the SCBA committee and selection committee. DH said that the specific conditions of contest would be written up before the selection commences and that a set of selection guidelines for the selection committee would be included.
- 10) Mr LL Wong suggested that Mr Poon Hua and Mr CC Loo should automatically be selected for any team that they wished to play for (Open or Youth), due to their performance at the World Youth Championships, as well as performance at national games. SR and DH believed that automatic selection would be fair for participating in the Youth Team, but not for the Open Team. Mr Liu said that Mr Poon Hua and Mr CC Loo should be on the selection committee even if they are going for selection, as they are strong enough to carry their team mates. DH replied that

those who are being selected naturally should not be in the selection committee, however this committee would consider the views of the top pairs if given the discretion to select a third pair by the conditions of contest.

- 11) For the ladies team, there are insufficient players and in past years, no trials have been necessary. Mr Tan Wei Teck suggested that selection for the Ladies team is not so urgent, until more qualified lady players emerge on the bridge scene. CC believed that as there are too few ladies, pair trials would be better, which would allow another pair to replace the existing 3<sup>rd</sup> pair, if they are strong enough. Mr Sng Tze Cheow said that there are a number of promising young candidates and a 2-stage procedure would be good, to encourage them to come forth, and go for the training. Mr Liu I Nan said that an 8-week training session is not enough, and what they need is a better training programme, not a 2-stage procedure. Mr Sng agreed to this. Mrs Greta Chai brought up the issue of importance of an NPC, in case the players do not get along. Mr Liu suggested a pair trial, where the top 2 pairs choose the 3<sup>rd</sup> pair. If they cannot agree, then the selection committee makes the decision.

3.3 After these discussions, the AGM voted accordingly:

**National School Youth Teams (under 21 years):** DH proposed that :

“The National School Youth team shall be selected by a 2 stage procedure. The first stage shall be open to all, subject only to citizenship requirements and the eligibility requirements of the international competition concerned. The first stage shall be conducted using a pairs format. The second stage shall be final selection by a selection committee appointed by the SCBA committee. Second stage selection shall be based on pre-defined criteria, including but not limited to: performance in clearly defined events (possible examples: major SCBA championships, international events, test matches, internal selection event), discipline and collegiality, training attendance.”

This was seconded by CW. There were no objections to the proposal. The resolution was passed unanimously.

3.4 **National Junior Youth Teams (under 26 years):** DH proposed that

“The National Junior Youth team shall be selected by a 2 stage procedure. The first stage shall be open to all, subject only to citizenship requirements and the eligibility requirements of the international competition concerned. The first stage shall be conducted using a pairs format. The second stage shall be final selection by a selection committee appointed by the SCBA committee. Second stage selection shall be based on pre-defined criteria, including but not limited to: performance in clearly defined events (possible examples: major SCBA

championships, international events, test matches, internal selection event), discipline and collegiality, training attendance.”

This was seconded by Mr Ron Savage. There were no objections to the proposal. The resolution was passed unanimously.

- 3.5 **National Open Team:** 3 proposals were suggested, 1) the original system of alternating Pair and Team trials, 2) the 2-stage pair trial involving a selection committee, 3) Team trials with a format involving qualifying and final rounds.

The AGM first voted for the option of keeping the original system or changing to a new system, with changing to a new system winning (8 votes for changing, 7 votes for the original system). The AGM then voted for the Team trials with qualifying and final round format (10 votes for team trials, 7 votes for 2-stage pair trial).

- 3.6 **National Ladies Team:** 5 proposals were suggested, 1) the original system of alternating Pair and Team trials, 2) Pair trials with the top 2 pairs choosing the 3<sup>rd</sup> pair, 3) Pair trials with the top 3 pairs being chosen, 4) a 2-stage pair trial involving a selection committee, 5) letting the SCBA committee decide on the best format. The AGM voted for the option of keeping the original system or changing to a new system, with changing to a new system winning (5 votes for changing, 3 votes for the original system). The AGM voted between option 2 and 3, since they were similar. Pair trials with top 3 pairs being chosen won (6 votes to 3 votes). The AGM then voted for Pair trials, with majority votes (13 votes).

- 3.7 **National Senior Team:** 2 proposals were suggested, 1) Pair trials with top 3 being chosen, 2) let the SCBA committee decide on the best format. The AGM voted for option 1 (7 votes for Pair trials, 3 for letting the committee decide)

Note: by this stage of the AGM, there were 22 members who were able to vote.

Therefore the following will be put forward to the next Council meeting regarding national team selections.

- 1) To conduct 2-stage pair trials with a selection committee for both the Youth Junior and Youth Schools teams
- 2) To conduct Team trials with qualifying and final rounds for the Open Team
- 3) To conduct Pair trials with top 3 pairs being chosen for the Ladies Team and Senior Team

- 4 **Adjournment:** YL proposed the meeting be closed, which was seconded by CW  
The meeting was closed at 10.30pm