



Questionnaire

2nd NBO Officers' Seminar, 3rd – 5th October 2002, Turin, Italy

Introduction

The 1st Seminar, held in Viserbella, Italy, in May 2000, was used not only to supply information on the tools put at the disposal of the NBOs by the EBL and on the way how to modernize such tools (for instance concerning ways of communication), but also to make an analysis of the organization of every NBO and obviously of the strong and weak points of each one.

The general moto of that Seminar was "Communication for a Better Knowledge", and the aim was to supply practical information to every delegation, making clear the experience of the others.

It became obvious that, as expected, the largest NBOs were also the best organized and the ones with less problems, although some of the smaller Federations showed an excellent organization and very high efficiency.

Since the first Seminar special reference could be made to the following three basic items:

(1) the CD on the Viserbella Seminar offered to all NBOs in Tenerife 2001. This includes President Rona's presentation, "The Bridge Federations in the Third Millennium", as well as the resumé of the answers given by the various NBOs to the questionnaire, "Communication for Better Knowledge".

(2) President Rona's report to the EBL General Assembly

in Tenerife on 19th June 2001, in particular the milestones concerning the NBOs role given under item 1 of such document.

(3) President Rona's letter of 19th December 2001.

The EBL Executive Committee thinks that this second Seminar, although a continuation of the first event, should be more oriented towards the role of the NBOs in the development of bridge at national level.

Taking into account what has been stated in the above-mentioned documents, namely that "bridge has many facets but only two main streams, competitive and recreational", we invite each one, regardless of the size and importance of its NBO, to prepare his participation in the 2002 Seminar under three different aspects:

- a. The Federation as the entity responsible for the development of amateur bridge in its country;*
- b. The Federation as the entity in charge of organising and developing competitive bridge in its country;*
- c. The Federation as the privileged entity in contact with the European official bridge organizations (EBL and NBOs).*

Each NBO is therefore invited to answer the following questionnaire.

1. Amateur Bridge

1.1 - Does your NBO feel really committed to the task of attracting the attention and the curiosity of your national society to the growing importance that Bridge is taking on the global process of innovation under way? Or do you feel this is not your business? Do you have any answers to simple questions like "Why learn bridge?", "Why teach bridge?"

YES NO

1.2 - If "yes", what practical steps are you undertaking to reach that goal?

Have you organised a plan and a schedule, or are you, for the time being, just taking isolated actions?

PLAN ISOLATED

Are you making use of the IOC and FISU recognition of the WBF as a Sports Federation and of the UNESCO resolution with regard to the teaching of Bridge as a school subject?

YES NO

Are you trying to promote recreational bridge in areas like the State school, with the disabled, the marginalized and the senior citizens?

YES NO

Are you using, or intending to use, specific clubs or associations, to develop the promotion in specialised areas?

YES NO

Please, report any practical experiences, positive or negative.

Does your NBO receive support from public authorities, like for instance in the Education, Social Welfare and Sports areas?

YES NO

Also, have you succeeded in opening any doors in communication terms, such as TV, Internet, etc^{[see 5.1]?}

YES NO

If yes, please explain.

1.3 – What is the approx. number of amateur bridge players in your country and the interest and impact of bridge in your society?

2. Competitive Bridge

2.1 - Is your NBO only or mainly interested in promoting competitive bridge among high level competition players? Or is it concerned with the expansion of competitive bridge at all levels?

High level All levels

2.2 - During the 1st Officers Seminar, May 2000, special attention was paid to the structural organisation of the Federations. There is no need now to deal again with that subject, but please inform if some changes has been implemented in your NBO or atleast some ideas have been discussed ^{[see 5.2]?}

2.3 - It is a fact that all the Federations have a need to communicate with their members. Today the computer is the best tool which exists to help the NBOs and the Internet as a bringer of messages. Some NBOs have not yet a data-base system. Please explain the current situation in your NBO. Are you expecting any help from the EBL in this field, at least for management and ranking?

See next page »»»

2.4 - Have there been any improvements in your NBO since 2000 concerning the organisation of activities and promotion at national level in the field of bridge teaching and of official T.D. training?

YES NO

2.5 - The overall number of individual regular EBL members is declining after a more or less stagnant period (1997: 372.040; 1998: 373.680; 1999: 373.967; 2000: 373.409; 2001: 370.748). Can you help to improve the situation in your country?

YES NO

2.6 - Has your NBO undertaken any action since the first Seminar in order to improve the fulfilment of the role of the Clubs?^[see 5.3]

YES NO

3. Teaching

3.1- Does your NBO support mini bridge? If yes, how? If no, why not?

YES NO

3.2 - Does your NBO support school bridge? If yes, how? If no, why not?

YES NO

3.3 - Do you have graduated bridge teachers in your NBO? If yes, what is the bond between your NBO and the teachers and what kind of assistance do you give them? If no, why not?

YES NO

3.4 - Is there an association of graduated teachers in your NBO? If yes, please give information about its structure and aims. If no, why not?

YES NO

3.5 - Is your NBO involved in any procedure to make student players member of an affiliated bridge club after attending a bridge course? If yes, how? If no, why not?

YES NO

3.6 - Has your NBO, the graduated teachers or local organisers, found a "transit" bridge club for student players in order to improve their bidding and playing after bridge courses, during a limited period (i.g. two years)? If yes, please give some information. If no, why not?

YES NO

3.7 - Does your NBO and/or the Regional Federation bodies run championships for student players? If yes, please give some information. If not, why?

YES NO

See next page »»»

3.8 - Did your NBO ever try to run a bridge course on television in collaboration with graduated teachers? If yes, do give some information. If no, why not?

YES NO

3.9 - Who is responsible for the promotion of bridge courses in your NBO?

3.10 - Do teachers, on request of your NBO, run courses - a kind of mini bridge – for companies which might be potential sponsors? If yes, please give some information. If no, why not?

YES NO

3.11 – Do teachers in collaboration with your NBO run a special, paid course (very often convention courses) for members of an affiliated bridge club in order to improve the bidding and playing of these people? If yes, please give information.

YES NO

3.12 – Is your NBO interested in a general (ready off hand) bridge course?

YES NO

4. International Co-operation

As stated in the General Assembly in Tenerife, June 2001, "it is the EBL's fundamental task to make use of the experience gained by the stronger Federations and transmit this to the weaker ones" and "it is also the League's duty to cooperate with all the Federations to permit them to carry out their work better".

4.1 - Does your NBO consider that the EBL action to create, organise and improve the official bridge teaching and the formation of official T.D.s is adequate and fruitful?

YES NO

4.2 - The only EBL action aiming at better reciprocal knowledge between the NBOs is in fact the organisation of the Officers Seminars, in principle once every two years. Does your NBO have in mind some other type of initiatives with a similar purpose?

YES NO

4.3 - The way of communication between the EBL and the NBOs has been totally reviewed as a direct result of the suggestions and requests put forward in the first Officers Seminar, May 2000. A decision was taken by the Executive Committee to suspend the printing of the EBL Review and Calendar and to concentrate all those resources on Internet. After 8 months of hard work, the new EBL website (www.eurobridge.org) went live in March 2001 "with a very high standard which can appropriately serve the NBOs and the bridge player". This achievement and permanent updating represents a tremendous increase in workload for the EBL team in charge of that matter. Does your NBO feel better informed now?

YES NO

Do you have any new suggestions or any ideas about how to get collaboration from the NBOs?

See next page »»»

5. Replies

The replies to this questionnaire (preferably by e-mail) should be sent to José Oliveira, Chairman of the NBO Liaison Committee, not later than 31st August 2002, to either of the following addresses:

Mail: Praça Rainha Santa, 5-6E
1600.687 Lisboa
Portugal

Fax: +351 21 7597662

E-mail: jmsol@clix.pt

^[1] From G. Rona's "Into 2000": take Bridge outside the strict circle of enthusiasts to reach a greater public, including those who consider themselves to be untouched by the fascination of Bridge

^[2] We recall the following guidelines drawn by President Rona:

it is necessary to reinforce the central and territorial operations of the Federation;

it is necessary to give greater importance to its government of the Bridge network and to further better co-ordination between the many peripheral arteries of the Bridge movement;

it is necessary to introduce improved regulations to cater for decentralisation and to review management systems in order to give proper space to the regions participating in the Federation's central government and at the same time to give the national presidency greater power in choosing its collaborators and wider responsibilities;

The objective is to make the territorial structures not only decentralised services, but protagonists and interpreters of the Federation's policies in two directions, firstly towards the territory by performing its functions and duties on behalf of the Federation both inside and outside the Bridge organisation and secondly towards the central structure of the Federation by contributing to its territorial policies and programmes;

an extremely important factor in reinforcing the Federation's territorial representation (is) the formation of a National Council, made up of members of the Federation's Executive Committee and those in charge of the peripheral organs.

^[3] Quoting again from the same document, "the present situation shows that the Clubs are forced to cope with a thousand difficulties due to the lack of basic conditions suitable for Bridge and adequate support, as well as the obstacles created by inadequate and inappropriate legislation. ... a law which allows the clubs to operate serenely and confidently within their own jurisdiction ... a specific fiscal regime ... specific structure to solve the problems involved in management, administration, bookkeeping and tax levy ... support of local authorities ... regulations for sponsorship ... be in possession of suitable premises, self-contained and free from interference or intrusion ..."

Thank you for your help in answering this questionnaire - hope to see you in Turin in October!

José Oliveira