

Total member numbers at club	Agree concept?	Which funding option?	Summary other feedback included given
Auckland/Northland Region			
602	Y	3	Fully endorse and support
45	Y	?	No-one at their club interested in RBM role
108	N	N/A	Consultant visiting and preparing a report not beneficial. Club members need to make the effort.
204	Y	3	Not as high as \$6 pa but a lower figure ok
97	Y	1	Mix of paid and unpaid RBDOs as 2nd choice Oppose national levy on all, clubs using service can make small contribution
176	Y	3	Fully endorse and support
77	Y	3	Fully endorse and support
402	Y	None	Understand and support concept They do not need RBDO and do not want a raise in fees for their club members
115	Y	?	Supportive of concept - recognise other clubs not as able as theirs and need help

Wellington Region:

222	N	?	Unsure if cost effective. Want programme that can benefit all clubs not just those near closure. Written and digital material enough for clubs they must help themselves
-----	---	---	--

173	N		<p>Their club going well - of little benefit to them</p> <p>Just had major expenditure at club</p> <p>Suggest 1 year trial NZB pays for</p> <p>Suggests market research/work done before taking steps</p>
131	?		<p>Do not agree with concept for their club as they do many of these things already and are a healthy club. No comment on broad concept</p>
74	Y	3	Fully support and endorse
105	Y	4B	National responsibility and player responsibility
251	Y	1	<p>Funding come from existing budget with re-prioritisation of expenditure.</p> <p>No appetite for any increase in levies on members.</p> <p>Outcome of appt will increase players and so increase NZB income.</p>
324	Y	3	Suggest pilot scheme for 12 to 24 months
			Content that NZB takes all decision on this

Otago/Southland Region:

51	Y	3	Fully endorse and support
181	Y	3	Fully endorse and support
170	?	1	<p>Not opposed to it but not supporting.</p> <p>Opposed to Option 3 - their club could use the levy internally better.</p> <p>Want to defer to 31 March 18 and have more research</p>

417	Y	3	Online forum of development practitioners be established to identify ways to move forward. Discussion on where RBDs priorities are targeted.
97	Y	3	Would want \$6 additional levy and for all members not just players so all contribute equally.
179	Y	1	Endorse concept. NZB has money and should pay

Waikato/Bays Region:

172	Y	3	Fully endorse and support
30	Y	3	Fully endorse and support
187	Y	3	Pleased with positive initiative Their club going well won't need intervention
33	Y	1 and 2	Fully support. Need help - can they have one direct or indirect. Will consider paying additional costs as a club if option 3 goes ahead so members don't pay.
196	Y	Alternative	Favour a paid part-time manager for the RBDs and voluntary RBDs.
351	Y	3	Fully endorse and support
88	Y	3	Fully endorse and support
113	?	?	General feedback and thoughts. Unable to support currently. Need more info.
101	N	N/A	No reason given

Canterbury Region:

66	Y	2	Support
138	Y	1	Clubs pay billeting and travel and apply to NZB for extra help if needed

740	Y	1	Larger clubs need help/support too. NZB and Regions should fund - combined they have 600K and should spend this not ask players for more.
23	Y	1	Do not want increase in levy
210	N		Understand reason for it. Their club is going well and no need at theirs
175	N	N/A	Oppose scheme. Want monies to fund positions used by NZB in other innovative ways to attract people to game and retention. Club wants funds used to benefit bridge in its immediate geographic region

Central Districts:

103	N	N/A	No reason given
128	Y	?	No financial option preference given
137	Y	3	Complaint at amount spent on internationals Prefer money spent on RBDs Want cost benefit report after 2 years Bill that part of levy separately and remove after 2 years if not continuing
98	Y	?	Request aid from an RBM Concern CD too wide for one person Request more help on website remote clubs can access for self-help

			2nd preference funding 1. Comments on: 1. Eligibility/selection criteria clubs given help 2. Average growth figure in report 3. Low retention levels anticipated 4. Comparative costs in report
71	Y	3	
75	N	N/A	Clubs and members have to do this work themselves. Feel current distribution of monies unbalanced - internationals small number huge expense
158	Y	3	Fully support and endorse
180	?	?	Club members need to do the work. Sent to all their members - no feedback - they assume they view it as unimportant

TOTS:

53	Y	3	Fully supportive
47	Y	3	Only full members not affiliates should pay Query if RBM will teach lessons
185	Y	3	2 year trial. Want to see results at end
44	Y	Different	NZB should fund and use existing personnel for first year

49 Clubs responded

Agree with concept:

Player numbers at clubs agreed	6342
Player numbers at club not agreed	1167
Player numbers at clubs neutral	594

Number of clubs agree with concept:

Yes	37
No	8

Members at club not responded	1
Not wanted at their club	
no comment on general concept	1
Not wanted at their club but won't oppose	1
Need more info to decide	1
	49

Out of 108 - 8 don't like some part of it.

Funding Options

Option 1 - NZB pays all	8
Option 2 - mix NZB/Region	1
Option 3 - mix NZB/REGION/PLAYER	21
Option 4B - NZB/Player	1
Different option - fund a part-time manager	
Have voluntary RBDs	1
Different option - use existing personnel and resources for Year 1	1
No preference given	8

Those against concept gave no view	8
	49

Deadline 31.7.17 extended for feedback
and all clubs written to, asking them
to respond and advising if they did
not respond NZB would assume
club content to allow NZB to make
its decision without their input

All feedback received 3 July 2017
to 7 September 2017 was considered