

2026 Contest Rule Review

Submissions from Bands



Submissions received from:

Boroondara Brass
Boroondara Harmony Brass
Box Hill Academy Brass
City of Greater Bendigo Brass
Footscray Yarraville City Band
Footscray Yarraville Western Brass

Hyde Street Youth Band
Stonnington City Brass
Sunshine Community Brass
Whitehorse Brass
Wonthaggi Youth Brass
Wodonga Brass

Summary of Submissions

A total of 12 submissions were received with the most common issues relating to Junior age eligibility, the sharing of players between bands and the rules governing Junior bands competing in Open grades. Other submissions addressed contest programming and time limits, adjudication, penalties, and the clarity and administration of the existing rules.

While several bands raised similar concerns, their proposed solutions were not always consistent. In particular, there are differing views on whether the Junior age limit should be reduced and whether player-sharing arrangements should be restricted to improve competitive fairness or expanded to support participation.

Key Themes

1. Junior Age Eligibility

One of the most frequently raised issues is the current Under 22 age limit for Junior competition. Several submissions propose reducing the Junior age limit to Under 19, bringing Victorian competition into line with the Aus National Band Championships. The principal concern is the significant difference in experience and musical development between younger school-aged musicians and those undertaking tertiary music studies.

Other submissions strongly support retaining the Under 22 limit, highlighting its importance in retaining young musicians, supporting regional bands, providing mentoring opportunities and assisting Junior bands to maintain sufficient playing numbers.

Alternative proposals included introducing an additional Under 19 category for solo competitions or restructuring age categories to better reflect stages of musical development.

2. Player Sharing and Contest Eligibility

A number of submissions raise concerns about the sharing of players between bands, particularly where higher-grade players compete with lower-grade bands.

Some bands believe the current arrangements can create an uneven playing field, particularly in D Grade, where the use of experienced players may undermine the developmental purpose of the grade.

Proposed changes include limiting the number of players borrowed from other bands, restricting the grades from which players may be drawn and introducing greater transparency around player nominations.

Conversely, other submissions seek increased flexibility, particularly for C Grade and Junior players, recognising the importance of player sharing in enabling smaller bands to compete. There are also calls for clearer communication between bands when players participate with multiple ensembles.

3. Junior Bands Competing in Open Grades

Several submissions identify that the current rules governing Junior bands competing in Open grades no longer adequately reflect existing competition arrangements.

Proposals include allowing Junior bands to compete in Open grades above D Grade, clarifying the relationship between Junior and Open classifications, and reviewing the requirement for Junior bands to compete in their own grade before entering an Open grade.

4. Contest Programming and Performance Requirements

Submissions propose several changes to contest programming requirements, including:

- Reviewing performance time limits, particularly for A Grade where lengthy set works can restrict repertoire selection.
- Clarifying the definition and requirements of Own Choice items.
- Removing or modifying compulsory set works for Junior C Grade brass bands to accommodate reduced instrumentation.

These proposals seek to ensure that contest requirements remain appropriate for the different grades and types of ensembles.

5. Rules Clarity, Administration and Transparency

Several submissions identify opportunities to improve the clarity and administration of the Contest Rules. Matters raised include inconsistent terminology, incorrect rule references, unclear eligibility provisions, nomination procedures and the application of penalties.

There are also requests for greater transparency in regrading decisions, clearer communication regarding shared players and more consistent publication of information through VBL communication channels.

Many of the matters can be addressed outside of the Contest Rules.

6. Adjudication, Scoring and Penalties

Submissions also raise questions about adjudication procedures and the application of contest penalties.

Suggestions include providing bands with greater information about adjudicators' expectations before competitions, reviewing the severity of time penalties, clarifying appeals procedures and ensuring appropriate conflict-of-interest provisions.

These matters reflect a desire for consistency, transparency and fairness in the assessment and administration of competitions.

Overall Observations

Two significant considerations emerge from the submissions. The first is the need to **balance competitive fairness with participation and development**. This is particularly evident in discussions about Junior age eligibility and the sharing of players between bands. While some proposals seek to establish clearer restrictions to ensure equitable competition, others emphasise the importance of flexibility in supporting smaller, regional and developing bands.

The second is the need to **ensure that the Contest Rules reflect current banding practices**. The growth and development of Junior bands, changing patterns of player participation and the evolving structure of competitions have highlighted areas where existing provisions may no longer adequately reflect how bands operate.

The submissions have been grouped by theme to assist delegates in reviewing the proposals and identifying matters requiring further discussion. The detailed summary that follows identifies the individual proposals, the submitting bands and the relevant rules, where applicable.

Theme 1: Junior Age Eligibility

Relevant Rules: 10.1, 11.2 and 17.2

Current Rules

Under Rule 10.1 of the VBL Contest Rules (Version 3.0):

- **Juvenile:** Under 15 years of age on 1 January of the year of the contest.
- **Junior:** Under 22 years of age on 1 January of the year of the contest.
- **Senior:** 60 years of age or older on 1 January of the year of the contest.

These definitions apply to both band competitions and the Victorian State Solo & Ensemble Championships.

Summary of Submissions

Junior age eligibility is one of the most frequently raised issues in the review. Six submitting organisations have addressed the issue, with differing views on whether the current Under 22 age limit should be retained, reduced or supplemented by additional categories. The submissions broadly reflect two competing priorities: providing equitable competition for younger musicians at similar stages of development and retaining opportunities for older youth musicians to participate in Junior banding.

Proposed Changes

Proposal 1: Reduce Junior Age to Under 19

Submitted by: Box Hill Academy Brass, Wodonga Brass and Sunshine Community Brass

These bands propose reducing the Junior age limit from Under 22 to Under 19.

The principal arguments are:

- Aligning Victorian Junior eligibility with the Australian National Band Championships.
- Providing fairer competition between musicians at comparable stages of development.
- Avoiding situations where secondary school students compete against university-level musicians.
- Establishing a clearer transition from Junior to Open competition.
- Encouraging the recruitment and development of younger players.

Additional considerations raised by individual bands:

Box Hill Academy Brass highlights the difficulties created by different age limits at State and National Championships. Bands may be required to change their membership between competitions, affecting ensemble continuity and development.

Wodonga Brass proposes that eligibility be assessed at the date of competition rather than 1 January. It also acknowledges that a transition period may be necessary for bands currently relying on the Under 22 eligibility provisions.

Sunshine Community Brass additionally proposes reducing the Juvenile age limit from Under 15 to Under 14.

Proposal 2: Retain Junior Age at Under 22

Submitted by: Hyde Street Youth Band and Wonthaggi Youth Brass

These submissions support retaining the existing Under 22 age limit for Junior band competitions.

The principal arguments are:

- Supporting the retention of young musicians during the transition from secondary school to tertiary study or employment.
- Providing mentoring opportunities for younger players through participation alongside older, more experienced musicians.
- Maintaining sufficient playing numbers, particularly for smaller and regional Junior bands.
- Allowing young musicians more time to develop the confidence and experience needed to transition into Open competition.
- Encouraging continued participation in community music and the development of future musical leaders.

Additional considerations raised by individual bands:

Hyde Street Youth Band emphasises the role of Junior bands in retaining young musicians aged 19–21 who may not yet be ready to transition to adult bands. It also highlights the importance of peer relationships, mentoring, leadership development and the limited availability of suitable positions in higher-grade Open bands.

Wonthaggi Youth Brass highlights the particular challenges faced by regional Junior bands when players leave to pursue tertiary education or employment. Returning former members can provide essential playing numbers and valuable mentoring for younger musicians. Reducing the age limit may make it more difficult for these bands to compete.

Proposal 3: Introduce an Additional Under 19 Solo Category

Submitted by: Hyde Street Youth Band

Hyde Street Youth Band proposes retaining the Under 22 Junior category while introducing an additional Under 19 category at the Victorian State Solo & Ensemble Championships. The proposal seeks to address concerns about the developmental gap between younger competitors and university-aged musicians without removing opportunities for older Junior players.

The proposed categories and time limits are:

Category	Time limit
Under 10, Under 12 and Juvenile	5 minutes
Under 19	7 minutes
Junior (Under 22)	9 minutes
Open and Senior	9 minutes
VCE/IB	12 minutes

Hyde Street suggests that the additional category could be introduced on a trial basis until the next rules review.

The submission acknowledges that introducing an additional category may increase administration and the duration of the championships; but considers that the developmental benefits would outweigh these challenges.

Proposal 4: Restructure Juvenile and Junior Solo Categories by School Year

Submitted by: Footscray-Yarraville City Band / Footscray Yarraville Western Brass

Footscray-Yarraville proposes restructuring the Juvenile and Junior solo categories according to school year rather than the current age-based system, while introducing an additional Youth category.

Proposed category	Eligibility
Juvenile	Years 7–9
Junior	Years 10–12
Youth	Under 22

The proposal aims to provide more equitable competition for secondary school students, particularly those in Year 10 who may currently compete against musicians undertaking tertiary-level music studies. The submission suggests using the typical ages associated with Victorian school years as a guide for interstate participants.

Key Considerations for Delegates

The submissions raise the following questions for consideration:

1. Should the Junior age limit remain Under 22 or be reduced to Under 19?
2. Should the same age eligibility apply to Junior band competitions and Junior solo competitions?
3. Would introducing an additional Under 19 solo category address concerns about competitive fairness while maintaining opportunities for older youth musicians?
4. What impact would reducing the Junior age limit have on smaller and regional Junior bands?
5. Should age eligibility continue to be assessed on 1 January, or at the date of competition?
6. Should the Juvenile age limit also be reviewed?
7. Would changes to age eligibility require a transition period?
8. What administrative and scheduling implications would arise from introducing additional solo categories?

Theme 2: Player Sharing and Contest Eligibility

Relevant Rules: 6.1, 15.1–15.9 and 16.1–16.3

Current Rules

Under Rule 15.2 of the VBL Contest Rules (Version 3.0), players may be nominated for one band in each grade at a contest, with the following exceptions:

- **Open D Grade:** Players may be nominated for any number of Open D Grade bands.
- **Percussion:** Players may perform on percussion with up to two bands in each of Open A, B and C Grades, and any number of Open D Grade and Junior bands.
- **Junior Grades:** Age limits apply.

Rule 15.5 permits a band to nominate up to two assisting musicians registered with another recognised Australasian band association.

Summary of Submissions

Player sharing is another significant theme, with submissions raising concerns about competitive fairness, particularly in the lower grades, while others seek greater flexibility to assist bands with limited player numbers.

Some bands believe that the current arrangements allow higher-grade players to have a disproportionate influence on lower-grade competitions, particularly in D Grade. Others argue that restrictions on player sharing can make it difficult for smaller bands and Junior ensembles to participate.

Submissions also mention a need for greater transparency and clearer communication between bands when players compete with multiple ensembles.

Proposed Changes

Proposal 1: Restrict Higher-Grade Players in Lower-Grade Bands

Submitted by: Stonnington City Brass

Stonnington City Brass raises concerns about A and B Grade bands supplying significant numbers of experienced players to D Grade bands, including instances where eight to ten higher-grade players may compete with a lower-grade ensemble.

The submission argues that this undermines competitive fairness and the developmental purpose of D Grade.

The proposed changes are:

- Require players to nominate a primary band and register the grade of that band.
- Permit borrowed players to compete only one grade below their registered primary band grade.
- Limit each competing band to a maximum of three external players per contest.

The intention is to prevent lower-grade bands from being substantially strengthened by players from significantly higher grades while retaining some flexibility for bands requiring assistance.

Proposal 2: Limit the Number of Bands a Player May Represent

Submitted by: Boroondara Brass

Boroondara Brass raises similar concerns about the influence of experienced higher-grade players in D Grade competitions.

The submission proposes:

- Limiting individual players to competing with a maximum of two bands at the same contest.
- Requiring C Grade and lower bands to declare the number of higher-grade players competing with them at that contest.
- Making this information available to the adjudicator to assist with an informed handicap decision.

The submission emphasises that D Grade should remain an inclusive, developmental environment where bands can build their own playing strength and experience.

Unlike Stonnington City Brass, Boroondara Brass does not propose a specific maximum number of higher-grade players. Its approach focuses on limiting overall participation and increasing transparency.

Proposal 3: Extend Player-Sharing Arrangements to C Grade

Submitted by: Footscray-Yarraville City Band / Footscray-Yarraville Western Brass

Footscray-Yarraville proposes amending Rule 15.2 to permit up to two nominated permit players per C Grade band to compete with more than one Open C Grade band at the same contest.

Currently, the rules allow players to compete with multiple Open D Grade bands, but restrict brass and wind players to one band per grade in Open C Grade.

The proposal seeks to provide greater flexibility for C Grade bands, particularly where access to suitable players is limited.

Proposal 4: Increase Flexibility for Junior Players

Submitted by: Hyde Street Youth Band

Hyde Street Youth Band proposes reviewing the restrictions on Junior players participating with multiple Open grade bands.

The submission suggests allowing Junior players to compete with two Open A, B or C Grade bands, similar to the existing arrangements for percussionists. Alternatively, it suggests adopting a permit system similar to that used at the Australian National Band Championships, allowing up to four permits.

The proposal is intended to provide more playing opportunities for young musicians and support bands that rely on Junior players to fill positions.

Proposal 5: Home-Band Recognition and Notification Requirements

Submitted by: Whitehorse Brass

Whitehorse Brass states that the current Contest Rules do not formally recognise a player's primary or home band, despite allowing players to compete with multiple bands under Rule 15.2.

The submission raises concerns that there is no requirement for a borrowing band to notify or consult with another band that regards the player as one of its members. This can lead to misunderstandings and disputes between bands, even where all parties are complying with the existing rules.

The submission calls for consideration of clearer administrative procedures around player sharing, particularly communication between the bands involved.

No specific rule amendment is proposed.

Key Considerations for Delegates

The submissions raise the following questions for consideration:

1. Should limits be introduced on the number of higher-grade players competing with lower-grade bands?
2. Should players be required to nominate a primary or home band and its grade?
3. Should there be an overall limit on the number of bands a player may represent at a single contest?
4. Should the current Open D Grade player-sharing provisions be extended to C Grade?
5. Should Junior players have greater flexibility to compete with multiple Open grade bands?
6. Should bands be required to declare the number of higher-grade players included in their contesting ensemble?
7. Should a player's home band be notified or consulted before that player is nominated by another band?
8. How can the rules balance competitive fairness with the practical needs of smaller and developing bands?

Summary

The submissions reflect differing views on the appropriate level of flexibility in player-sharing arrangements.

Stonnington City Brass and Boroondara Brass seek greater restrictions or transparency to protect competitive fairness, particularly in D Grade. Footscray-Yarraville and Hyde Street Youth Band propose greater flexibility to support participation and access to players.

Theme 3: Junior Bands Competing in Open Grades

Relevant Rule: 23.2

Current Rules

Rule 23.2 permits Junior grade bands to compete in Open D Grade, provided that they also compete in their own Junior grade at the same contest. The provision does not expressly address Junior bands competing in Open C Grade or higher.

Summary of Submissions

Three submissions address how Junior bands may enter Open grade competitions. They differ on whether entry in the band's own Junior grade should remain compulsory and which Open grades should be available. These are requests to amend or clarify the current provision; the submissions do not establish that all existing contest arrangements are invalid.

Proposed Changes

Proposal 1: Update Rule 23 to Reflect Higher Open Grades

Submitted by: Stonnington City Brass

Stonnington notes that Junior bands have competed in Open C Grade while Rule 23.2 refers specifically to Open D Grade. It requests an adjustment to the rule to reflect those circumstances. No detailed replacement wording is supplied.

Proposal 2: Allow Junior Bands to Enter an Appropriate Open Grade

Submitted by: Sunshine Community Brass

Sunshine proposes replacing 'Open D Grade' in Rule 23.2 with 'Open Grade', while retaining the requirement to compete in the band's own Junior grade at the same contest.

It also proposes a new Rule 23.3 requiring the same player list in the Junior and Open performances, subject to additions allowed by Rule 15.2.

- Amend Rule 23.2 to refer to 'Open Grade' rather than 'Open D Grade'.
- Retain compulsory entry in the band's own Junior grade.
- Require substantially the same player list across both performances, with Rule 15.2 exceptions.

Proposal 3: Remove Compulsory Junior-Grade Entry for Some Bands

Submitted by: Hyde Street Youth Band

Hyde Street proposes allowing Junior B and C Grade bands to enter Open D Grade without having to compete in their own Junior grade at the same contest. It also proposes allowing Junior A Grade bands to enter Open C Grade. This differs from Sunshine's proposal, which would retain compulsory Junior-grade entry.

Key Considerations for Delegates

- Should Rule 23.2 expressly permit Junior bands to compete above Open D Grade?
- Should entry in the corresponding Junior grade remain compulsory?
- Should a Junior band's Open-grade eligibility depend on its Junior grading?
- Should the same players be required in both Junior and Open performances, and how would existing nomination exceptions operate?

Summary

The submissions seek changes to Rule 23 but propose different conditions. In particular, Sunshine would retain compulsory Junior-grade participation, whereas Hyde Street seeks to remove it in specified circumstances.

Theme 4: Contest Programming and Performance Requirements

Relevant Rules: 17.1, 17.4 and 17.5

Current Rules

Rule 17.1 sets a 40-minute total playing time for Open brass bands and 25 minutes for Junior brass bands. Open brass bands perform a Major Work, March, Sacred Item and Own Choice Item; Junior brass bands perform a Major Work and two contrasting concert items. Rule 17.1(c) specifies the Open Concert Band items but does not state a total playing time. Rule 17.5 restricts repetition of a previously winning item within a 13-month period, subject to its stated exceptions.

Summary of Submissions

The proposals concern available programming time, the meaning of Own Choice, the suitability of set works for Junior C Grade and the absence of an express time limit for Open Concert Bands. The submissions put forward different preferences; whether those preferences warrant a rule change is for delegates to determine.

Proposed Changes

Proposal 1: Vary A Grade Time According to Set-Work Length

Submitted by: Footscray-Yarraville City Band / Footscray-Yarraville Western Brass

Footscray-Yarraville proposes retaining a 40-minute total playing time for Open B, C and D Grade brass bands, but allowing Open A Grade the specified duration of the Major Work plus 30 minutes for the remaining items. The submission argues that lengthy set works can restrict repertoire choices under the existing 40-minute limit.

Proposal 2: Define the Own Choice Item

Submitted by: Footscray-Yarraville City Band / Footscray-Yarraville Western Brass

The submission proposes defining the Own Choice Item as a Major Work distinct from the set work, and excluding an item that the band has performed and won with during the preceding 24 months. This would be a substantive programming restriction, not simply a clarification of the existing wording. The proposed 24-month period should also be considered alongside the existing 13-month restriction in Rule 17.5.

Proposal 3: Change Junior C Grade Set-Work Requirements

Submitted by: Wonthaggi Youth Brass

Wonthaggi proposes that Junior C Grade brass bands perform an entirely Own Choice program rather than a compulsory set work. Alternatively, if a set work is retained, it proposes a work scored in approximately four to eight parts. The submission argues that this would better accommodate smaller ensembles or those without standard brass-band instrumentation.

Proposal 4: Specify an Open Concert Band Time Limit

Submitted by: Sunshine Community Brass

Sunshine requests a time limit for Rule 17.1(c), which currently lists the Open Concert Band program without an express total playing time. The submission does not specify the duration to adopt.

Key Considerations for Delegates

- Should A Grade's playing time vary with the duration of the set work?
- Should Own Choice be restricted to a Major Work, and should a separate prior-winning restriction apply?
- Should Junior C Grade have an all-Own Choice program or a reduced-instrumentation set work?
- Should an express total time limit be added for Open Concert Bands, and if so, what duration?

Summary

These submissions seek specific amendments to programming requirements. Each would affect repertoire selection or contest administration differently.

Theme 5: Rules Clarity, Admin and Transparency

Relevant Rules: 1.1, 4.3, 6.1, 10.1, 11.1–11.2, 12.1, 15.2, 15.8, 16.1 and associated grading provisions

Summary of Submissions

Whitehorse Brass raises communication and administrative matters, including the regrading process and consistency of public updates. Additional technical observations were supplied in an AI-generated review forwarded with its material.

Proposed Changes and Matters Raised

Proposal 1: Greater Transparency Around Regrading

Submitted by: Whitehorse Brass

Whitehorse requests greater transparency and communication about the regrading process. The submission does not specify a replacement grading procedure or a particular amendment to the Contest Rules. Regrading is also addressed by separate VBL grading bylaws.

Proposal 2: Publish Information Consistently

Submitted by: Whitehorse Brass

Whitehorse asks that information published on the VBL Facebook page also be published on the VBL website at the same time. This is primarily a communications practice rather than necessarily a Contest Rules amendment.

Proposal 3: Review Player-Sharing Communications

Submitted by: Whitehorse Brass

Whitehorse's separate note discusses the absence of a formal home-band designation and asks for consideration of clearer communications between bands when players compete in multiple ensembles. No precise rule text is proposed. This issue is described in Theme 2 and is not repeated as an additional amendment here.

Proposal 4: Technical Observations in Supporting AI Review

The forwarded AI-generated document identifies the following potential drafting or administrative issues. They are reproduced as matters for verification, not accepted findings:

- Document footer shows 21 November 2022 although the stated adoption date is 21 November 2021.
- Rule 4.3 may refer to the wrong section for amendments; Rule 15.2 appears to refer to emergency-player Rule 16.1 rather than the nomination provision in Rule 15.1.
- Under 10, Under 12 and VCE/IB appear in the solo time limits but are not defined consistently elsewhere in the rules.
- 'Senior' is used for an age category and a school band category; terminology could be distinguished.
- Rule 12.1 could more explicitly address whether winning a Novice solo affects later Novice eligibility.

- Rule 21.1 Champion of Champions eligibility should be checked against the sections listed in Rule 11.2, including percussion.
- Rule 20.1 scoring and tie-break provisions should be checked for school and primary-school programs without a Major Work.
- The interaction between the general eligibility rule (6.1) and the two-assisting-player provision (15.5) should be checked.
- The list of recognised associations in Rule 1.1 could be reviewed for currency and completeness.
- Minor typographical and capitalisation inconsistencies could be corrected.

Additional Administrative Suggestion in Supporting AI Review

The AI review suggests allowing ordinary nomination changes until seven days before a contest, followed by the emergency-player process. This is based on the 14-day nomination deadline in Rule 15.8 and the emergency circumstances described in Rule 16.1. It is a suggested policy change and requires consideration of how the existing rules are administered.

Key Considerations for Delegates

- Which matters require amendments to the Contest Rules rather than changes to bylaws or administrative practice?
- Which apparent drafting inconsistencies are confirmed on examination of the current rules?
- Would proposed administrative changes create additional obligations or affect existing eligibility arrangements?

Summary

The submissions contain both requests for clearer communication and potential technical amendments.

Theme 6: Adjudication, Scoring and Penalties

Relevant Rules: 5.3, 18.2, 20.1, 24.1, 25 and 27 (and relevant contest procedures)

Summary of Submissions

City of Greater Bendigo Brass requests advance guidance from adjudicators. Separate questions about scoring, penalties, appeals and conflicts of interest appear in the AI-generated supporting review supplied by Whitehorse Brass. The latter are suggestions for consideration rather than verified shortcomings or formally drafted band amendments.

Proposed Changes and Matters Raised

Proposal 1: Advance Information About Adjudication Expectations

Submitted by: City of Greater Bendigo Brass

Bendigo suggests that adjudicators provide competing bands with a description of what they are looking for in each element of a performance before the contest. The submission gives differing approaches to printed tempo markings as an example. It does not provide proposed rule wording.

Proposal 2: Matters Raised in Supporting AI Review

- Rule 18.2: consider whether the existing points deduction for exceeding time limits is proportionate, or whether a smaller penalty or grace period should be introduced. The document gives a contest example but does not establish that the existing penalty was incorrectly applied.
- Rule 24.1: examine the relationship between disqualification, fines and the specific time penalty in Rule 18.2; consider whether the rules should distinguish types of breaches and specify the decision-maker.
- Rule 25: consider whether appeal deadlines and the scope of appeals, including adjudicators' results, should be made more explicit.
- Rule 27: consider whether conflict-of-interest provisions should expressly address adjudicators, as well as other contest officials.
- Rule 5.3: consider the extent to which a contest schedule may override provisions in the Contest Rules and whether any additional approval requirements are appropriate.
- Rule 15.2(b): clarify, if necessary, whether the percussion allowance is two bands in each of Open A, B and C Grade or two bands in total.
- Rule 20.1: check how scoring and tie-break provisions apply to sections that do not perform a Major Work.

Key Considerations for Delegates

- Would advance adjudicator guidance assist competitors, and how could consistency between adjudicators be maintained?
- Are the current penalties and appeal procedures sufficiently clear and appropriate?
- Which suggestions are genuine drafting ambiguities and which would change contest policy?

Concluding Notes

This document groups the submissions by topic to assist delegates in identifying the different amendments and administrative matters raised. It records the positions advanced by submitting bands without endorsing their factual assumptions or proposed solutions.

Where submissions make competing proposals, those differences have been retained. References to perceived unfairness, administrative gaps or inconsistencies reflect the submitters' views unless expressly confirmed by the current rules.

The additional AI-generated review forwarded by Whitehorse Brass is identified separately from direct band proposals. Technical suggestions from that document should be verified before any rule amendments are drafted.

Delegates may consider which matters warrant a formal rule change, which can be addressed administratively, and which require no change.