



**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE EBU LAWS & ETHICS COMMITTEE
HELD AT 40 BERNARD STREET, LONDON WC1
ON WEDNESDAY 30TH NOVEMBER 2005**

| | | |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| Present: | Martin Pool | Chairman |
| | Richard Fleet | Vice-Chairman |
| | Steve Barnfield | |
| | Max Bavin | Chief Tournament Director |
| | David Burn | |
| | Jeremy Dhondy | |
| | David Stevenson | |
| | Grattan Endicott | Vice-President |
| | Nick Doe | Secretary |

1. Election of Committee Chairman for the Year 2005/06

Mr Doe welcomed members to the meeting, and called for nominations for Chairman. Mr Pool was nominated by Mr Fleet and seconded by Mr Barnfield. There being no other nominations, Mr Pool was declared duly elected. He thanked the Committee.

2. Election of Committee Vice-Chairman for the Year 2005/06

Mr Fleet was proposed by Mr Pool and seconded by Mr Barnfield. There being no other nominations, Mr Fleet was declared duly elected.

| | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| 3. Apologies for Absence | David Martin | |
| | Philip Mason | EBU Vice-Chairman |
| | Denis Robson | EBU Chairman |
| | Gerard Faulkner | Vice-President |

4. Minutes of Previous Meeting (21st September 2005)

4.1 Accuracy

The minutes were agreed to be a true record and signed by the Chairman.

4.2 **Matters arising**

4.2.1 *Psyches and “forgets” (item 2.2.3)*

Mr Doe said that he had been asked to clarify whether the new regulation was of immediate effect, or would come into force with the 2006 *Orange Book*. The L&E decided that the former was appropriate.

Mr Bavin drew the L&E’s attention to the fact that it could be argued that the regulation was contrary to the Laws on the basis that the Laws require full disclosure of players’ agreements. The L&E was happy that its position was legally defensible, as it is not part of a pair’s agreements to forget them.

4.2.2 *Permitted methods – minimum strength for artificial openings (item 5.5)*

Mr Doe said that he had been asked to clarify whether the new minimum would apply to strong diamond openings. The L&E confirmed that this was its intention.

4.2.3 *Articles for English Bridge (referred to in item 5.8)*

The L&E was pleased to note that it appeared that the matter had been satisfactorily sorted out, with articles on announcements under the joint authorship of Messrs Pool and Stevenson appearing in the October and December issues.

4.2.4 *Changes to psyche form (referred to in item 6.1)*

Subject to the elimination of one typographical error, the L&E approved some changes to the form, drawn up by Mr Doe following not only the comments at the last meeting but also some observations by Mr Stevenson on a matter raised at an earlier meeting.

4.2.5 *Correspondence with players – 05.22 (item 6.3)*

The L&E considered the following psyche from the Easter Festival in London, which had been classified on site as Green, in the light of comments from the partner of the player who had psyched. The L&E reclassified the psyche as being in the Amber category.

Dealer N
Game all

North

♠ Q 10 5 2
♥ A 9 8 4 3 2
♦ 8
♣ Q 3

West

♠ K 9 4
♥ K J
♦ A J 9 5
♣ A 9 7 6

East

♠ A 7 6
♥ 10 7
♦ Q 7 4 3
♣ K J 10 8

South

♠ J 8 3
♥ Q 6 5
♦ K 10 6 2
♣ 5 4 2

Bidding:

West

North

East

South

| | | | |
|------|------|------|------|
| Pass | Pass | Pass | 1♥ |
| 1NT | 2♥ | Dbl | Pass |
| 2NT | 3♥ | Dbl | Pass |
| Pass | Pass | | |

4.2.6 *Correspondence with players – 05.30 (item 6.4)*

Mr Doe apologised that there was no further material to consider because the need to write to the players had been overlooked.

4.2.7 *Conflicting information (item 6.5)*

The L&E noted an exchange of views between L&E members, initiated by Mr Fleet after the last meeting. It concluded that the TD must be called whenever it appears that a player may be in receipt of conflicting information (such as where the alerting (or lack of it) is inconsistent with the convention card or the convention card is internally inconsistent). If the player carries on regardless without calling the TD, then it is at his own risk, and it will be difficult to justify any claim for an adjustment on the grounds of misinformation if the player guesses which information to believe and happens to guess wrong.

The L&E decided that this situation should be added to the list in the draft *Orange Book* of occasions on which it is particularly important for the TD to be called.

Any other matters arising (including action points) not featuring elsewhere on the agenda

4.2.8 *Implications of Appeal to the National Authority of 26.7.05 (item 3)*

Mr Pool asked whether L&E members felt the need for any further discussion in the absence of further correspondence. They did not.

5. *Disciplinary matters*

5.1 *Complaint from a One-day event (“Donkey”)*

The L&E noted that Mr Pool had decided not to write to the player complained of for comments, in the belief that the L&E was unlikely to wish to pursue the matter. It felt that as a general rule a decision not to write for comments should be fairly rare, even if there was a good chance that the L&E would not wish to take any further action, and Mr Doe was asked to seek comments in this case.

5.2 *Complaint from an EBU event (“Elephant”)*

Mr Doe was asked to seek comments from the player complained of.

5.3 *Complaint about a club (“Ferret”)*

The L&E considered a complaint about the conduct of a club in relation to a player who was not a member of the club. It concluded that the matter did not fall within the scope of the Disciplinary Rules, and rightly so, as it was quite properly a matter for the club to decide whether or not it would permit the player to play as a visitor.

5.4 *Disciplinary penalties*

The L&E noted that a few recent complaints had concerned incidents where the TD on site had imposed a disciplinary penalty. It was clear that there were some aspects relating to disciplinary penalties where either the Law required clarification or the L&E's intentions could usefully be set out in more detail.

The L&E decided that as a matter of Law:-

- A procedural or disciplinary penalty may be appealed by any contestant involved at the table at which the incident giving rise to the penalty arose, but not by any other contestant. (Note – if the behaviour under penalty takes place away from the table, nobody except the contestant penalised will have a right to appeal).
- The only matter in respect of which the TD's decision is final under Law 91A (and thus not subject to any appeal) is the power to suspend a contestant for the whole or part of the current session.
- In the case of a disciplinary penalty, the Appeals Committee has no power to change the penalty, but can only recommend that the TD change his decision.

It further decided that as a matter of policy:-

- Disciplinary penalties should be expressed in multiples of the standard amount for the final method of scoring.

- In normal circumstances the minimum amount which a TD should consider imposing as a disciplinary penalty is twice the standard amount. (Note – this is because the L&E considers that an offence which warrants a disciplinary penalty is inherently a more serious matter than any infraction warranting a standard procedural penalty, and should accordingly be penalised more heavily as a matter of course).
- Only in exceptional circumstances would it be appropriate for a procedural or disciplinary penalty to be varied following an appeal by a contestant other than the one penalised.
- Deposits should be taken on any appeal against a disciplinary penalty, and forfeited if appropriate under the usual criteria.

The L&E noted a suggestion that to consider a complaint with a view to possible disciplinary proceedings, when a disciplinary penalty had already been imposed on site, was inappropriate as involving an element of double jeopardy for the offenders. The L&E dismissed this argument. It was quite wrong to suggest that in a case serious enough to warrant disqualification on site the L&E should be precluded from taking further action, whereas in other cases further action might still be warranted because the powers of the L&E differ from those of the TD on site.

In passing the L&E noted that there is a common misconception that EBU regulations prescribe an automatic penalty if a player's mobile phone goes off in the playing area during play. The L&E considered that it was appropriate to have a regulation that mobile telecommunications equipment was only permitted in the playing area if switched off, and that there should be an automatic penalty if the equipment went off. It commended the suggestion to the Tournament Committee.

5.5 Complaint from a match played privately in an EBU competition

[additional item]

The L&E considered correspondence from a player who had said that he did not wish to make a formal complaint involving possible disciplinary proceedings, but still hoped that the L&E might see fit to write to his opponents about their alleged conduct. The L&E noted that on rare occasions in the past it had been considered appropriate to write to a player to draw attention to the fact that an opponent had been moved to write to the L&E, and to seek comments despite the fact that formal disciplinary proceedings were not contemplated. It decided, however, that it was not generally appropriate to follow up correspondence in this way when it was clear that a formal complaint was not being made. No further action was appropriate on this occasion.

6. Terms of reference

The L&E noted that the Board was minded to introduce formal terms of reference for the two Standing Committees which currently lacked them, and had asked the Committees to consider and comment on matters which should be addressed in drafting them. The L&E considered a draft which Mr Doe had been asked to produce in consultation with Mr Pool, and thought it suitable to be recommended to the Board for adoption.

7. Orange Book changes

7.1 Convention cards – revised EBU 20A

The L&E considered a further draft produced by Mr Doe following the discussion at the previous meeting, and agreed minor amendments. The amended draft is included as Appendix A to these minutes.

The L&E noted that the stocks of the current EBU 20A held by Aylesbury are very low, and agreed that the new version should be brought into use in advance of the implementation of the 2006 *Orange Book*, in order to avoid the necessity to reprint the old version.

7.2 Convention cards – proposal to dispense with EBU 20

The L&E agreed to discontinue the official use of the EBU 20 card. Players adopting relatively simple methods would however be permitted to continue to use it if they wished.

7.3 Disclosure of system – the requirement to be aware of opponents' basic system

The L&E considered a proposal from Mr Stevenson to omit this regulation from the 2006 *Orange Book*, on the grounds that it caused confusion and seemed not to produce much benefit. In a sense it had served its purpose because its principal benefit had been to discourage questions about opening no trump ranges. When the new *Orange Book* came into force such problems would be addressed in a different way by the introduction of announcements.

The L&E agreed that the provision should be deleted.

7.4 Permitted methods – tactical bids

Mr Stevenson drew attention to the tendency of some players to use an artificial 2NT enquiry in response to partner's weak two not only on strong hands but also on some weak hands as a "tactical manoeuvre". The agreement to use the bid on such hands is often no more than implicit, but is nonetheless real if opener recognises the possibility. Opponents who are less able to recognise the possibility are at risk of being misled – even if the bid is described as an artificial enquiry, without reference to strength, they are likely to assume that it has to be strong, as that is how it is normally played. The L&E decided that there was no reason why such tactical bids should not be permitted, subject to full disclosure, but it was appropriate to reinforce the need for full disclosure by including a reference to such bids in the relevant section of the *Orange Book*.

7.5 Permitted methods – application (M. Bell)

The L&E approved an application to permit natural, forcing, openings of 1♥/1♠. These would be permitted at Level 2 and would be alertable.

7.6 Timetable and practical arrangements for publication

Mr Pool reported that the Board had requested that the *Orange Book* be published (i.e. printed and available for distribution) by 1st June if it were to be brought into force on 1st August. Mr Stevenson considered that he was now in a position to produce a final draft, which he hoped could be circulated to proof-readers in the near future. The L&E agreed that a draft should be circulated to L&E members as early as possible in December, to give them a final opportunity to comment, with a view to producing a final text to go to the Board in January.

Mr Doe reported that quotes for publication had been obtained and other practical issues investigated, with seemingly satisfactory results.

The L&E noted that no nomenclature had been suggested to replace the use of the terms Level 2, Level 3 and Level 4. Whilst noting that it was somewhat illogical to use these terms in the light of the decision to abandon the use of the terms Level 1 and Level 5 (i.e. to have three numbered levels starting at "2"), no new terms which were obviously superior had been suggested. For example, descriptive terms such as "Basic Level", "Club Level", and "Tournament Level" were considered flawed, not least because they suggested, wrongly, that there was an automatic correlation between the type of event and the systems policy in force. The L&E agreed that the existing terms would continue to be used (with a suitable explanation in the *Orange Book*) unless any better suggestions emerged. Suggestions were still welcome.

7.7 Other issues – valuation methods

The L&E considered correspondence highlighting the difficulty of regulating by the use of a valuation method such as Opening Points (i.e. Rule of X), which is absolute, when players wished to use judgment of matters such as playing strength in deciding whether a particular hand was worth an opening bid. Players whose methods included light opening bids might find that they wished to (and might well have an implicit agreement to) open certain hands which did not comply with the Rule of (say) 19, but which were considered stronger than other hands which did comply with the Rule of 19 but would not routinely be opened. The L&E noted that it was possible to reinforce the use of Opening Points by including a provision in the *Orange Book* that "weaker than this" meant "weaker, by reference to Opening Points...*", but this did not really solve the problem.

**[Secretary's Note – indeed, such a provision has already been agreed – see Appendix B, item 2.1.2]*

The L&E did not reach a conclusion, but noted that it had considered the matter some years ago, and the recollection of some L&E members was that it had minuted that some flexibility was appropriate. Mr Doe was asked to locate the old minute, in case it could be adapted to form the basis of a clarifying provision. It was likely to be possible to devise a provision allowing for the possibility of adjusting the valuation of a hand to take account of matters such as playing strength (intermediates, honour structure etc.), provided that the result was considered to be a reasonable bridge judgment. However, to regulate by reference to a concept of reasonableness might lead to an undesirable lack of consistency.

7.8 Other issues – permitted methods – application (R. Cannon)

The L&E refused an application to allow a 2♣ opening with weak and strong options at Level 3.

[Secretary's note – a copy of the updated cumulative record of Orange Book decisions is attached as Appendix B to these minutes].

8. White Book

8.1 Index

Mr Doe apologised that he had underestimated the time required to complete the task, which he now hoped would be completed by Christmas.

8.2 Practical arrangements for publication in hard copy

Mr Doe reported that quotes for publication had been obtained and other practical issues investigated, with seemingly satisfactory results.

9. Date of next meeting

Wednesday 11th January at 1.15 pm at 40 Bernard Street. It was agreed that *Orange Book* changes would be placed first on the agenda and Reports from Tournament Directors second.

10. Reports from Tournament Directors

10.1 05.61

The L&E considered a report from the Brighton Summer Congress in the light of correspondence with the players concerned. Mr Doe was asked to write again to one of the players for further information.

Due to lack of time consideration of the remaining reports was deferred.

[Secretary's note – will L&E members please retain the papers relating to Reports from Tournament Directors]

11. Any other business

11.1 Data Protection and access to contact details

Mr Doe gave L&E members details of the contact details held for them on the EBU membership database, and sought approval for them to be combined into a directory for circulation to fellow L&E members, which was given.



Name _____ EBU No. _____
 Partner _____ EBU No. _____

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF BIDDING METHODS

1NT OPENINGS AND RESPONSES

Strength _____ Tick if artificial and provide details below
Shape constraints _____ Tick if may have singleton

Responses 2+ _____
 2♦ _____ 2♥ _____
 2♣ _____ 2NT _____
 Others _____

TWO-LEVEL OPENINGS AND RESPONSES

| Meaning | Responses | Notes |
|---------|-----------|-------|
| 2+ | | |
| 2♦ | | |
| 2♥ | | |
| 2♣ | | |
| 2NT | | |

OTHER ASPECTS OF SYSTEM WHICH OPPONENTS SHOULD NOTE

OPENING LEADS

| (For all the card combinations shown, clearly mark the card normally led if different from the underlined card). | | (Hatch over this box if using non-standard leads). | |
|--|----------|--|---------|
| ♠ suit contracts | A K x | K Q 10 | K J 10 |
| | Q J x | 10 x x | 9 8 7 x |
| | H x x x | H x x x x x | x x x |
| ♥ suit contracts | A K x(x) | K Q 10 | K J 10 |
| | Q J x | 10 x x | 9 8 7 x |
| | H x x x | H x x x x x | x x x |

Other agreements in leading, e.g. high level contracts, partnership suits:-

CARDING METHODS

| | Primary method v suit contracts | Primary method v NT contracts |
|---|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| On Partner's lead | | |
| On Declarer's lead | | |
| When discarding | | |
| Other carding agreements, including secondary methods (state when applicable) and exceptions to above | | |

SUPPLEMENTARY DETAILS (ctd)



RUNNING MASTER RECORD OF LAWS & ETHICS COMMITTEE DECISIONS CONCERNING ORANGE BOOK REVISIONS

The current Orange Book was published in 1988, although a number of amendments have been brought into force since then, details of which are contained in the current cumulative update booklet (yellow, dated January 2005, incorporating changes coming into force on 1st April 2005). The EBU Laws & Ethics Committee ("L&E") is currently undertaking a complete review of the *Orange Book* with a view to publication of a new edition which is likely to come into force some time in 2006. This paper sets out the current state of the proposals, and is updated on a meeting by meeting basis. It was originally based on the digest of *Orange Book* decisions prepared for Council following the L&E meetings in November and December 2004.

In two respects the wording in this paper does not necessarily represent the precise wording which will be included in the 2006 *Orange Book*:-

- to some extent the decisions of the L&E are paraphrased in this paper – the actual minutes should be referred to for detailed wording if necessary; and
- in a number of cases the wording of the minutes themselves will not necessarily be included verbatim in the new *Orange Book*, the precise wording of which will be a matter for the detailed drafting, some of which remains to be done.

In addition, not all proposed changes to the Orange Book are included in this paper. A number of changes of, presentation, order, wording and other matters have been introduced by the Editor on his own initiative or in response to suggestions from L&E members and others. The L&E has seen successive drafts, in which these changes are reflected, but details are not included in this paper unless they have been specifically discussed by the L&E.

Some sections of the original Council paper are not included in this paper, notably details of the changes coming into force on 1st April 2005, which can be found in the cumulative update booklet.

Revision 6 – November 2005. This reflects decisions made at the November 2005 L&E meeting, and changes since the previous version are underlined.

SECTION 1 – ALERTING (including ANNOUNCEMENTS)

1.1 Basic alerting rules

1.1.1 Passes and bids

You must alert a pass or bid if

- it is not natural; or
- it is natural but has a potentially unexpected meaning.

1.1.2 Doubles

- doubles of natural suit bids – not alertable if for takeout; alertable otherwise;
- doubles of no trump bids – not alertable if for penalties; alertable otherwise;
- doubles of artificial suit bids – not alertable if shows the suit doubled; alertable otherwise.

(Note – for the purposes of the first bullet a form of words is to be devised to include with natural suit bids opening bids of one of a minor suit which are in principle natural, but may be made on fewer than three cards in the suit (i.e. including “short” clubs and Precision diamonds, but not strong clubs or diamonds or “either-or” clubs, none of which are “in principle natural”))

1.1.3 Redoubles

- redoubles which are for business or show general strength, which partner is normally expected to pass if the next hand passes – not alertable;
- other redoubles (notably those partner is expected to take out) – alertable.

1.2 Alerting rules – Exceptions

1.2.1 Announceable bids

Bids should not be alerted if an announcement is required instead (see section 1.4)

1.2.2 Calls above 3NT

In principle no calls above 3NT to be alerted except for:-

- artificial opening bids;
- lead-directing passes; and
- lead-directing doubles and redoubles that ask for the lead of a suit other than the suit doubled.

(Note – doubles of a potential final contract which carry a lead-directing message, such as Lightner doubles, are within the final bullet).

1.2.3 Exceptions

The following will not require an alert:-

- a 2♦ response to an **announceable** 2♣ Stayman enquiry

1.3 Alerting rules – Specific instances

1.3.1 Potentially short minor-suit openings

Not alertable (because not unexpected) if in principle natural, but may be made on three cards in the suit, but not fewer.

Alertable (because potentially unexpected) if in principle natural, but may be made on fewer than three cards in the suit.

(Note – openings which are not in principle natural, such as strong clubs or diamonds or “either-or” clubs, will remain alertable).

1.3.2 Walsh

No change:-

- 1♦ response to 1♣ which denies a major unless strong (typically game-forcing) – not alertable;
- 1♥/1♠ response to 1♣ which may be a 4-card suit, concealing longer diamonds – alertable.

1.3.3 Completion of transfers

Not alertable unless it shows something specific, e.g. shows or specifically denies a particular length in responder’s suit.

1.3.4 Rescue sequences when 1NT is doubled

No change.

1.3.5 Natural openings at the two level

Not alertable because now announceable.

(Note – openings which show the suit bid, but promise another suit, are not natural (and will therefore remain alertable). Openings which show the suit bid and have distributional constraints relating to other suits, but only promise another suit in certain defined circumstances, are now considered natural for alerting/announcing purposes (and will therefore be announceable)).

1.3.6 Very common alerts

Proposals were made to eliminate alerts of artificial bids in certain very common situations, namely:-

- fourth suit forcing;
- a 2NT strong enquiry response to a natural weak two opening.
- bids of opponents suits

These new proposals have been rejected. There will be no change – the bids concerned will remain alertable (and a bid of an opponent’s suit which is used in a natural sense will remain non-alertable).

1.3.7 Natural forcing openings of 1♥/1♠

Alertable as having a potentially unexpected meaning.

1.4 Announcements

1.4.1 Basic purpose of announcements

- Instead of an alert in the traditional manner, the partner of the person who makes an announceable bid makes a short specified statement about the bidder's hand.
- In effect, announcements are a specialist form of alert.
- Questions can still be asked, as they can about alerted bids.
- Announcements are not intended to provide comprehensive explanations – matters of detail will still be disclosed by means of information on convention cards and the answers to questions.

1.4.2 Scope of announcements – 1NT openings and responses

- natural 1NT openings to be announced by stating the range;
- where a 1NT opening which is in principle natural may be made by agreement on some hands which contain a singleton, the statement “may contain a singleton” to be added to the range announcement;
- Stayman to be announced:-
 - in response to a natural 1NT opening;
 - where there has been no intervention; and
 - where it is used in the traditional manner to ask for a 4-card major; and
- red suit transfers (i.e. ♦s to ♥s and ♥s to ♠s) to be announced by naming the suit shown, i.e. “hearts” or “spades” (the wording is the recommended wording; variations (e.g. “transfer to hearts”) are not subject to penalty but players should be consistent):-
 - in response to a natural 1NT opening;
 - where there has been no intervention; and
 - where the transfer guarantees at least 5 cards in the major suit concerned.

1.4.3 Scope of announcements – 2-level opening bids

- a natural opening bid of two of a suit should be announced by stating the range into which it falls, from the following categories (the wording is the recommended wording; variations are not subject to penalty but players should be consistent):-
 - strong forcing
 - strong not forcing
 - intermediate
 - weak

(Note – openings which show the suit bid and have distributional constraints relating to other suits, but only promise another suit in certain defined circumstances, are now considered natural. Openings which show the suit bid, but promise another suit, are not natural).

1.4.4 Regulations for hearing-impaired players

None considered necessary, although the possibility to be borne in mind if the scope of announcements is widened in future.

SECTION 2 – PERMITTED METHODS

2.1 General

2.1.1 Number of Levels

- No Levels 1 or 5;
- Levels 2 and 4 to be published in full in the *Orange Book*, and virtually all EBU events to be played at one of these Levels;
- Level 3 to be included in the *Orange Book*, for use by other sponsoring organisations.
- Nomenclature will remain unchanged, unless a convincing alternative to “Level 2” etc. is proposed (descriptive terminology so far considered is flawed). An explanation of the apparent illogicality of having three numbered levels, starting at “2”, will be included.

2.1.2 Valuation methods

A note to be introduced that whilst other methods of hand valuation are permitted, compliance with minimum strength requirements will be assessed by reference to HCP and/or Rule of X, as appropriate.

However, the possibility of introducing a provision to allow judgement of such things as playing strength (intermediates, honour structure etc.) to depart from the strict requirements, will be investigated.

2.1.3 Treatments

The section to be simplified. The provisions restricting treatment of the Multi at Level 3 (which will be the only method in respect of which treatments are banned) to be moved to the section dealing with the Level 3 Multi.

2.1.4 Random calls

The prohibition on agreements to make random calls to be removed, subject to a new regulation on disclosure (see section 3.1.2)

Note – any such agreements will remain subject to the generality of the permitted methods regulations, so that, in effect, random calls will only be permitted in situations where any defence (continuation etc.) is allowed.

2.1.5 Two different systems at different conditions (i.e. position and/or vulnerability)

Two examples of things which are not considered within the prohibition:-

- playing 4-card major openings at some conditions and 5-card majors at others;
- varying the meanings of two-level openings according to position or vulnerability.

2.1.6 Strong openings

The minimum strength for an opening to be defined as strong to be Rule of 25, rather than Rule of 23.

The use of the expression “non-strong opening” to be discontinued.

Regulation of the minimum strength of strong artificial openings at the one level to be changed to a combination of HCP and “Rule of X”.

2.1.7 Nomenclature – Multi 2♦

References to a Multi 2♦, without qualification, mean a traditional Multi where:-

- there is ambiguity as to the major suit held if the hand is weak; and
- there is at least one strong option of reasonable frequency.

Although the word “Multi” may be used as part of the description of a “♥s only” or a “weak only” Multi, players must disclose the full range of options. If a short description is used, a suitable qualification must be included in the case of any non-standard Multi.

2.1.8 Tactical bids

Bids which are ostensibly strong, but may be made as a tactical manoeuvre on a weak hand by agreement (often implicit) are permitted, subject to the requirement to disclose the use of the bid fully. (Primary example – 2NT enquiry in response to a weak two).

2.2 New Level 2 provisions

2.2.1 Natural or balanced openings of one of a minor

To clarify the current position, a 1♣ or 1♦ opening which can be played as natural or balanced may alternatively be played as canapé, provided that at least 4 cards are held in the suit.

2.2.2 Strong 1♣ and 1♦ openings

The minimum strength to be Rule of 25 or 16 HCP.

2.2.3 1♥/1♠ openings

These to be permitted to be played as natural and forcing.

2.2.4 Opening bids at the two level

The following to be permitted:-

- any two-level opening bid which has only strong options;
- any opening bid of two of a suit which shows a three-suiter including the suit bid, even if it only guarantees 3+ cards in the suit bid.

2.2.5 2NT opening as minor two-suiter

No longer to be permitted at Level 2.

2.2.6 Strong two-suited 2NT overcall

2NT to be permitted to show a strong two-suiter with no anchor suit, in defence to one of a suit or 1NT. Minimum strength Rule of 26.

2.2.7 Defence by fourth hand

The provisions to be extended to permit any overcall to show a two-suiter including the bid suit.

2.2.8 Defence to 1NT

A double to be permitted to have any meaning which includes a specified suit of at least 3 cards in a three-suited hand, and 4 cards otherwise.

2.2.9 Cotterill semi-positive 1NT

No longer to be permitted at Level 2.

2.2.10 Encrypted signals

The ban on encrypted signals to remain, subject to one exception. Wording to be changed to make it clear that all encrypted carding methods are within the ban.

2.2.11 *Dual meaning signals*

The reference to suit preference to be removed.

2.3 *New Level 3 provisions*

2.3.1 *Minimum strength for opening bids at the one level*

A lower limit was proposed but not agreed. No change.

2.3.2 *Minimum strength for opening bids at the one level in third and fourth positions*

A lower limit than that applying in first and second positions was proposed but not agreed. No change.

2.3.3 *“Either-or” 1♣ openings*

A proposal to permit these at Level 3 was not agreed. No change.

2.3.4 *Natural 1NT openings*

- 6-3-3-1 distribution to be added to the distributions permitted to contain a singleton;
- The restriction relating to the rank of the singleton in a 5-4-3-1 hand to be removed;
- All remaining restrictions and general provisions to continue in force (except the alerting provision which is superseded by the new announcement provisions).

2.3.5 *Strong artificial 1NT openings*

The minimum strength to be brought in line with that for a strong artificial openings at the two level.

2.3.6 *Opening bids at the two level*

The following to be permitted:-

- a Multi 2♦ which has ♥s as its only non-strong option (a “♠s only” option was rejected);
- a 2♣ or 2♦ opening to show both majors with a minimum length of 4/4.

2.3.7 *Treatment of Multi 2♦ at Level 3*

The following is a treatment, currently not permitted, but in principle not objectionable, and to be allowed from OB 2006:-

- an agreement to open a Multi with a weak hand with a 5+ card major, but not on a balanced hand with only a 5-card suit, i.e. if the main suit is only of 5 cards, the hand will also contain a side suit of 4+ cards.

The following is not a treatment and is currently permitted:-

- an agreement to vary the strength and/or suit length for the weak two element of a Multi according to position and/or vulnerability.

2.3.8 *2NT opening as minor two-suiter*

The restriction to a 5-point range to be removed.

2.3.9 *Responses to opening bids, overcalls and doubles*

Any response to be permitted to any opening bid, overcall or double, subject to strengthening of the general prohibition on conventions designed to deceive opponents intentionally as to the length or strength of a suit and/or the strength of a hand.

2.3.10 *Cotterill semi-positive 1NT*

Constructive values to be required in place of a specified point count.

2.3.11 Canapé overcalls

Canapé overcalls to be permitted, provided that the suit bid is of 4+ cards.

2.3.12 Transfer overcalls

Any overcall to be permitted that shows at least 4 cards in a specified suit, subject to the existing strength requirements.

2.3.13 Defence to 1NT

Any defence to be permitted.

2.4 New Level 4 provisions

2.4.1 Minimum strength for one-level openings

The overriding ban on openings at the one level by agreement on 7 HCP or less to be abandoned.

Note – no change is proposed to the other provisions relating to minimum strength, i.e.:-

- it is not permitted to open a conventional one of a suit by agreement on less than Rule of 18;
- opening a natural one of a suit by agreement on less than Rule of 18 is subject to the no conventions rule; and
- opening a natural 1NT by agreement on less than 9 HCP is subject to the no conventions rule.

2.4.2 “Either-or” 1♣ openings

The minimum strength for the strong option to be brought in line with that for a strong 1♣ opening, namely Rule of 25 or 16 HCP.

2.4.3 Opening bids of one of a suit

Any opening to be permitted that shows at least 4 cards in a specified suit, subject to the normal minimum strength requirements.

2.4.4 1♠ opening

To be permitted to show an unbalanced hand with either minor.

2.4.5 Artificial (but not strong) 1NT openings

Any 1NT opening to be permitted which shows at least 4 cards in a specified suit, minimum strength of Rule of 18.

(Note – this introduces a blanket permission in place of the small number of openings of this type currently specifically permitted).

2.4.6 Opening bids at the two level

The rules to be simplified to permit any opening bid which satisfies one of the following conditions:-

- all the non-strong options include the same specified suit of at least 4 cards; or
- all the non-strong options have a specification which does not include holding 4+ cards in the suit bid.

2.4.7 Opening bids at the three Level

Multi-way openings to be permitted to show either a weak hand with a specified suit or any number of strong hands (minimum Rule of 25).

2.4.8 Removal of restrictions on the strength of various conventions

- Stoker 1NT opening – Minimum strength Rule of 18. No maximum.
- Clarke 3♣ opening; Dhondy 3♣ opening – No stipulated range.
- Bliss cue bid – No stipulated range.
- Mollo 1NT overcall – No maximum strength.
- Reese 2♣ protection – No minimum strength.

2.4.9 Transfer overcalls

Any overcall to be permitted that shows at least 4 cards in a specified suit, subject to the strength requirements previously only applicable at Level 3.

2.4.10 Mollo and Gardener 1NT overcalls

The requirement of at least a 6-card suit for the Mollo overcall, and the weak option of the Gardener overcall, and the restriction on treatments of the Gardener overcall, to be removed.

SECTION 3 – OTHER REGULATIONS

3.1 Disclosure of system

3.1.1 Questions during the auction

No change to the present advice to defer questions if the action at that turn does not depend on the answer.

3.1.2 Random calls

A new regulation to be introduced concerning disclosure of agreements to make random calls, including:-

- that players adopting an agreement to make calls which had no specified meaning would be under an obligation to take great care over disclosure, particularly of negative inferences; and
- that such players would be ruled against unless a TD was completely satisfied that they had given full disclosure.

3.1.3 Experienced and inexperienced players

The provision that the Laws are not intended to provide scope for knowledgeable players to gain advantage at the expense of inexperienced players to be deleted.

3.1.4 Knowing your opponents' basic system

The requirement to be aware of opponents' basic system, no trump range and style of leads, signals and discards at the start of the round to be abandoned.

3.2 Convention card design

3.2.1 EBU 20

Official use to be discontinued. Players adopting relatively simple methods to be permitted to continue to use it.

3.2.2 EBU 20A

Revised draft now approved in principle.

3.3 Psyches

3.3.1 Classification

Minor amendments to the regulations to improve clarity.

3.3.2 Illegal psyches

The ban on psyching game-forcing or nearly game-forcing artificial openings to be removed

The ban on psyching a Multi in a Level 3 event to remain.

3.3.3 WBF convention cards

The prohibition on references to psychic habits on such convention cards to be removed.

3.4 Procedures

3.4.1 Stop procedure

No specific changes proposed but further discussion to take place if specific proposals formulated, in particular as to whether:-

- to apply the procedure to tempo-sensitive situations where it does not currently apply because there has been no jump bid;
- to change the obligations of the opponents when the procedure is not correctly followed by the side which makes the jump bid.

3.5 Other

3.5.1 Occasions on which it is particularly important to call the TD.

To be added to the list:-

- when there is conflicting information about the opponents' methods, such as where the alerting (or lack of it) is inconsistent with the convention card or the convention card is internally inconsistent.