



**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE EBU LAWS & ETHICS COMMITTEE  
HELD AT IMPERIAL HOTEL, RUSSELL SQUARE, LONDON WC1  
ON TUESDAY 11<sup>TH</sup> NOVEMBER 2008**

<b>Present:</b>	Jeremy Dhondy	Chairman and Elected Member
	Mike Amos	Elected Member
	Sally Bugden	EBU Chairman
	David Burn	Elected Member
	Frances Hinden	Elected Member
	Neil Morley	Elected Member
	Martin Pool	Vice Chairman and Elected Member
	David Stevenson	Elected Member
	Gerard Faulkner	Vice-President
	John Pain	Secretary

**1. Election of Chairman and Vice Chairman**

The Secretary invited nominations for the post of Chairman. Mr Pool proposed Jeremy Dhondy as Chairman. There were no other nominations and Jeremy was declared elected.

The Chairman proposed Martin Pool as Vice Chairman. There were no other nominations and Martin was declared elected.

The Chairman took the opportunity to remind members of the confidential nature of some of the Committee's work.

The Chairman noted the recent death of Jon Williams. Mr Dhondy said it was a sad loss and extended the Committee's sympathy to Jon's family.

<b>2. Apologies for Absence</b>	Max Bavin	Chief Tournament Director
	Barry Capal	EBU General Manager
	Grattan Endicott	Vice-President
	Andrew Petrie	EBU Vice Chairman

The Chairman welcomed Neil Morley to his first meeting of the Committee.

Mrs Bugden said that the EBU Board wished it placed on the record its appreciation of the work done by Martin Pool during the five years he had been Chairman of the Laws and Ethics Committee. She was especially pleased that Martin would be maintaining the link between the Committee and the Board. On behalf of the Board she wished Jeremy good luck in his new role as Chairman of the committee.

**3.1/2 Accuracy**

There were no corrections.

The minutes of the meeting of September 4th were approved and signed.

### **3.3 Matters arising**

#### **3.3.1 Disciplinary Case 'Vesuvius'**

The Secretary reported that a hearing had been held on September 22<sup>nd</sup> and that the member had appealed against the decision of the Disciplinary Committee and the sanction imposed. The appeal process was currently taking its course.

#### **3.3.2 Disciplinary Case 'Blackfriars'**

The Secretary reported that the member had admitted the charge and a Disciplinary Committee was due to meet on November 14<sup>th</sup> to decide upon a sanction.

#### **3.3.3 Referees Panel**

The Secretary reported that Jeffrey Allerton and Jon Williams had both accepted the invitation to join the Panel of Referees. Jon had officiated at the Autumn Congress before his untimely death. It was agreed to leave the panel as it is for the time being.

#### **3.3.4 Orange Book reprint**

The Secretary reported that the shop currently had approximately 450 Orange Books in stock with little prospect of significant numbers being used. A printer's quote for replacement books was considered but the Committee did not favour a reprint at the current time – particularly with more changes due. Mrs Bugden suggested that in future the Orange Book should only be available in downloadable form as printed copies went out of date very quickly.

#### **3.3.5 Calls considered made using bidding boxes**

Mr Stevenson reported on his investigations. In WBF and ACBL events the regulation is that a call is considered made when the bidding cards hit the table. In most of Europe (except France) the regulation is the same as in England – namely when the cards are removed from the bidding box with apparent intent.

Mr Amos said he encountered no difficulty with the current regulation and Miss Hinden suggested that if the method worked she saw no reason to change it.

It was agreed to revisit the matter next time when the Chief TD would be present.

#### **3.3.6 Psyches in EBU Tournaments**

A discussion to revisit item 6.9 of the minutes of September 4<sup>th</sup> was deferred until the next meeting when the Chief TD would be present.

#### **3.3.7 Simplified Orange Book**

Discussions between Miss Hinden and Mr Amos were ongoing but it was hoped to have a first draft available before the next meeting. Miss Hinden sought clarification over its purpose and it was confirmed that it was an attempt to both simplify and to make it more readable. The Chairman said that the current 72 pages were just too intimidating for most people and Mr Stevenson noted that attempts to provide more explanation had, in fact, made the current book longer than before. Mr Morley agreed the current book was off-putting and there was a need to provide a relatively easy and readable document. **ACTION: FH MA**

Mr Faulkner suggested that the principle was an excellent one but he felt the practice of producing it might be difficult.

The chairman said that the aim was to have the completed work ready for publication on August 1<sup>st</sup> 2009.

#### **3.3.8 Report from Club Committee**

Mr Pool reported back from the Club Committee. They had considered the recommendations regarding the proposed changes to alerting of doubles and thought them very good. They had one suggestion which was to turn the suggested wording around so that the regulation told players what they could do rather than what they could not do. The committee would consider the matter after the Club Committee had reported back from its meeting on January 19<sup>th</sup>. **ACTION MP**

### 3.3.9 *Guidance for Appeal Committees*

The Chairman and Mr Stevenson had collaborated over the production of guidance for Law 16B1. The paper was intended for Appeals Chairmen and Tournament Directors.

The Committee made some changes to the wording and the final document is attached to these minutes and will be available on the website. (Appendix A)

The Chairman said it was an attempt to provide some guidance to help ACs and TDs.

### 3.3.10 *Gold Cup Regulations*

The Secretary reported that he had acted as a proof-reader for the Gold Cup regulations and a number of references had been amended as a consequence. In particular the regulation on the alerting procedure had now been amended. When only English and/or Welsh teams are involved the EBU regulations apply for alerting and announcing; when only Scottish teams are involved the Scottish rules apply. Matches involving one Scottish team and one English/Welsh team would be decided by mutual arrangement but in the case of dispute the WBF regulations were to be used.

The committee thanked BGB for amending their regulations and confirmed that this, in its view, settled any difficulties in the regulations concerning alerting.

It had also been decided that BGB (acting as Regulating Authority) would accept all default positions in the 2007 laws, which in particular meant that rulings could be weighted in line with Law 12C1C.

## **4 *Appeals to the National Authority***

4.1 None this time

## **5 *Disciplinary Cases***

5.1 No new cases this time

## **6 *Technical Matters***

### 6.1 *Correspondence*

a) The Committee considered correspondence from a member regarding clarification of law 40 and the legality of stopping players making natural bids. It was confirmed that under the 2007 Code it was permitted to make such regulations. E.g. in a simple system events the organisers could prohibit the use of weak 2 bids. The Secretary was asked to write to the member saying this regulation was permitted but to encourage him to contact the organisers of the tournament to lobby for a change. The member would be reminded that the Tournament Organizer was permitted to allow variations from what was written in the OB or indeed a completely new set of allowable conventions.

This led to a wider discussion of EBU Simple System methods (Orange Book 9D9) and it was agreed that the Chairman and Mr Stevenson would review the list of permitted methods in time for the next meeting.

b) The Committee considered correspondence from a member whose deposit for an appeal to the National Authority had been retained. The Chairman offered to compose a reply.

**ACTION JD**

### 6.2 *Convention Cards*

The Secretary reported that the shop had approximately 140 packs of 100 of EBU20B in stock. Mr Pool said that there was a case for making amendments before the next printing, and Committee members were asked to give thought to what needed changing. The Secretary was asked to find out from the Shop what their average usage was.

*[Secretary's note: The largest user is EBU Tournaments when 2 or 3 packs of 100 are sent to each event. The Shop rarely sells large numbers although 10 packs had been sold in the last two weeks]*

### 6.3 8 clear-cut tricks

There was discussion on how best to clarify marginal hands which were suitable for artificial 2-openings. In particular a hand had occurred at the Surrey One day event in September which had led to discussion, namely AQJ9874 with an outside AK. The Committee RULED that this did not meet the requirements for 8 clear-cut tricks (i.e. AQJ9874 was not clear-cut 6 tricks). Since the hand also failed the other two tests (extended rule of 25 or 16 HCPs) it was not suitable to be opened as a strong artificial two.

The Committee agreed that it had not sufficiently clarified this area. In particular it needed to explain the difference between playing tricks and clear-cut tricks and to provide examples of hands that fulfilled the criteria and also hands that did not. Mr Stevenson agreed to provide examples in a 'quiz-style'. **ACTION: DWS**

### 6.4 WBF Laws Committee minutes

The Committee noted the minutes of the WBF Laws Committee which provided a number of interpretations of the 2007 Code and those minutes are attached to these minutes. (Appendix B)

Mr Faulkner enquired in what capacity the L&E had received the minutes and whether they were binding on the EBU as NBO. The Secretary undertook to find out from Mr Endicott.

*[Secretary's note: Mr Endicott confirmed that the minutes became 'official' in Beijing when (excluding the Kooijman rider) they were ratified by the WBF Executive Council. They are binding on all NBOs and Zones. His view is that no EBU regulations need adjustment as a consequence but recommends that someone look to confirm this position.]*

### 6.5 White Book

The Chairman asked whether it was time to produce a new White Book given that many law references were wrong. Mr Stevenson said it was only a short time since the last one but agreed that, for example, the guidance on logical alternatives was now out of date; Mr Amos noted that also guidance on insufficient bids was now wrong. Mr Morley said that at the very least an up to date version should be posted on the website. The Chairman noted that the days of the beautifully bound volume were numbered and that perhaps only electronic versions should be available in future. It was in any case easier to search electronically for items rather than use the printed index which had proved inadequate in many cases.

Mrs Bugden suggested that a member of the committee might undertake an investigation into printing costs, effectiveness of a printed volume and Mr Pool would raise the question of the book at the next Club Committee.

In the meantime Mr Stevenson was asked to do an initial review of a) what needed to be changed and b) other 'cosmetic' changes and Mr Pool offered to research alternative ways of publishing the document with a view to reporting back at the next meeting. **ACTION DWS MP**

## 7. Applications for new permitted methods

The Committee considered an application to allow different systems to be used in different positions in Level 2 events. In particular the applicant wished to play Precision Club in first, second and fourth seat and Acol with strong 2s in third seat.

The Committee unanimously declined the application.

The Secretary to write giving the Committee's decision.

**8. Reports from Tournament Directors**

**08.046**

The Committee considered a form filled in by a panel TD, where much of the required information was missing or incomplete. Missing: form of scoring, pair numbers, result at table and score for NS; assigned result and the actual ruling. TDs are reminded of the need to complete forms as fully as possible. The Secretary was asked to write to the TD to remind him of his obligations in this area.

**08.058**

The Committee considered a hand from the Brighton Sunday evening open pairs. The Secretary was asked to write to both players for their comments, particularly as it appeared the pair had left the tournament three boards before the end and gave no reason.

**08.067**

Event: Brighton Swiss Teams

Dealer S

All Vulnerable

IMPS to VPs.

**North**

♠ Q J 8 6  
♥ K Q 5 3  
♦ 8 2  
♣ Q 5 4

**West**

♠ K  
♥ 8  
♦ J 9 7 6 4  
♣ A K J 9 8 3

**East**

♠ 9 7 5 3  
♥ A 10 9 6  
♦ K 10 5 3  
♣ 6

**South**

♠ A 10 4 2  
♥ J 7 4 2  
♦ A Q  
♣ 10 7 2

Bidding:	West	North	East	South
				1♣(1)
	pass	1♥	pass	2♥
	3♣	3♥	pass	pass
	3NT(2)	dbld	4♦	dbld
	pass	pass	pass	

1 alerted

2 not alerted but showing diamond stop and suit

**Result:** 4♦x ✓ by East = -710 **Lead** ♥2

**Tournament Director's statement of facts & ruling**

I was first called after the opening lead was faced.

South called me to the table after dummy had been tabled claiming that he had been damaged by the failure to alert 3NT. He said that North was inexperienced and that North had doubled 3NT for penalties as she thought it was natural. South said that he would not have doubled 4♦ had 3NT been alerted.

Ruling:

Both North and South are experienced players and in the top half of the field. Both players are sufficiently experienced to realise that 3NT was not to play. (Laws 20F5A/B and 20F6).

Other comments by TD:

North is a Premier Life Master (554 Greens and 8 Gold Points). Even if North believed that 3NT was natural South, by his own statement, said he realised that it was not natural. His double of 4♦ must be for business.

North/South appealed.

East/West comment – ‘I thought it routine’.

***Appeals Committee’s decision***

Ruling upheld. Deposit returned.

At this level we feel that North could have worked out that 3NT would not be natural. North is not an inexperienced player. Also the double of 4♦ we felt was ill-judged.

***L&E comment:***

The Committee was unanimous in believing that the deposit should have been kept.

**8A *Any other business***

Miss Hinden sought clarification on the conditions of contest for the Premier League and in particular the regulations relating to the correction period when screens were in use. It was not always possible to check everything in the time allowed. It was confirmed that this was a matter for the Selection Committee.

**9 *Date of next meeting***

Thursday 12<sup>th</sup> February 2009 at 1.15pm. Imperial Hotel, Russell Square, London, London W1.  
*(Secretary’s note: McAlpine’s not available that day)*

The meeting closed at 4.50pm

## **Advice to Appeal Committee Chairman (and Tournament Directors) on the impact of the new laws regarding **logical alternatives**.**

### **November 2008**

Is an action a logical alternative (an LA)?

When deciding whether an action constitutes an LA under the 2007 Laws, the TD should consider two things.

1. He should decide whether a significant proportion of the player's peers [playing the same system] would consider the action.

What is a significant proportion? The laws don't specify %. While it is best if a TD gets a feeling for the term "significant proportion" he will not go far wrong if he assumes it means a minimum of 20% of players.

If the action would not be considered by a significant proportion then it does not constitute an LA.

2. If a significant proportion would then the TD should next consider whether some of them would actually choose it.

It is best not to consider specific figures. If even a small number would choose it then that is enough.

As to methodology, asking players for opinions is helpful, without telling them the problem. For example, if this is a hesitation case, ask them as a bidding problem without mentioning the hesitation.

The TD should ask them what they would call after the given sequence, telling them the methods employed. If their answer is not the action under consideration then a further question should be asked, namely what alternatives they considered. This poll should give the TD a fair idea of whether an action is an LA.

### **What should an appeal committee do if the ruling is appealed?**

- They should look at Law 16B. 1B in that section defines an LA.
- They may ask the TD for details of any poll he took.
- They could consider their own poll but time and practicality usually rules this out.
- They should be aware that the old, so called, 30% or 70% rules are not the ones in force now.
- They should be aware that this is a judgment area and might like to ascertain the experience of the players
- In practice under the 2007 laws a disputed action is less likely to be allowed than previously.

Minutes of a meeting of the WBF Laws Committee in Beijing  
on Friday, 10<sup>th</sup> October, 2008.

Present:- Ton Kooijman (Chairman)  
Grattan Endicott (Secretary)  
John Wignall (Drafting Subcommittee Chairman)  
Max Bavin  
Maurizio Di Sacco  
Joan Gerard  
Bertrand Gignoux  
Alvin Levy  
Jeanne van den Meiracker  
Dan Morse  
Jeffrey Polisner  
William Schoder

Guest: Yoshida Tadashi

Apologies were received from the President Emeritus and entered for all other members of the Committee not present in Beijing.

1. In opening the meeting and welcoming all present, the Chairman observed that the Committee had been dormant for a couple of years while the work on the 2007 Code of Laws was in hand. Now it was time to be busy again. Fresh interpretations are needed and this is the first meeting of the new decade.
2. Members were invited to comment on experience of the 2007 laws in action. Mr. Yoshida Tadashi remarked that there were problems in applying Law 27. Mr Levy said that in the ACBL no major problems have been encountered and the Laws Commission is pleased with the enhanced options for Regulating Authorities; the ACBL has not adopted the Law 12 option of weighted scores. Japan, the Committee learnt, has empowered Directors to award weighted scores. Jeanne van den Meiracker mentioned a problem with Law 27 and minor problems with Law 12. Mr. Gignoux said there is satisfaction in France with Law 25 and as in other NBOs a problem with Law 27. Mr.Wignall reported Zone 7 as relaxed in relation to Law 27 and, over all, content with the new code of laws.

Mr. Di Sacco had no complaint with the operation of the new laws to date. He considered that a good job had been done in consolidating them.

Mr Gignoux would have liked screen regulations to have been incorporated into the laws, and it is known some would like to see the alert procedure there also. The Chairman felt it would be a long time before these moves came about.

A short discussion followed concerning the inclination to relax slightly the stringency of Law 27. This would be examined in more detail later in the meeting. Mr. Schoder felt that we need not go into endless examples on Law 27; with the encouragement of the phrase 'in the Director's opinion',

The Director should exercise his opinion and, if needs be, recover via Law 27D. Mr, Bavin remarked that since the 2007 Laws took effect he has not encountered any case of an insufficient bid.

3. A Report from the October 8<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Drafting Subcommittee was considered. The Committee confirmed its interpretations and decisions as follows:



That Mr Kooijman be encouraged to complete his work on a commentary or appendix and then publish it, either after ratification by the WBF (possibly obtained via the internet) or, if he wished, as a personal commentary on the laws.

In Law 12, “serious error” should be judged according to the calibre of player.

In Law 13F, the use of ‘may be awarded’ reflects the intentions of the Committee. It is inappropriate to refer in any case to Law 67. Note also that when the surplus card is found to have been played and an adjusted score is awarded any player who was dealt a correct number of cards, with no two cards identical, is in no way at fault.

When applying Law 17E, passes following the first pass out of rotation are cancelled and only the first pass out of rotation is an infringement.

Law 25A - It is strongly recommended that bidding box regulations should provide that if a player’s attention is diverted as he makes an unintended call the ‘pause for thought’ should be assessed from the moment when he first recognizes his error. (Regulating Authorities please note.)

Law 27B – Mr. Endicott’s statement on interpretation was adopted and agreed viz:– The Committee has noted an increasing inclination among a number of Regulating Authorities to allow artificial correction of some insufficient bids even in cases where the set of possible hands is not a strict subset of the set of hands consistent with the insufficient bid. The Committee favours this approach and recommends to Regulating Authorities that, insofar as they wish, mildly liberal interpretations of Law 27B be permitted with play then being allowed to continue. At the end of the hand Law 27D may then be applied if the Director judges that the outcome could well have been different without assistance gained through the insufficient bid (and in consequence the non-offending side has been damaged).

It was also agreed that where it says in Laws 27B1(a) and 27B1(b) that ‘the auction proceeds without further rectification’ this is interpreted as meaning that the auction and play continue without further rectification.

Law 43B3 – when referring to Law 12B1 the Director treats both sides as offending and a split adjusted score is awarded.

If, having lost his rights, dummy draws attention to a revoke during the play, no penalty tricks are transferred. However, the Director restores equity.

Law 45F – Mr. Kooijman’s proposal that the Director should not adjust the score if the player would have played the indicated card anyway was agreed. Dummy is liable to a procedural penalty.

Law 50E - Mr. Di Sacco asks that examples be provided of the application of this law. A distinction must be made between the requirement that the player must play this card and information that the player has the card. Initially the underlead from K Q J x to partner’s A x is allowed, but subsequently the Director may decide that 50E3 applies.

Mr. Bavin observes that the player must convince the Director that he has not gained from the information that the player possesses the card. This continues the WBF Laws Committee decision made in previous years.

Law 64C – If there are two revokes on the same board the equity in the case of the second revoke is determined by reference to the position after the first revoke.

Law 86D – if an offending side is responsible for the inability of the second table to play the board it shall not be allowed to profit from its own favourable score on the first table. The parenthetical statement at the end of this law applies in the particular circumstances that one side is offending and the other not; in all other circumstances the core law applies,

disregarding the parenthetical statement. It is possible there are two non-offending sides. When considering application of Law 86D a 'favourable' score refers to an unlikely result. The unlikely result taken into account may favour either a non-offending side or an offending side and, except as stated above, it lies within the discretionary powers of the Director to decide upon the application of this law.

[Rider: The concept suggested by the Chairman subsequent to the meeting is that when the side receiving a bad score at table A causes the irregularity by which the board cannot be played at the other table, the TD takes this score into account with full weight to assign an adjusted score.

When the side receiving an unusual good score at table A causes at that table an irregularity by which the board cannot be played at the other table, if the TD decides to award an assigned adjusted score the weight given to that good result should be limited although it may play some part in the adjustment.

If the board cannot be played because a side at that table causes an irregularity and there is an unusual good result at the other table there is a good reason to give an assigned adjusted score, giving full weight if the side with that good score is innocent and less than the full weight (perhaps 50%) if the side with that good score committed the irregularity.

When there is an unusual good score at one table and at the other table the board cannot be played, with no player responsible, it is felt a weight of something like 60% may be appropriate.]

Law 93G - the power of modification given in this law is a right to modify the procedure in dealing with appeals. It does not extend to overriding the rights of contestants to appeal under Law 92A. If the Regulating Authority makes no arrangement for an appeal to be heard (see Law 80B2(k)) the Director in charge shall hear and rule upon it under Law 93A.

The Committee confirmed its agreement to the interpretations in Mr Endicott's submission to the Drafting Subcommittee and the adoption of them recommended by the latter, viz:

## **LAW 12**

When the Director is empowered elsewhere in the laws simply to "award an adjusted score" he refers to Law 12 to determine whether this will be an assigned or an artificial adjusted score. Law 12 intends that whenever he is able to award an assigned adjusted score he does so; if Law 12C1(d) or Law 12 C2(a) applies the adjusted score is artificial. Note that 12C2(a) does not say "no result has been obtained" but "no result can be obtained", so that if a board is incomplete but has reached a stage when completion of the board can be foreseen an assigned score is appropriate.

## **LAW 16 and others – concerning information rights**

16A1(d) allows the player use of his memory of information in the laws and regulations. It does not authorize him to look during the auction and play at the printed regulations, the law book, or anyone's scorecard or the backs of bidding cards etc. as (Law 40C3(a)) an aid to memory. For system card and notes see Law 20G2.

Neither does 78D authorize players to consult during the auction and play printed copies of the information given them under this law.

20F1 defines the manner in which, during the auction and play, a player may request and receive an explanation of the opponents' prior auction. At this time he is entitled to an explanation only of calls actually made, relevant available alternative calls not made, and any partnership understanding as to inferences from the choice of action among the foregoing. (An "alternative" call is not the same call with another meaning – for example, if the reply to an opponent is that "5D

shows diamonds preference”, any reply to a further question “what would it mean if 4NT were Blackwood ?” is given voluntarily and not as a requirement of Law 20F1.)

81C2 requires the Director to advise players of their rights and responsibilities under the laws. He confines such information to rights and responsibilities that are relevant to the situation he is dealing with.

#### **LAW 20**

There is no infraction when a correct explanation discloses that partner’s prior explanation was mistaken. The words “nor may he indicate in any manner that a mistake has been made” (in Law 20F5(a)) do not refer to compliance with the overriding requirement of the laws always to respond to enquiries under Law 20F with correct explanations of the partnership understandings.

#### **LAW 75C**

The phrase “they have no claim to an accurate description of the N-S hands“ first appeared in the 1975 laws of the game. It was accompanied then as now by the injunction forbidding the Director to alter the table result. It was entered primarily to establish beyond doubt that that the partnership agreement must be described accurately in response to lawful enquiry and that the explanation given must not aim to describe what the explainer believes as to the contents of either hand. It was continued in those terms in the 1987 law book, while for 2007 NBOs were invited to say whether the example or the wording should be updated. Among replies received there was a general consensus for retaining them as they had been previously, whilst moving the statements from a footnote into the body of the Law.

#### **LAW 93**

The power of modification given in this law is a right to modify the procedure in dealing with appeals. It does not extend to overriding the rights of contestants to appeal under Law 92A. If the Regulating Authority makes no arrangement for an appeal to be heard (see Law 80B2(k)) the Chief Director shall hear and rule upon it under Law 93A.

4. The Committee examined a note prepared by the Chairman on the WBF screens regulations and agreed it should be forwarded to the WBF Rules & Regulations Committee. Inter alia it suggests that the regulation should say that a player who removes his bidding cards from the tray ‘may be deemed to have passed’.

The meeting then concluded.