



**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE EBU LAWS & ETHICS COMMITTEE
HELD AT IMPERIAL HOTEL, RUSSELL SQUARE, LONDON
ON WEDNESDAY SEPTEMBER 21ST 2011**

Present:	Jeremy Dhondy (JD)	Chairman and Elected Member
	Mike Amos (MA)	Elected Member
	Max Bavin (MB)	Chief Tournament Director
	David Burn (DB)	Co-opted
	Sally Bugden (SB)	EBU Chairman
	Frances Hinden (FH)	Vice Chairman and Elected Member
	Martin Pool (MP)	Elected Member
	Tim Rees (TR)	Elected Member
	David Stevenson (DS)	Elected Member
	Grattan Endicott (GE)	Vice-President
	Gerard Faulkner (GF)	Vice-President
	Gordon Rainsford (GR)	Co-opted. Assistant Chief TD.
	John Pain (JP)	Secretary

1	Apologies for Absence	Barry Capal (BC)	EBU General Manager
		Andrew Petrie (AP)	EBU Vice Chairman
		Neil Morley (NM)	Elected Member

2

2.1/2 Minutes of the previous meeting

The minutes of the meeting of April 12th 2011 were approved and signed. There were no matters of accuracy.

2.3 Matters arising

2.3.1. BB@B – schedule of misdemeanours

The Committee had considered the schedule produced by FH. The deadline for comments was extended to October 31st 2011. SB congratulated her on an excellent start.

2.3.2 OB5E1(b)

It was confirmed that the 2011 Orange Book had been amended to include passes as well as bids. No further action required.

2.3.3 Revised regulations

It was confirmed that the revised regulations listed in Appendix A, B and C were now in force.

2.3.4 Other matters arising

None

3 Appeals to the National Authority

None this time

4 Disciplinary Cases

4.1 Wroxall

The secretary reported that the matter was ongoing and that the Club had not completed its own procedures. Consequently the Laws and Ethics committee would take no action at this stage.

4.2 Abba

The Committee closed the case and the papers were put to file.

4.3 Chicago

The matter had been resolved to the Committee's satisfaction. A Mediation Committee had been formed from three members of the Disciplinary Panel who had travelled to hear the case. Whilst the Mediation Committee had no powers to sanction either party it had requested that both sides apologise, which had been done. The costs for holding the meeting had been met by the County. It was confirmed that the liability for costs included venue costs with light refreshments, mediation committee travel expenses and the Secretary's travel expenses.

There was discussion as to whether offering such a mediation service where other routes had failed was considered to be a valuable service which might be expanded. The L&E Chairman and Secretary would liaise to produce a list of guidelines for such a service.

Action: JD and JP

4.4 Doors

The Chairman reported that the matter was not yet resolved, but EBU Honorary Counsel had agreed to speak to both sides to try to move the case forward.

It was agreed there was need to make Counties aware of the responsibility of dealing with disciplinary matters referred to them by clubs. MP and GF agreed to draft further advice for counties.

Action: MP and GF

5 Technical Matters

5.1 Advice on claims and concessions

The Chairman said that the next Appeals Focus (due in October) would address the issue of ruling on claims and concessions and he asked for the Committee's input to produce suitable guidance.

MB said it was particularly important that the issue of whether a statement of a number of tricks necessarily constituted a line of play be addressed.

e.g. 'I have four spades, three hearts, two clubs and a diamond' doesn't necessarily constitute a clear statement under Law 68C 'A claim should be accompanied at once by a clear statement as to the order in which card will be played, of the line of play or defence through which the claimer proposes to win the tricks claimed'.

He also said that Law 70C which dealt with an outstanding trump should be addressed.

JD would produce a draft for comments.

Action: JD

5.2 Multiple Ties

There was discussion over the wording in WB143.7.3 which involved multiple ties. It was agreed to change the section to read:

143.7.3 Between three or more contestants who have not all played each other

(a) A multiple tie will be resolved in favour of any contestant which has defeated all of the other contestants in terms of the final method of scoring (see #143.5.1) in head-on matches/rounds (see #143.5.4).

(b) Failing that, the tie will be resolved by application of #143.7.1 (b) to (f) inclusive.

It was further agreed to change the sixth example on page 168 which was incorrect. The revised wording will be:

"Sixth, he uses point-a-board count-back. This involves comparing the results by each team on the all the boards played by them (see #143.5.3). He compares the boards - and finds the two teams score the same!"

Both changes to take effect from August 1st 2012

There was some discussion about whether it was time to review the whole of the Split-tie regulations but the committee decided to leave well alone.

It was agreed to ask the Tournament Committee to consider how much information on split-tie procedures should be published for general consumption.

Action: JD

5.3 Correction period when the next stage is on the same day as the previous stage

The current regulation (WB146.2) says that the correction period expires 10 minutes before the next session begins. It was acknowledged that this will sometimes cause problems where an error is discovered, say, 11 minutes before the start and therefore 'in time' requiring rescoring and new starting positions to be produced. The TD i/c was expected to do his best in the situation minimizing any delay to starting the next session. It was agreed not to alter the 10 minute deadline.

5.4 Responsibility for kibitzers at EBU events

Following an incident where a kibitzer had been inebriated and had refused to leave when asked by the TD there was a discussion on whether or not the player who introduced the kibitzer was responsible for their behaviour. It was decided that under UK law an adult over 18 was not the responsibility of the player and that it was not appropriate to penalize the player for the behaviour of a kibitzer.

There was some discussion whether formal regulations were needed to deal with errant kibitzers as Law 76C2 allows but it was felt that TDs had sufficient powers to deal with them.

5.5 item removed

5.6 Alerting 1NT after intervention

The committee considered correspondence from Mike Fisher regarding the auction 1♥ (1♠) 1NT where 1NT was made on any shape hand with 6-9 points. It was confirmed that the normal expectation was that 1NT would show a spade guard and any agreement that it did not required an alert. FH would write to Mr Fisher confirming the position.

Action: FH

5.7 Appeals from non-affiliated clubs to the EBU acting as Regulating Authority

There were varying views as to whether a non-affiliated club could use the services of the EBU to consider 'appeals to the national authority'. GE considered that under Law 80A1(c) the EBU, acting as the National Bridge Organisation, would be bound to hear any matter that came before it. GF asserted that it would be a condition of a provision of such a service that the cost of the appeal

must be met in full by the appellants. It was agreed to refer the matter to the Board for consideration.

Action: SB

5.8 *Benefits of being Appeals Chairman/On-site or phone referees and Appeals Consultant*

The Chairman outlined the current situation regarding the appointment of Appeals Chairman, Referees and Appeals Consultants.

Those appointed, in advance, to be Appeals Chairmen or Appeals Consultants for directly organized EBU events were entitled to ½ price entry for the part of the tournament to which they were appointed. (e.g. Brighton 1st weekend). There was an expectation that those appointed would then be available to perform the role.

In other EBU events ad hoc committees were chosen from amongst the players present (e.g. Tollemache qualifying). Such players are not entitled to the ½ price entry and therefore could decline to sit on appeals committees if asked.

It was acknowledged that in some congresses it might not be possible to appoint a person in advance. Where a player was then used on several occasions at such an event a retrospective ½ price entry could be made.

Phone referees usually performed the role from home and did so as a service to members without remuneration.

On site referees are paid a fee and travel expenses.

The Chairman observed there were some anomalies, and cited the Portland Pairs, where some venues had appointed referees but others had to make do with ad hoc committees or use a phone referee. It was confirmed that in such cases the ½ price entry was appropriate where the appointment had been made in advance.

It was also confirmed that One Day Events (which are now licensed events run by counties) and other County Congresses could make their own arrangements and were not bound by the EBU procedures in this regard. One Day Events will no longer appear on referee availability returns.

5.9 *Appeals Booklet*

It was confirmed that the 2009 booklet had been completed and plans were in hand for the 2010 edition. The 2009 edition is now available on the website. Thanks were due the FH and NM for doing the work. FH would write to the contributors thanking them for their work.

5.10 *Dual meaning signals*

FH raised the question of whether the following method constituted a dual meaning signal:

You have shown a long suit (say 6+ cards). Partner leads a top honour in it, say the ace and you play that a middle card encourages, and high/low cards are suit preference.

The Committee confirmed that this was permitted under current methods and did not fall into the definition of dual meaning signals. DS offered to look afresh at the whole subject with a view to bringing proposals to the April meeting.

Action: DS

5.11 *Player being woken up by an alert or an announcement*

Following a request from GR and a paper from Jeffrey Allerton the Committee considered afresh the minute from the L&E meeting of May 16th 2007:

Original Minute from May 16th 2007

3.9 Player being woken up by an Alert or Announcement

The Committee considered correspondence where a player intended to open 1♠ but placed 1NT on the table. When partner announced 12 to 14, the player realised his error. The Committee noted there were other situations where, for example, an alert might wake the player up. The Committee confirmed that knowledge of the mechanical error was authorised information; the TD should be summoned who could apply Law 25A.

It was confirmed that this discussion was only about the situation where it is *partner* who woke you up; if it is solely opponents then that is agreed to be authorised information.

Several members had concluded that this advice was contrary to bridge law in that it permits the use of UI to rectify an error. GR had observed that players are not generally aware of the current position and express surprise when it is pointed out. It was agreed that GE would raise the matter in Veldhoven at the forthcoming World Team Championships and seek an opinion from the WBF Laws Committee.

It was also agreed that MB would find out how other NBOs handled the matter, although it was pointed out that many NBOs follow the EBU lead so some information may be of limited worth.

The item was referred to the next meeting without coming to a decision.

MA suggested that the time might be right to look again at the definition of 'call made' when using bidding boxes where the current position was 'removed with the bidding box with apparent intent'. Again no decision was made.

6. Applications for new permitted methods

None this time.

7. Reports from Tournament Directors

GF noted that the standard of form filling varied enormously but some forms had been completed very poorly indeed. TDs and Appeals Chairmen were reminded of the need to complete forms with as much detail as possible. Due to pressure of other business there may be a considerable delay before forms are seen by the Committee and missing detail may be hard to obtain.

GR apologized for the fact that some of the Brighton forms had not been signed off by him as the TD in charge – it not being immediately evident who that referred to – it could have been the TD in charge of the section, for example. TDs will be briefed in future regarding who should sign off the forms.

It was agreed that the red psyches & deposit keepings should continue to be seen by the L&E, but if the reviewing subcommittee agree with the classification/action they need make no comment. The secretary will ensure they are included with the papers circulated.

It was further agreed that 'claim' appeals should always give both the full hand and the play up until the point of the claim, also (ideally) the position at the point of the claim. The present form did not make that easy.

11.013/11.027/11.049 – three psyches by the same person

The Committee considered three psyches, all classified as green by the TDs, which involved a player making the same style of psyche but with three different partners. In each case the player had 'invented a major'

11.013 The auction went 1♥ double 1♠ with (♠7 ♥954 ♦K1082 ♣Q9765)

11.027 The auction went pass 2♦ (weak) double 2♥ with (♠AK10862 ♥5 ♦64 ♣Q862)

11.049 The auction went pass 1♥ double 1♠ with (♠J76 ♥AJ75 ♦K65 ♣1064)

In each case the partner had taken appropriate action and the committee confirmed the psyches were green but the Secretary was asked to write to the player pointing out that psychic tendencies do become known to a players circle of partners and even though each one was with a different partner it was still possible that a partner might have knowledge not available to the opponents.

Action: JP

11.019 The Secretary was asked to pull out the psyche record of a pair.

Action: JP

11.020 – Appeal from Jersey Congress

The TD had been asked to rule on a claim where the play to the first six tricks had been given but that player’s actual claim statement had not been given (perhaps there hadn’t been one). The ruling had been appealed and the ruling upheld. Nevertheless the Committee felt that sight of the claim statement would have made commenting on the hand as a whole rather easier.

11.022/11.023 – Two appeals from the Garden Cities Regional Final, Peterborough

Two rulings which resulted in appeals between the same two teams had arisen at the end of the heat. However most players had left and finding any committee had proved very difficult. In the end the TD i/c found a pair who would hear both appeals. Both teams were content with the arrangement and the appeals went ahead. Both appeals were dismissed by the committee and there was some suggestion that both were without merit and the deposit should have been kept. However in the circumstances of a) having only two committee members and b) both from the same pair the Appeal Committee decided to return both deposits and the L&E Committee accepted that as a valid reason.

11.024 Spring Bank Holiday ‘A’ pairs final

<p>♠ KQ86 ♥ 64 ♦ 876 ♣ K1097</p> <p>♠ A109732 ♠ J54 ♥ Q853 ♥ J10 ♦ 54 ♦ AKQ32 ♣ 5 ♣ A63</p> <p>♠ - ♥ AK972 ♦ J109 ♣ QJ842</p>	<p>Board 3 : Dealer South : EW vulnerable</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;"><i>West</i></th> <th style="text-align: left;"><i>North</i></th> <th style="text-align: left;"><i>East</i></th> <th style="text-align: left;"><i>South</i></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>1♥</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1♠</td> <td>1NT(1)</td> <td>2♥(H)</td> <td>3♣</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3♠</td> <td>Dbl(H, pen)Pass</td> <td></td> <td>4♣</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pass</td> <td>Pass</td> <td>4♠</td> <td>Pass</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pass</td> <td>double</td> <td>All Pass</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(1)</td> <td>8-10</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Table result 4♠x – 1 by West</p>	<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>				1♥	1♠	1NT(1)	2♥(H)	3♣	3♠	Dbl(H, pen)Pass		4♣	Pass	Pass	4♠	Pass	Pass	double	All Pass		(1)	8-10		
<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>																										
			1♥																										
1♠	1NT(1)	2♥(H)	3♣																										
3♠	Dbl(H, pen)Pass		4♣																										
Pass	Pass	4♠	Pass																										
Pass	double	All Pass																											
(1)	8-10																												

The TD was called at the end of the auction by EW to reserve rights. North’s first penalty double was agreed as slow.

The TD concluded that a slow penalty double expresses doubt and ruled that 4♣ was not a logical alternative. Ruling 3♠x✓

NS appealed and the committee upheld the ruling, with the deposit being kept after reaching a unanimous decision quickly.

L&E approved of the deposit being retained.

11.028 Cheltenham Midweek Congress Swiss Teams

<p>♠ 93 ♥ K1074 ♦ KJ762 ♣ 62</p> <p>♠ KJ652 ♠ AQ874 ♥ A82 ♥ 63 ♦ 85 ♦ 1094 ♣ A85 ♣ 1094</p> <p>♠ 10 ♥ QJ95 ♦ AQ3 ♣ KQJ73</p>	<p>Board 11 : Dealer South : Love all</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">West</th> <th style="text-align: left;">North</th> <th style="text-align: left;">East</th> <th style="text-align: left;">South</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>1♣</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1♠</td> <td>Dbl</td> <td>2♠</td> <td>4♥</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pass(Q)</td> <td>Pass</td> <td>4♠</td> <td>Pass</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pass</td> <td>Dbl</td> <td>All Pass</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Table result 4♠x-2 by West</p>	West	North	East	South				1♣	1♠	Dbl	2♠	4♥	Pass(Q)	Pass	4♠	Pass	Pass	Dbl	All Pass	
West	North	East	South																		
			1♣																		
1♠	Dbl	2♠	4♥																		
Pass(Q)	Pass	4♠	Pass																		
Pass	Dbl	All Pass																			

The TD had ascertained that West passed after asking questions about North's double. He had concluded that East's 4♠ was not suggested by the UI from West's questions. result to stand.

The Appeal Committee upheld the TDs ruling.

The L&E confirmed that the TD and Appeal Committee were correct in their interpretation of the law, although they might have ruled differently.

11.031 Gloucs and Hereford One Day Swiss teams

<p>♠ K765 ♥ KJ7 ♦ A109 ♣ KQ3</p> <p>♠ 10 ♠ Q98 ♥ 10986543 ♥ 2 ♦ J ♦ KQ853 ♣ A652 ♣ J987</p> <p>♠ AJ432 ♥ AQ ♦ 7642 ♣ 104</p>	<p>Board 31 : Dealer South : NS vulnerable</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">West</th> <th style="text-align: left;">North</th> <th style="text-align: left;">East</th> <th style="text-align: left;">South</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Pass</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pass</td> <td>1♠</td> <td>2♦</td> <td>4♠</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5♥</td> <td>5♠</td> <td>All Pass</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Result at table 5♠-1 after the ♥2 lead.</p>	West	North	East	South				Pass	Pass	1♠	2♦	4♠	5♥	5♠	All Pass	
West	North	East	South														
			Pass														
Pass	1♠	2♦	4♠														
5♥	5♠	All Pass															

Declarer won the opening lead on the table and played a small spade. He said that West had thought for a considerable time before playing ♠10. This led him to play West for ♠Q10 doubleton and so go one down in the contract. The TD asked east if he was aware of the hesitation and he said he had noticed a break in tempo. The TD asked West if he had anything to think about and he said no, and that he was not aware of having played slowly. North added that the play was slow enough for him to think that West was void in spades and considering his discard.

The TD ruled that under L73D2 it was a deviation in correct procedure to hesitate with a singleton and gave a weighted ruling of 80% of 5♠✓ and 20% of 5♠-1.

The Appeal Committee confirmed the TDs ruling.

The L&E Committee considered the hand in some detail noting in particular that *had* West held precisely ♠Q10 he would not have anything to think about either. It was acknowledged that he would then have had a *choice* even if the decision was trivial. However the Committee considered that any break in tempo might disturb declarer's thought process and considered the ruling to be not unreasonable.

Some of the committee thought the ruling might well have been 'no damage' had the players been of a sufficiently high standard.

11.062 Brighton Summer Meeting Swiss teams

The Secretary was asked to write to a pair to obtain their comments after one of the pair had withdrawn from the tournament after the first match on Sunday. This followed a request for a ruling after the TD was minded to rule a psyche red but was unable to complete the ruling as the player had left the building. This had left a team of three. A substitute player played for the remainder of the tournament.

Action : JP

8 *Date of next meeting*

Wednesday January 11th 2012 at 1pm.

Preferred venue is Baker Tilly offices, Bloomsbury Road (next to Tottenham Court Road tube station).

The meeting closed at 5.20pm.

As this was the final meeting before the AGM the Chairman thanked all committee members for their work during the year.