



**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE EBU LAWS & ETHICS COMMITTEE
HELD AT 40 BERNARD STREET, LONDON WC1
ON TUESDAY 14TH DECEMBER 2004**

Present:	Martin Pool	Chairman
	Richard Fleet	Vice-Chairman (until part way through item 3.2)
	Steve Barnfield	
	Max Bavin	Chief Tournament Director
	David Burn	
	Jeremy Dhondy	
	David Stevenson	
	Grattan Endicott	Vice-President
	Gerard Faulkner	Vice-President
	Nick Doe	Secretary

- 1. Apologies for Absence** David Martin
Philip Mason EBU Vice-Chairman
Denis Robson EBU Chairman

2. Minutes of the previous meeting (10th November)

2.1 Accuracy

The minutes were agreed to be a true record and signed by Mr Pool as Chairman.

2.2 Matters arising

2.2.1 L&E webpage (item 2.2.1); Publication of minutes on website (item 2.2.6)

Mr Doe reported that minutes up to September had been posted on the site, and the November minutes had been sent to the webmaster for posting. It was queried whether the minutes should be posted as soon as they were approved by the Chairman, once approved by the L&E, or only after they had passed Council. Mr Doe said that the previous practice with regard to circulation was that minutes were circulated as soon as they were approved by the Chairman, and he had taken the view that posting on the website was no different in principle. The L&E was happy with this, as long as arrangements were in place to substitute an amended version if changes were made when accuracy was considered at the subsequent meeting.

It was understood that progress was being made with the other items for the site.

2.2.2 Articles for English Bridge (item 2.2.3)

The L&E noted that these were in hand.

2.2.3 Correspondence with players (item 4.2.4)

Mr Doe reported that a chaser had been sent. It appeared that some correspondence might have gone astray.

2.2.4 White Book – Index (item 6.2)

Mr Doe reported that he hoped to have time to attend to this in the near future.

2.2.5 Disciplinary procedures (item 7.1)

Mr Doe reported that it is common practice under the present dual structure for references to “the English Bridge Union” to be construed as references to the English Bridge Union Ltd or to the unincorporated association, according to context. He had been advised that no difficulty was foreseen if County Constitutions referred to an appeal to the Union, whereas the appeal would in fact be dealt with by the company following the forthcoming constitutional changes.

3. Orange Book revisions

Note – a number of decisions were made during the course of this item. Unless otherwise indicated, the general sense of the regulation was agreed, but the actual wording of the regulations to be included in the *Orange Book* will not necessarily follow the precise wording recorded in these minutes.

3.1 Alerting and Announcements

A. Announcements

The L&E considered papers from Messrs Stevenson and Burn setting out a number of situations in which announcements might be used. Mr Stevenson reported that he had had a very useful discussion with Messrs Armstrong and Hackett, which had reinforced his conclusion that announcements should be introduced in only a very limited number of situations, with a view to expanding the list at a later date if the L&E found that announcements had proved successful.

A discussion took place as to the logic of confining announcements to certain responses to 1NT openings, as opposed to extending them to the equivalent responses to other NT bids (such as 2NT openings, NT rebids after strong artificial openings, NT overcalls etc.).

Mr Fleet, seconded by Mr Barnfield, then proposed that there should be no further extension to the categories of announcements agreed at the previous meeting. Mr Dhondy, seconded by Mr Burn, proposed an amendment that Stayman for 4 card majors over a natural 1NT opening should be the sole addition. The amendment having been approved nem con, the amended proposal was approved by 5 votes to 1.

[Secretary’s note – the combined effect of the decisions at the two meetings is as follows:-

- (a) natural 1NT openings should be announced by stating the range;*
- (b) 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” should be added to the range announcement;*
- (c) Stayman should 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*
- (d) red suit transfers (i.e. ♦s to ♥s and ♥s to ♠s) should be announced:-*
 - 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*

(Note – the exact form of the announcement has not been agreed in the case of red suit transfers).]

B. Alerting of natural openings at the two level

Mr Stevenson regretted that it had not been thought appropriate to announce these. He considered that if natural openings of varying strengths were neither to be announced nor to be alerted, players would adopt the undesirable practice of asking questions over a non-alerted opening, and then passing, implying borderline values for action. In the light of the decisions already made, it was agreed the alerting status of such bids must depend on whether the openings had a potentially unexpected meaning, and that the existing guidance in *OB* section 5.4 would need to be reviewed. It was also agreed that problems would be minimised if greater attention were paid to the existing regulations concerning disclosure on convention cards and the requirement to ascertain details of opponents' basic system at the start of the round.

It was generally agreed that weak two openings could not be said to be unexpected. Some difficulties were anticipated, however, with intermediate openings or strong but not forcing openings. It was agreed that openings which showed the suit bid, but included agreed distributional constraints relating to other suits (e.g. a Precision 2♣ opening, played in the traditional manner where opener guarantees either 6+♣s or a side 4-card major if he only has 5♣s) should not be considered natural for alerting purposes.

A proposal from Mr Burn, seconded by Mr Stevenson, that two level openings should not require an alert (as they did not have a potentially unexpected meaning) if they were:-

- (a) natural and weak; or
- (b) natural and strong

was approved nem con. (Note – this decision means that openings which are natural and intermediate are to be alertable as potentially unexpected; this distinction will require some attention to the strength definitions in the *OB*).

C. Alerting of potentially short minor-suit openings

A proposal by Mr Stevenson, seconded by Mr Dhondy, that 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, should require an alert, was approved nem con.

(Note – the L&E specifically confirmed that that opening bids of one of a minor suit which are in principle natural, but may be made on three cards in the suit, but not fewer, are not considered potentially unexpected, and will no longer require an alert. Openings which are not in principle natural, such as strong clubs or diamonds or “either-or” clubs, will of course remain alertable under the first limb of the basic rule agreed at the previous meeting. (An “either-or” 1♣ is an opening which has a strong artificial option and one or more weaker options chosen from balanced, natural or 4-4-4-1 types)).

D. Alerting of the completion of transfers

A proposal from Mr Stevenson, seconded by Mr Burn, that completion of a transfer should be alerted if it shows something specific, but not otherwise, was approved by 5 votes to 1. The L&E considered that some examples would be helpful to illustrate this decision:-

- (a) A pair has no agreement to break transfers. Completion of the transfer will no longer be alertable.
- (b) A pair agrees to break transfers only on a maximum with 4-card support. Completion of the transfer is therefore consistent with 2- or 3-card support, or 4-card support and a minimum. It therefore does not show something specific and will no longer be alertable.
- (d) A pair agrees to break transfers on all hands with 4-card support. Completion of the transfer therefore shows specifically 2- or 3-card support and will remain alertable.

- (d) A pair agrees that to complete the transfer after a double shows specifically 3-card support (opener, say, passing with 2-card support and breaking with 4-card support). This will remain alertable.

3.2 Permitted methods

Mr Stevenson reported that the OBESC process had worked better for permitted methods than it had for alerting and announcements, and although some members had commented sparingly, the recommendations presented to the L&E were for the most part agreed. In addition there were a number of areas in which OBESC had identified two or more options between which the L&E was invited to choose, without a specific recommendation being made.

The L&E considered a number of proposals.

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

Mr Stevenson highlighted the lack of definition in the current regulations as to what constitutes different systems. The L&E considered two different schemes:-

- playing 4-card major openings at some conditions and 5-card majors at others
- varying the meanings of two-level openings, which happens notably in fourth seat, where weak opening bids played in other seats (or the weak options for Multi-meaning openings) are not required, although other criteria for such variations are also possible.

The L&E approved Mr Stevenson's recommendation that these schemes should not be regarded as playing two different systems, and was happy for him to devise appropriate wording to address the matter.

B. Treatment of Multi 2♦ at Level 3

Mr Stevenson highlighted one possible agreement, namely that a Multi is opened with a weak hand with a 5+ card major, but not on a balanced hand with only a 5-card suit (i.e. 5-3-3-2 distribution). Put another way, this amounts to an agreement that there will either be a 6-card suit, or, if the main suit is only of 5 cards, the hand will also contain a side suit of 4+ cards. This is arguably a treatment.

Mr Doe asked for clarification of whether an agreement allowing for different strengths and/or suit lengths for the weak two element within a Multi at different conditions (i.e. position and/or vulnerability) was considered to be a treatment. Many players clearly considered this to be "just bridge", but comparison of the different provisions currently applicable at Levels 3 and 4 suggested that this might be considered to be a treatment.

Whilst it was recognised that these points would become moot if a decision was later made to discontinue publication of Level 3, the L&E thought that it would be helpful to address them. It was agreed that the possible agreement highlighted by Mr Stevenson did constitute a treatment and was thus not currently permitted at Level 3, but that there was no compelling reason why it should not be permitted in future, assuming the retention of Level 3. It was agreed that varying the style of the weak two element according to position and/or vulnerability was not a treatment and is therefore currently permitted.

C. Strong openings

It was agreed that clarification was necessary concerning agreements that ostensibly strong openings might be made with fewer than the specified values.

D. Minimum strength for opening bids at the one level

OBESC had suggested reducing the minimum strength required at Level 3 and introducing a lower limit for openings in third and fourth seat at Levels 3 and 4. A proposal from Mr Dhondy, seconded by Mr Barnfield, that the status quo remain, was approved nem con.

(Note – the minimum strengths currently permitted without restriction are as follows:-

- Level 4 – Rule of 18 for one of a suit; 9 HCP for a natural 1NT;
- Level 3 – Rule of 19 or 11 HCP for one of a suit; 10 HCP for a natural 1NT.

Weaker natural, but not conventional, openings are permitted subject to the no conventions rule. It was noted that this area might need to be revisited should the new Laws change the position with regard to the regulation of natural methods, in which case the use of the no conventions rule might be rendered obsolete).

E. Natural or balanced openings of one of a minor

The L&E accepted a recommendation, made to resolve a matter which is not clear in the current regulations, that at Levels 3 and 4 a 1♣ or 1♦ opening which is permitted to be played as natural or balanced may alternatively be played as canapé, provided that at least 4 cards are held in the suit.

F. Artificial (but not strong) 1NT openings

The L&E accepted the recommendation (modified to reflect the decision at paragraph D), that at Level 4 any 1NT opening should be permitted which shows at least 4 cards in a specified suit, with a minimum strength of Rule of 18.

(Note – there are currently a small number of openings of this type specifically permitted, and it was considered that a blanket provision was appropriate to cover these and any others which might be devised).

G. Strong artificial 1NT openings

The L&E modified a recommendation that the minimum strength be brought in line with that for a strong club opening, and agreed that the minimum strength should be the same as that for a strong artificial opening at the two level.

(Note – the minimum strength for strong artificial openings at the two level is currently 18 HCP for balanced types, Rule of 25 for Acol 2 types and 16 HCP for three-suiters).

H. Strong and “either-or” 1♣ openings

The L&E accepted a recommendation that the minimum strength for the strong option of an “either-or” 1♣ opening should be brought in line with that for a strong 1♣ opening, namely 16 HCP.

(Note – see 3.1 C for explanation of “either-or” 1♣ openings).

The L&E considered a suggestion that it was inconsistent to regulate the minimum strength of strong artificial openings at the one level in terms of HCP when most other opening bids are regulated in terms of “Rule of X”. It concluded that it was undesirable to permit players to open supposedly strong artificial openings on distributionally strong hands with a low point count, and accordingly the distinction should be retained.

OBESC had suggested that “either-or” 1♣ openings, which are currently only permitted at Level 4, might be permitted at Level 3. A proposal from Mr Barnfield, seconded by Mr Stevenson, that the status quo remain, was approved nem con.

I. Responses to opening bids, overcalls and doubles

The L&E considered a recommendation that responses should be entirely deregulated at Levels 3 and 4. Whilst the L&E did not envisage many difficulties with such deregulation, it did believe that there were some potential problems with conventional passes, as a player with a worthless hand would be required to invent some positive bid if a pass by him would show something which he did not have.

A proposal from Mr Stevenson, seconded by Mr Dhondy, that, subject to strengthening the provisions of OB 9.1.4, any response should be permitted at Levels 3 and 4 to any opening bid, overcall or double, was approved by 4 votes to 1.

(Note – OB 9.1.4 is a general provision disallowing conventions designed to deceive opponents intentionally as to the length or strength of a suit and/or the strength of a hand. The suggestion that a reference to “psyches required by system” (a concept which is used in the international regulations) be included, was noted).

J. Opening bids at the two level

The L&E considered a recommendation to simplify the rules. It noted that it was somewhat inconsistent for Level 4 to be more restrictive in some respects and more liberal in others than the most closely-comparable international regulations.

A proposal from Mr Stevenson, seconded by Mr Burn, that at Level 4 any two level opening should be permitted which satisfies one of the following conditions:-

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

was approved by 3 votes to 1.

The L&E approved the recommendations that the following should be permitted at Level 3:-

- (a) a Multi 2♦ which has ♥s as its only non-strong option
- (b) a 2♣ or 2♦ opening to show both majors with a minimum length of 4/4

(Note – currently, a 2♦ but not a 2♣ opening may show a non-strong hand with both majors, and the minimum length is 5/4).

The L&E approved the recommendations that the following should be permitted at Level 2:-

- (a) any two-level opening bid which has only strong options
- (b) 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.

(Note – at present, three suiters are permitted under *OB* 12.6.3 (a), which permits any agreement that includes length (at least 4 cards) in the bid suit. Perhaps unintentionally, this excludes, for example, the use of a 2♥ opening to show the hand-type shown by a traditional Precision 2♦ opening, if played in the flexible manner which includes 4-3-1-5 and 3-4-1-5 distributions as well as 4-4-1-4 and 4-4-0-5).

K. Canapé overcalls

The L&E approved the recommendation that canapé overcalls should be permitted at Levels 3 and 4, provided that the suit bid is of 4+ cards.

L. Transfer overcalls

The L&E considered a recommendation to liberalise the suits which can be shown by transfer overcalls. A proposal from Mr Stevenson, seconded by Mr Dhondy, that the following should be permitted at Levels 3 and 4:-

- (a) any overcall that shows at least 4 cards in a specified suit, and the normal values and distribution for an overcall at the level of a minimum response in the suit shown by the overcall; and
- (b) any overcall that shows a balanced hand, and the normal values and distribution for a NT overcall at the level of a minimum response in NTs

was approved nem con.

(Note – whilst the decision liberalises the suits which can be shown, it restricts such overcalls at Level 4 to the strength requirements which were previously only applicable at Level 3).

M. Opening bids of one of a suit

The L&E decided to permit at Level 4 any opening that shows at least 4 cards in a specified suit (subject to the normal minimum strength requirements (see paragraph D)).

N. Defence to 1NT at Levels 2 and 3

The L&E considered three options:-

- no change
- allow a double which is not for penalties if it shows a specified suit
- allow any defence (as currently applicable at Level 4)

A proposal from Mr Dhondy, seconded by Mr Burn, that :-

- (a) any defence should be permitted at Level 3; and
- (b) a double should be permitted at Level 2 to have any meaning which includes a specified suit of at least 3 cards in a three-suited hand, and 4 cards otherwise

was approved by 2 votes to 1.

O. Specific applications

The L&E noted that a number of specific applications had been considered by OBESC in the course of its deliberations. The decisions already made involved the acceptance of a number and the refusal of others. It was agreed to bring into effect changes to the regulations arising from the accepted applications, with effect from 1st April 2005. To the extent that applications were covered by proposed new blanket provisions, only the matters specifically applied for would be playable from April, with the new blanket provisions being deferred until the implementation of the new *Orange Book*.

The following applications were accepted:-

[Secretary's Note – the letter in square brackets following the heading of each application is a cross reference to the relevant paragraph above. An asterisk indicates an application which it is proposed will be covered by a blanket provision with effect from OB 2006].

(i) Natural or canapé 1♣/1♦ openings (Carpenter) [E]

The expression “natural or balanced” in OB 12.2.2 (c), 12.2.3 (c), (e) and (f), and 13.1.2 (b) and (c) is interpreted as including canapé, i.e. in the natural option, the suit bid is of at least 4 cards, but is the shorter suit if a two-suiter is held.

(Note – the application did not request authorisation of “potential canapé”, i.e. where the relative suit lengths are ambiguous if a two-suiter is held. The interpretation does not extend to include potential canapé).

(ii) Moscito-style 1♦/1♥/1♠ openings (Carpenter) [M]

(iii) SCAMP 1♦ opening (Rudolf) [M]

(iv) Generic application (Bell) [F, M]

At Level 4, an opening bid of one of a suit or 1NT may be played to show any hand with 4+ cards in a specified suit, minimum strength Rule of 18.

(Note – the applications from Messrs Carpenter and Rudolf were for specific schemes, all of which are permitted as a result of the acceptance of the more general application from Mr Bell).

(v) Transfers in response to 1♥/1♠ (Armstrong, Carpenter) [I*]

At Level 3, transfer responses to 1♥/1♠ openings may be played [as per the provisions currently applicable at Level 4, i.e. OB 14.2.1].

(vi) 1♠ response to 1♣ opening (Carpenter, Johnston, Bell) [I*]

At Level 3, a 1♠ response to a 1♣ opening may be played as artificial, negative or semi-negative.

(vii) 1♠ response to 1♣ opening (Richter) [I*]

At Level 3, a 1♠ response to a 1♣ opening may be played as any of:-

- (a) a balanced hand with no 4-card major, any defined values
- (b) ♦s, invitational or better values
- (c) a very weak ♣ raise

(viii) 1♠ response to 1♣ opening (Bell) [I*]

At Level 3, a 1♠ response to a 1♣ opening may be played as either:-

- (a) a hand with no 4-card major, any defined values; or
- (b) any agreed meaning, game forcing

(ix) 2NT response to 1♣/1♦ opening (1) (Courtney) [I*]

At Level 3, a 2NT response to 1♣/1♦ may be played as either:-

- (a) a weak single-suited hand (the suit need not be specified); or
- (b) support for opener, any defined values

(x) 2NT response to 1♣/1♦ opening (2) (Courtney) [I*]

At Level 3, a 2NT response to 1♣/1♦ may be played as either:-

- (a) a weak pre-emptive raise
- (b) a game forcing raise with an unspecified shortage

(xi) 2NT response to one of a suit (Bessant) [I*]

At Level 3 a 2NT response to an opening bid of one of a suit may be played as at least game-try values with at least 5-5 in any two of the unbid suits.

(xii) 2♣ or 2♦ response to 1♣/1♦ opening (Bell) [I*]

At Level 3 a 2♣ or 2♦ response to an opening bid of one of a minor which is played as a natural opening in an unspecified minor, may be played as to play in opener's minor (i.e. "pass or correct").

(xiii) Multi 2♦ (O'Neill) [J]

At Level 3, a Multi may be played with a weak two in ♥s as its only non-strong option.

(xiv) Major two-suiters (Carpenter, Ryall) [J]

At Level 3, a 2♣ or 2♦ opening may be played to show both majors (at least 4-4), any defined values.

(xv) Two level openings (Bell) [J]

At Level 2, an opening bid of two of a suit may be played as a non-strong three-suiter including the suit bid, which may be of only 3 cards.

(xvi) Canapé overcalls (Milman) [K]

At Level 3 and Level 4, canapé overcalls are permitted provided that they show at least 4 cards in the suit bid.

(xvii) Defence to 1NT (Lewis) [N]

At Level 3 any defence is permitted.

At Level 2, a double is permitted to have any meaning which includes a specified suit of at least 3 cards in a three-suited hand, and 4 cards otherwise.

The following applications were refused:-

- (xviii) 2NT opening to show non-strong single-suiter with ♦s (Carpenter) (Currently permitted at Level 4; extension to Level 3 refused)
- (xix) 2♥ opening as weak two in ♥s or ♠s (Carpenter)
- (xx) Removal of a number of restrictions imposed by the no conventions rule on 3 card major suit openings and sub-minimum 1NT openings (Rowbotham)
- (xxi) 2NT opening to show ♣s and another or ♣ pre-empt (Bell) (Currently permitted at Level 4; extension to Level 3 refused)
- (xxii) 2♥ opening as ♣ pre-empt; 2♠ opening as ♦ pre-empt (Kerkin) (Currently permitted at Level 4; extension to Level 3 refused)
- (xxiii) Canapé overcalls where the suit bid may be of fewer than 4 cards (Milman) (see (xvi))
- (xxiv) 2♦ opening as weak two in ♥s or weak with ♠s and a minor; 2♥ opening as weak two in ♠s or weak with ♥s and a minor; 2♠ opening as weak with both majors or both minors (Grounds)
- (xxv) Two-suited overcalls at the one level (Macmillan)
- (xxvi) 3♣ opening as 5/5 in the majors with better ♥s; 3♦ opening as 5/5 in the majors with better ♠s (Hatton) (Currently permitted at Level 4; extension to Level 3 refused)
- (xxvii) Double of 1♣ to show 16-22 HCP, any distribution; double of 1♦ to show 11-15 HCP without a 5-card major (Jordan)
- (xxviii) 1♣ opening as 15-17 HCP, any shape (Haag)
- (xxix) Reduction in the strength requirements for opening bids of one of a suit in 3rd and 4th positions (Bell)
- (xxx) 1♠ opening as an unbalanced hand with no 4-card major (Bell)
- (xxx1) 1♣/1♦ opening as an unspecified 5-card major (Bell)
- (xxx2) Reduction in the strength requirements for strong 1♣ openings (Bell)
- (xxx3) “Either-or” 1♣ opening (Bell) (Currently permitted at Level 4; extension to Level 3 refused)
- (xxx4) Any two or three level opening that guarantees 4 cards in a specified suit (Bell) (Note – although it is proposed that part of this will be covered by the new blanket provisions (see paragraph J), such changes to the blanket provisions will await the new *OB*)
- (xxx5) Removal of the restriction that the non-strong options for two level openings must all guarantee or all deny the suit bid (Bell) (Note – a partial relaxation is proposed in the new blanket provisions, but such changes will await the new *OB*)

3.3 Other amendments

The L&E noted that detailed discussions had so far centred on alerting (and announcements) and permitted methods. There are of course other matters dealt with in the *Orange Book*. L&E members were invited to consider any other matters which required attention, and make appropriate suggestions to Mr Stevenson.

3.4 Detailed drafting and presentation

Mr Stevenson confirmed that sufficient decisions had been made to enable him to start the detailed drafting. Suggestions from L&E members were of course welcome. The L&E noted that a number of comments had been received over the life of the present *Orange Book* urging a different style of presentation of the section on permitted methods. Mr Doe tabled an extract from a paper he had written for OBESC some while ago, which contained examples of two alternative schemes of presentation designed to make it easier for players to find their way around the section on permitted methods.

Mr Stevenson said that comments had tended to recommend that definitions be brought together in one place, with cross-references as appropriate. The suggestion was noted that an introductory section on the no conventions rule (should it be appropriate to retain it) might be considered.

3.5 Timetable

The L&E considered that the timetable had not slipped as far behind as some people had thought or feared. It seemed realistic to hope for a draft by 1st April 2005. This should enable the basic target – of bringing the new *Orange Book* into force at the same time as the new Laws – to be met. (Mr Endicott commented that the timing for the Laws revision was still not finalised, but he hoped that it might be possible for draft text to be circulated via Zones to NBOs by, say, 1st April).

4. Annual review of the composition of the Panel of Referees

The L&E decided to make no changes to the composition of the panel. It wished to record that suggestions were always welcome, both for players to join the panel, and particularly for younger players who might be interested in gaining experience on appeals committees, with a view to joining the panel at a later date.

5. Reports from Tournament Directors

Due to lack of time this item was again deferred.

6. Date of next meeting

Wednesday 26th January at 1 pm at 40 Bernard Street.

7. Any other business

7.1 Consultation on rulings – correspondence – K.E. Stanley

Correspondence from Keith Stanley was noted. Mr Doe was asked to respond to the effect that the suggestions made largely reflected current policy.

7.2 Rubber Bridge Laws

The L&E noted that Messrs Cohen and Davenport had been deputed to put the matter of a revision in hand, but it was not known what progress might have been made.

7.3 Disciplinary procedures

Mr Dhondy highlighted the fact that he had not been involved as a member of the Investigatory Panel in two cases, and had not even known that they were being considered by others. Mr Doe apologised that due to an oversight he had allowed two reports from Tournament Directors with potential disciplinary connotations to go out to the reviewers. It had then been decided that it was better for one of the reviewers (Mr Barnfield) to act as a member of the Investigatory Panel in place of Mr Dhondy, which was an option available under the current interim procedures.

[Secretary's note – Committee members were asked to retain the Reports from Tournament Directors, consideration of which was deferred. They will therefore only be re-circulated to Committee members who specifically request them.]