



**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE EBU LAWS & ETHICS COMMITTEE
HELD AT 40 BERNARD STREET, LONDON WC1
ON WEDNESDAY 22ND JUNE 2005**

Present:	Martin Pool	Chairman
	Richard Fleet	Vice-Chairman
	Steve Barnfield	
	Jeremy Dhondy	
	David Martin	
	David Stevenson	
	Gerard Faulkner	Vice-President
	Nick Doe	Secretary

Before proceeding to business, the L&E wished to add its voice to the tributes to Tom Bradley, the former EBU Treasurer, who died at the end of May.

- | | | |
|---------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| 1. Apologies for Absence | Max Bavin | Chief Tournament Director |
| | David Burn | |
| | Philip Mason | EBU Vice-Chairman |
| | Denis Robson | EBU Chairman |

2. Minutes of the previous meeting (13th April)

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 Orange Book changes – announcement in English Bridge (items 2.2.1 and 5.1)

The L&E noted Mr Pool's response in the June issue of *English Bridge* to the critical letter in the previous issue. Mr Pool said that he would have preferred for the L&E to discuss the response before it was published, but time had been short. The L&E noted with approval that the Editorial Board had recently decided on a change in policy, so that EBU Committees criticised in letters to be published would be offered the opportunity to respond in the same issue. Mr Pool reported that the Chairman of the Editorial Board had assured him that she was anxious to work with the L&E to produce the best possible introduction of the 2006 *Orange Book* to the membership via the pages of *English Bridge*.

The L&E also discussed the fact that the cumulative *Orange Book* changes had not been included in the new (2004/05) combined EBU Diary and Handbook, and were again to be omitted from the 2005/06 edition. It noted that Mr Stevenson had written a critical letter to the General Manager on the subject.

There was a range of opinion as to the relative importance of the inclusion of this material in the diary, in comparison with other methods of disseminating it, but the L&E regretted that the decision had been made without reference to it. It also considered that the matter raised other concerns about the way in which the EBU communicates with its members.

The view was expressed that more frequent attendance by the EBU Chairman and Vice-Chairman at L&E meetings might avoid the problems of decisions relevant to the L&E's work being made without its knowledge.

2.2.2 *White Book – Index (item 2.2.2)*

Mr Doe confirmed that he had made further progress, and hoped that the index would be ready shortly.

2.2.3 *Disciplinary matters – complaint from a club event (“Tayberry”) (item 3.7)*

Mr Doe reported that the complaint had been withdrawn before he had been able to write to the complainant, but it had seemed helpful to write as planned in any event, and he had done so.

2.2.4 *Reports from Tournament Directors – 04.92 (item 6.1)*

Mr Doe reported that he had made the proposed changes to the psyche form.

2.2.5 *Reports from Tournament Directors – 05.01 (item 6.12)*

In the absence of a paper from Mr Bavin on the question of weighted scores (which attracted some criticism), the matter was deferred to the next meeting.

2.2.6 *Any other matters arising not featuring elsewhere on the Agenda*

None.

2A. Appeals to the National Authority

[additional items – the first appeal had been included in the revised agenda which had been circulated, but the second had arisen subsequently, and the procedural discussion arose out of consideration of the two appeals]

2A.1 Appeal from the Gold Cup

[Mr Fleet (who had been the referee in the case) withdrew from the discussion after clarifying some issues for the L&E's benefit]

The L&E considered an appeal to the National Authority from the Gold Cup.

The L&E concluded that the appeal did involve a matter of principle, in that two separate appeals (one by each side) had been treated together. This had had the effect of depriving one of the teams of the opportunity to put its case after having seen the submissions of its opponents in support of their appeal. The deposit would therefore be returned and the appeal considered on its merits.

The L&E upheld the decision of the Tournament Director and Referee to rule on the basis that misinformation had occurred, and to adjust the score to a contract of 5♥ doubled, played by E. Having considered the variety of possible leads and plays in this contract the L&E assigned the following weighted adjusted score in place of the single adjusted score assigned by the Referee:-

25% of 5♥^x –4 (N/S +800)
plus 65% of 5♥^x –3 (N/S +500)
plus 10% of 5♥^x –2 (N/S +300)

2A.2 Appeal from the Brighton Summer Congress

[Mr Dhondy, who had been Chairman of the original Appeals Committee, took no part in the discussion]

The L&E gave preliminary consideration to an appeal from the 2004 Brighton Summer Congress which had arisen in the following circumstances. The on-site appeal had been considered by the L&E as part of the normal review process, and the L&E had decided to write to the player concerned deprecating what it saw as an abuse of the appeals process. In response the player had given notice of his wish to appeal to the National Authority, and had requested a personal appearance before the L&E.

The L&E noted that there had been some misunderstanding concerning a request for a copy of the appeal form, which went some way to explaining the delay, and therefore decided that the appeal should not be ruled out of time. It was virtually unprecedented for the L&E to allow a personal appearance at an Appeal to the National Authority, such things being invariably dealt with by correspondence, but the L&E considered that there were special circumstances which warranted an exception being made on this occasion. The player would, however, be invited to put his arguments in writing in advance of the hearing of the appeal.

The L&E wished to make it clear that it had not formally decided that there was an issue of principle, an error of direction, or an error in the application of Law or Regulation, so as to justify the deposit being returned and the appeal being heard on its merits. It was for the appellant to make his case on these matters.

2A.3 Appeals to the National Authority – procedures

The L&E considered that its statement of policy with regard to Appeals to the National Authority was not as clear as it might be. The relevant part of the statement currently reads as follows:-

The deposit will normally be returned only if the Laws & Ethics Committee considers the appeal to involve either a question of principle, an error of direction, or an error in the application of Law or Regulation. The Committee does not revise value judgements unless they are grossly inappropriate

The L&E confirmed that consideration of Appeals to the National Authority is a two-stage process. It first considers whether one of the following four factors is present:

- a question of principle
- an error of direction
- an error in the application of Law or Regulation
- a grossly inappropriate value judgement

If the L&E decides that such a factor is present, then the appeal will be considered on its merits and the deposit normally returned. Otherwise, the appeal is dismissed and the deposit forfeited.

When, as a result of the above process, an appeal is considered on its merits, the L&E acts like any other Appeals Committee and considers all relevant matters. It may therefore substitute its own judgement for that of the Referee or Appeals Committee even though the previous judgement is not considered poor enough to rank as grossly inappropriate. The deposit may still be forfeited if the L&E considers the appeal to be without merit.

Mr Doe was asked to draft amendments to the statement to improve clarity.

3. Correspondence with players

3.1 04.66

The L&E considered the following psyche from the Brighton Summer Congress, which had been classified on site as Amber, and noted that the players had been informed that the L&E was considering a re-classification but had declined a further opportunity to comment.

Dealer E
Love all

	North	
	♠ A 10 9	
	♥ Q 3 2	
	♦ A 7	
	♣ K J 9 8 4	
West		East
♠ K Q 5		♠ 8 4
♥ 10 6		♥ J 9 8 7
♦ K J 10 6 5 4 3		♦ Q 8 2
♣ Q		♣ A 10 7 2
	South	
	♠ J 7 6 3 2	
	♥ A K 5 4	
	♦ 9	
	♣ 6 5 3	

Bidding:	West	North	East	South
	3♦	Dbl	Pass	Pass
	Pass	Pass	3♠*	4♥
			Pass	

The L&E re-classified the psyche as being in the Red category.

3.2 04.109

The Committee considered a response from a player to a request for an explanation of his actions. No further action was considered appropriate, and the papers would be put to file.

3.3 04.117

Mr Doe apologised that the letter requesting comments had only recently been sent, and the L&E agreed that the players should be given further time to respond.

3.4 04.119

The L&E considered the following psyche from the Blackpool Year-End Congress, which had been classified on site as Green, in the light of comments from one of the players.

Dealer E
E/W vul

	North	
	♠ Q 10 7	
	♥ Q 9 6 2	
	♦ 8 7	
	♣ K 7 6 5	
West		East
♠ J 4 2		♠ K 9 8 3
♥ K 10 4		♥ A J 6 5
♦ A K J 3 2		♦ 6 5
♣ A 8		♣ J 10 3
	South	
	♠ A 6 5	
	♥ 8 3	
	♦ Q 10 9 4	
	♣ Q 9 4 2	

Bidding:	West	North	East	South
	1♦	Pass	1♥	1♠*
	1NT	Pass	Pass	Pass

The L&E re-classified the psyche as being in the Amber category.

3.5 04.122

The L&E considered a psyche from the London Year-End Congress, which had been classified on site as Amber, in the light of comments from the pair concerned. The L&E decided to leave the classification unchanged.

3.6 05.13

Mr Doe apologised that the letter requesting an explanation had only recently been sent, and the L&E agreed that the players should be given further time to respond.

4. Disciplinary matters

4.1 Complaint from an EBU event (“Pear”)

The L&E noted a response from one of the players. No further action was considered appropriate, and the papers would be put to file.

4.2 Complaint about a circular to clubs (“Raspberry”)

The L&E considered further correspondence and noted that an apology had reached the complainants. No further action was considered appropriate, and the papers would be put to file.

4.3 Reference from Sussex C.C.B.A. (“Aardvark”)

The L&E considered a complaint which had been referred to it by Sussex. Mr Pool (who is also Chairman of Sussex) asked the L&E to note that he had a minor amount of prior knowledge of the case, which he explained. The L&E did not think that there was any reason to justify debarring him from considering the matter.

The L&E noted that no response had been received to the request for comments, and a reminder would be sent.

4.4 Reference from a County Association (“Bat”)

The L&E noted that an anticipated reference from a County had not materialised, the County having eventually decided that it was able to deal with the matter itself.

5. Technical matters

5.1 Misinformation – late director calls – split rulings

The L&E again considered its policy in situations where misinformation comes to light but the TD is not called at the proper time, so that the option to rewind the auction under Law 21B1 is lost. The L&E is on record as approving a refusal on the part of the TD to adjust the score on the basis of some different action by the non-offending side at a particular point in the auction, if the TD could have rewound the auction to that point had he been called in time.

The L&E considered the wording of Law 21B3 and Law 40 C, which respectively read:-

When it is too late to change a call, the Director may award an adjusted score (Law 40C may apply).

and

If the Director decides that a side has been damaged through its opponents' failure to explain the full meaning of a call or play, he may award an adjusted score.

The question to be decided was whether it is in accordance with the Laws to adjust the score when it is not too late to change a call, or would not have been had the director call been timely.

After a discussion Mr Fleet proposed the following interpretation:-

The general language of Law 40C is not restricted in misinformation cases by the words at the beginning of Law 21B3. Accordingly, the TD may adjust the score if damage has occurred, regardless of when he was called.

The proposal was seconded by Mr Barnfield and carried by 4 votes to 1. The L&E noted that a TD may still judge that a player who knew or should have known that he had a responsibility to call the director was attempting to gain an advantage by delaying the call, and deny him redress. The L&E also noted that the offending side have an equal responsibility to call the TD.

In the light of the decision it was not necessary to consider the matter of split scores, although the L&E could envisage occasions on which they might be justified.

6. Orange Book changes

A further draft of the 2006 Orange Book had been circulated in advance, and comments from L&E members were invited via Mr Doe as Secretary.

6.1 Alerting and announcements

Mr Stevenson made the following proposal in the interests of reducing the number of meaningless alerts:-

After one side has bid a suit naturally, or shown a suit by a transfer, then a bid of that suit by the other side, without a jump, should not require an alert unless it is natural, i.e. shows length in the suit bid.

The proposal, seconded by Mr Martin, was defeated by 3 votes to 2.

The L&E noted the draft of an article by Mr Stevenson for *English Bridge*. Comments were requested in good time for the copy deadline in just under two weeks.

6.2 Permitted methods

Mr Fleet raised what he considered to be an anomaly, namely that players are permitted to use any method of hand valuation which is readily comprehensible, yet regulation of the permitted minimum strength for various calls is expressed exclusively in terms of high card points and "Opening Points" (i.e. "Rule of X"). Mr Stevenson proposed an additional provision to qualify the statement about hand valuation methods, namely that any judgment as to whether players' methods satisfies the minimum strength requirements is based on HCP and/or Rule of X, as appropriate. This was agreed without a vote.

Mr Fleet also advocated an abandonment of the regulation of the strength of natural calls, particularly at Level 4, but this received little support. Mr Fleet made a specific proposal that the blanket ban on opening at the one level on 7 HCP or less should be abandoned at Level 4, and it was agreed to discuss this at the next meeting.

The L&E considered whether it was appropriate to maintain the existing ban on encrypted signals and agreed to maintain the status quo (subject to one exception which had already been agreed some meetings ago). It agreed that the ban on encryption should extend to all carding methods.

The L&E agreed to permit a 1♠ opening at Level 4 to show an unbalanced hand with either minor.

The L&E agreed to rationalise the provisions with regard to 2NT overcalls in defence to one of a suit and 1NT openings. These will be permitted to show a strong unspecified two-suiter, minimum strength Rule of 26.

The L&E agreed to rationalise the provisions with regard to a 2NT opening which shows a minor two suiter. This will no longer be permitted at Level 2. At Level 3, the requirement of a maximum range of 5 HCP will be removed.

The L&E considered a number of openings for which a maximum strength or a particular range is currently stipulated, in the light of Mr Stevenson's recommendation to abandon such stipulations (i.e. to confine the regulation of strength to the minimum permitted). The following were agreed:-

Stoker (1NT opening at Level 4 to show a 3-suited hand) – delete reference to maximum HCP and substitute minimum Rule of 18.

Clarke (3♣ opening at Level 3 to show 6+ clubs and a 4-card major) – delete reference to HCP range.

Dhondy (3♣ opening at Level 3 to show at least 5-5 in the minors) – delete reference to HCP range.

Cotterill (1NT response to a takeout double of 1♠ to show semi-positive values, not necessarily balanced) – this will no longer be permitted at Level 2. At Level 3, delete reference to HCP range and substitute reference to constructive values.

Bliss (cue bid at Level 4 to show an intermediate jump overcall in an unspecified suit) – delete reference to HCP range.

Mollo (1NT overcall at Level 4 to show a weak hand with a 6-card suit) – delete reference to maximum strength.

Reese (2♣ in the protective position at Level 4 to show a balanced hand; alternatively clubs or a balanced hand) – delete reference to minimum strength.

The L&E considered a proposal to abandon the present general rule on treatments, moving the specific provisions relating to the Level 3 Multi 2♦ to the section concerned with the Multi. Whilst there was general agreement that the reduction in regulation by way of detailed specifications for particular conventions meant that there was less need for a general provision, concern was expressed that to put nothing in its place might cause problems. It was agreed to move the specific provisions relating to the Multi, and to simplify the remaining provisions, and Mr Stevenson was asked to draft a replacement provision.

It was agreed to abandon the restriction on treating Gardener (1NT overcall at level 4 to show a strong balanced hand or a weak hand with a long suit of at least 6 cards). It was also agreed to abandon the minimum requirement of a 6-card suit for the weak option.

It was noted that the current ban on dual meaning odd-even and high-low signals (as distinct from discards) is restricted to cases where there is a suit-preference element. It was agreed to ban all such dual-meaning signals.

6.3 Convention card design

It was agreed to consider the possible abandonment of the ban on references to psyching habits, in conjunction with some other suggestions about the regulations concerning psyches.

Due to lack of time the remainder of this item was deferred.

6.4 Other issues

The L&E approved a suggestion that the wording of the item on timely director calls should be strengthened to accord with the language used in the Laws.

The L&E agreed with the proposal to tidy up the regulation concerning betting on events to make it clear that a bet by a player was only acceptable if he stood to gain by doing well in the event.

Due to lack of time consideration of a number of other matters were deferred.

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

7. Reports from Tournament Directors

Due to lack of time this item was deferred.

8. Date of next meeting

Tuesday 26th July at 1.15 pm at 40 Bernard Street.

9. Any other business

None.

[Secretary's note – L&E members were asked to retain the papers relating to the items deferred, which will not be re-circulated for the July meeting]



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

This paper is based on the digest of *Orange Book* decisions prepared for Council following the Laws & Ethics Committee meetings in November and December 2004. It has now been adapted to include decisions made at subsequent meetings, to act as a running record of the decisions which have been made to date.

To some extent the decisions are paraphrased in this paper – the actual minutes should be referred to for detailed wording if necessary. However, the wording in the minutes does not imply that the identical wording will necessarily be included in the new *Orange Book*, which will be a matter for the detailed drafting which remains to be done.

Revision 3 – June 2005. This reflects decisions made at the June 2005 L&E meeting, and changes since the previous version are underlined.

SECTION 1 – ALERTING AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

1.1 *Announcements*

1.1.1 *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.

1.1.2 *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.

1.1.3 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).

1.2 Basic alerting rules

1.2.1 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.

1.2.2 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”))

1.2.3 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.

1.2.4 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).

1.3 Alerting rules - Exceptions and Specific instances

1.3.1 Exceptions

The following will not require an alert:-

- fourth suit forcing;
- a 2NT strong enquiry response to a natural weak two opening.
- a 2♦ response to an **announceable** 2♣ Stayman enquiry

1.3.2 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)).

1.3.3 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).

1.3.4 Completion of transfers

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

1.3.5 Bids of opponents suits

New proposals rejected. No change.

1.3.6 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.

1.3.7 Rescue sequences when 1NT is doubled

No change.

SECTION 2 – PERMITTED METHODS – GENERAL

2.1 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*, at least at the drafting stage.

2.2 Detailed provisions for OB 2006 – Level 2

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 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.

2.2.3 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.

2.2.4 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.

2.2.5 Strong two-suited 2NT

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.

2.2.6 2NT opening as minor two-suiter

No longer to be permitted at Level 2.

2.2.7 Cotterill semi-positive 1NT

No longer to be permitted at Level 2.

2.2.8 Dual meaning signals

The reference to suit preference to be removed.

2.3 Detailed provisions for OB 2006 – Level 3

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.

2.3.2A 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 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).

2.3.3 Strong artificial 1NT openings

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

2.3.4 “Either-or” 1♣ openings

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

2.3.5 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.

2.3.6 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 Canapé overcalls

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

2.3.8 Transfer overcalls

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

2.3.9 Defence to 1NT

Any defence to be permitted.

2.3.10 2NT opening as minor two-suiter

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

2.3.11 Cotterill semi-positive 1NT

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

2.4 Detailed provisions for OB 2006 – Level 4

2.4.1 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).

2.4.2 “Either-or” 1♣ openings

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

2.4.3 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.

2.4.4 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.

2.4.5 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.

2.4.6 Minimum strength for one-level openings

Consideration to be given to abandoning the overriding ban on openings at the one level on 7 HCP or less.

2.4.7 1♠ opening

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

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 Gardener 1NT overcall

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

2.5 Miscellaneous

2.5.1 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.

2.5.2 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.

2.5.3 Strong openings

Clarification needed concerning agreements that ostensibly strong openings may be made with fewer than the specified values.

Regulation of the minimum strength of strong artificial openings at the one level to remain in terms of HCP rather than “Rule of X”.

2.5.4 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.

2.5.5 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 – see 2.4.9) to be moved to the section dealing with the Level 3 Multi.

2.6 Definitions

2.6.1 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.

SECTION 3 – OTHER REGULATIONS

3.1 Convention card design

3.1.1 EBU 20

Consideration to be given to its replacement by an ACBL-style card with tick boxes.

3.1.2 EBU 20A

Consideration to be given to amendments arising out of new regime for announcements.

3.2 Psyches

3.2.1 Classification

Minor amendments to the regulations to improve clarity.

3.2.2 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.

Note – the remaining sections of the original Council paper are not required in this record of decisions to date on the Orange Book 2006. Details of the changes coming into force on 1st April 2005 (which comprised section 3 of the Council paper) can be found by referring to the original Council paper, or to the new cumulative update booklet.