



**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE EBU LAWS & ETHICS COMMITTEE
HELD AT 40 BERNARD STREET, LONDON WC1
ON WEDNESDAY 26TH JANUARY 2005**

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

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

2. Minutes of the previous meeting (14th December)

2.1 Accuracy

Mr Doe said that it had been suggested to him that the minutes would be clearer with the addition of the words "at Level 3," after the word "currently" in the first note in parentheses in item 3.2 (J). This was agreed. With this amendment, 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)

Mr Doe reported that Mrs Gudge had recently indicated that the outstanding material (including details of *Orange Book* changes effective 1st April) would go up on the site very shortly.

[Secretary's note – a complete reorganisation of the L&E section of the site, including the posting of significant quantities of new material, was put into effect in the first week of February.]

2.2.2 Articles for English Bridge (item 2.2.2)

The L&E noted two articles prepared by Mr Stevenson, and considered that the tone of one of them was too light-hearted. One of the articles was short, and it was suggested that the Editor might prefer to use it in the context of Mr Dhondy's question and answer column. Mr Doe was asked to liaise with the appropriate people concerning publication.

2.2.3 White Book – Index (item 6.2)

Mr Doe regretted that he had not yet been able to make any progress.

3. Orange Book revisions

3.1 Reference back from Council

Mr Pool reported that Council had referred one matter back to the L&E, namely the decision neither to announce nor to alert natural two-level openings which were either strong or weak. The L&E discussed the options, which included maintaining the status quo (i.e. that currently in force – alerting weak but not strong twos), introducing announcements for either weak or strong twos but not the other, or announcing all natural twos. A proposal from Mr Fleet, seconded by Mr Barnfield, that the status quo be maintained, was defeated by 3 votes to 2.

After further discussion of the merits of the remaining options, Mr Stevenson proposed that all natural two-level openings should be announced, with the announcement to fall into one of four categories:-

- strong and forcing;
- strong but not forcing;
- intermediate;
- weak.

The proposal was seconded by Mr Dhondy and carried unanimously.

(Note – the precise definitions of the various categories, as well as the prescribed form of the announcements, remain to be determined).

The L&E decided to revisit the decision of the last meeting, that two-level openings which show the suit bid, but which have particular distributional constraints relating to other suits (such as a Precision 2♣ opening as traditionally played) should not be considered natural for alerting purposes. Most L&E members considered that a weak two opening which shows 5+ cards in the suit, but is not made on 5-3-3-2 distribution (one, therefore, which shows either 6 cards, or 5 cards plus a second suit of at least 4 cards) should be considered as natural. In the light of this it was agreed that there was a measure of inconsistency in the previous decision. A proposal from Mr Dhondy, seconded by Mr Stevenson, that openings akin to the Precision and Blue Club 2♣ openings (i.e. openings which show the suit bid and have distributional constraints relating to other suits, but only promise another suit in certain defined circumstances) should be treated as natural for alerting purposes, was carried nem con.

(Note – openings which always promise a second suit are not natural).

3.2 Other matters arising from the Council meeting

Mr Pool reported that Council had expressed a firm view that detailed provisions equivalent to the current Level 3 should continue to be published in some form or another. Mr Stevenson indicated that under the revised format he proposed to adopt, where all the provisions relating to a particular class of call were presented in the same place, the inclusion of Level 3 provisions would not take up much additional space. As a good deal of work had already been done on Level 3, he proposed to include it in the draft, and the L&E was content for him to do so. It would be interesting to see whether other sponsoring organisations followed the EBU lead in ceasing to use Level 3.

Council had also considered that it would be a good idea to publish a guide to announcements so that sponsoring organisations would readily be able to try them out in advance of the implementation of the new *Orange Book*. The L&E noted the suggestion, but considered it premature as any such guide would necessarily be based on the detailed regulations which had yet to be drafted.

The L&E noted a suggestion made at Council that colour-coded convention cards might be considered. The L&E was not convinced that this would be helpful, quite apart from the fact that there were cost implications. Mr Fleet considered that it was time for a fundamental re-design of the convention card, but the L&E was unconvinced that this was necessary.

Mr Bavin complimented Mr Pool on what he considered to have been an excellent presentation to Council.

3.3 Changes coming into force on 1st April 2005

The L&E noted that an announcement was to appear in the February issue of *English Bridge*. Unlike on previous occasions, it would not consist of a full statement of the precise changes to the text. Instead, it would summarise them in a form which it was hoped would be more helpful to members. There would be a statement that full details were available on the website or from Aylesbury. A new cumulative update booklet had been prepared, and the details would be posted on the website shortly.

3.4 Other matters

Mr Stevenson drew the L&E's attention to the fact that its decisions on alerting had not contained any reference to redoubles. The L&E decided that there was no need for any specific provisions for redoubles in the statement concerning the alerting of calls over 3NT, except that the reference to lead-directing doubles should be to doubles and redoubles. With regard to other redoubles the following was agreed without a formal vote:-

- redoubles that are for business or show general strength, which partner is normally expected to pass if the next hand passes, should not require an alert; whereas
- other redoubles, notably those which partner is expected to take out, should require an alert.

The L&E considered the alerting status of Lightner doubles, in relation to which some doubt was expressed as to the effect of the decisions already made. A proposal from Mr Stevenson, seconded by Mr Fleet, that a double of a potential final contract which carries a lead-directing message, should be considered to be a lead directing double for the purposes of the decisions already made, was approved nem con.

(Note – the effect of this is that a Lightner double is alertable).

The L&E noted that Mr Doe had prepared a digest of the decisions made at the previous meetings, which had been circulated to Council members prior to the last Council meeting. It decided that this should be updated on a meeting-by-meeting basis as a record of the decisions so far made.

[Secretary's note – a copy is attached as Appendix A to these minutes].

During the course of a subsequent item it became apparent that a number of L&E members were under the impression that changes had been agreed to the conditions applicable to ostensibly natural 1NT openings which may by agreement contain a singleton. It was confirmed that no such decision had been minuted, neither was any such proposal included in the papers for any of the previous meetings at which *Orange Book* matters had been discussed (although this may have been an oversight). Mr Stevenson proposed that the provisions applicable at Level 3 should be relaxed to permit an otherwise natural 1NT opening on the following distributions in addition to those which are defined as balanced or semi-balanced:-

- 4-4-4-1
- 5-4-3-1
- 6-3-3-1

There would no longer be any restriction on the rank of the singleton. However, the remaining provisions, including the existing restriction that the point count must be strictly within the advertised range, would remain in place. The proposal was seconded by Mr Dhondy and carried by 5 votes to 1.

(Note – the restriction on the rank of the singleton, requiring the singleton to be an honour, is currently applicable to 5-4-3-1 but not 4-4-4-1 distributions).

A discussion took place on the timetable for implementation of the new *Orange Book*, some doubt being cast on the need to defer implementation until the new Laws came into force. Although it was anticipated that changes dictated by the new Laws were not likely to be extensive, as a

practical matter it was assumed that the text of the new Laws was likely to be available before the draft of the new *Orange Book* was finalised. Accordingly, a decision as to whether to depart from the implementation plan agreed at the April 2004 meeting could be deferred until a final draft *Orange Book* was ready, by which time the progress of the Laws revision would no doubt be clearer.

4. Correspondence with players

4.1 04.55 and 04.56 (item 4.1 of 8th September 2004)

The Committee considered further correspondence and agreed that, subject to checking that there were no further relevant incidents on file which had not been put before the meeting, the papers should be put to file. It was, however, appropriate to write to the player concerned to draw his attention to some points concerning disclosure of his methods.

A proposal from the Chair that the name of the player should be removed from the Panel of Referees was carried nem con.

4.2 Permitted methods – the “no conventions” rule

The L&E considered correspondence from a player who contended that a pass which was inferentially forcing because of agreements concerning the strength of other, non-conventional, calls which had not been selected, should not be taken to breach the “no-conventions” rule. The L&E disagreed – a forcing pass is clearly conventional under the Laws, and the fact that it is said to be only inferentially forcing is of no significance: it is still forcing by virtue of the players’ agreements.

(Note – the “no-conventions” rule allows certain actions on hands which are weaker than normally permitted “but only if you do not play any conventional calls thereafter”).

4.3 Split rulings in Swiss Pairs events

The L&E considered correspondence suggesting that the effect on the Victory Point scores of the contestants affected by a split ruling was unintended and capricious – the ruling had led to a match result of 6-6 on the normal (20VP) scale. The L&E did not agree.

Mr Stevenson suggested that it was more important to consider whether he (as the Tournament Director involved) had been correct to give a split ruling, and it was agreed to place this on the agenda for a discussion at the next meeting.

5. Disciplinary matters

The L&E noted that following implementation of the constitutional changes at the last Council meeting, responsibility for investigating and prosecuting all disciplinary matters which had not yet reached the stage of a decision to convene a formal disciplinary hearing now reverted to the full L&E. It expressed its thanks to those L&E members who had given their time to serving on the Investigatory Panel during the longer than originally anticipated period during which it had been necessary to operate the Panel system.

The L&E noted that there were no formal hearings pending, and reviewed the state of two matters currently under investigation.

5.1 Complaint from a Welsh Bridge Union event (“Orange”)

The L&E noted the current position.

5.2 Complaint from an EBU event (“Pear”)

The L&E considered correspondence. The matter had originally been raised by a player who appeared to be more concerned with alleged failures in appeals procedure than with the behaviour of his opponents. It was agreed to write to the player in response to the concerns which he had raised, and to the Appeals Committee in relation to some of the matters raised.

However, two of the L&E members who review Reports from Tournament Directors had suggested that the alleged behaviour of the opponents warranted disciplinary proceedings, and the matter had therefore been considered by the Investigatory Panel. It was agreed to write to the players concerned for comments.

6. Reports from Tournament Directors

At Mr Pool's invitation, Mr Fleet took the chair for this item.

The L&E noted that once again the standard of form-filling in a number of cases was below that which it was entitled to expect.

6.1 04.59

Dealer S
Game all
Swiss Pairs

North

♠ A Q 7 6
♥ J 4 2
♦ 9 6 4 2
♣ Q 3

West

♠ -
♥ K 10 6 5
♦ A K J 10 8 7 5
♣ K 4

East

♠ J 10 9 8 5 2
♥ 8
♦ 3
♣ J 9 8 7 6

South

♠ K 4 3
♥ A Q 9 7 3
♦ Q
♣ A 10 5 2

Bidding:	West	North	East	South
				1♥
	2♦	2♥	Pass	Pass ^H
	3♦	Dbf	Pass	Pass
	Pass			

Result: 3♦^X-1 N/S +200

Tournament Director's statement of facts & ruling

I was called to the table by W, who questioned whether N could be allowed to double after S's slow pass. N stated that he had doubled because he was maximum for his 2♥ bid. After consultation I ruled that the double was not automatic and adjusted the score accordingly.

Score adjusted to 3♦-1, N/S +100.

Appeals Committee's decision

We don't think that pass is a logical alternative for N, and the hesitation does not suggest that double is going to be more successful than 3♥.

Table score restored.

L&E comment:

The L&E was surprised at the Appeals Committee's decision that Pass was not a logical alternative, and by its conclusion that double was not suggested. The L&E considered that double was suggested because it catered for whatever S was likely to have for his hesitation (if S had extra strength, he could pass; if he had extra distribution, he could remove to 3♥).

6.2 04.60

Dealer S

Love all

Swiss Pairs

North

♠ K Q 7 6 5
 ♥ Q 8
 ♦ Q 9 5
 ♣ K 10 3

West

♠ A 9 8
 ♥ A J 10 9 7 4
 ♦ 4
 ♣ 9 6 5

East

♠ J 4 3
 ♥ K 6 5 3
 ♦ J 8 6 2
 ♣ 7 4

South

♠ 10 2
 ♥ 2
 ♦ A K 10 7 3
 ♣ A Q J 8 2

Bidding:	West	North	East	South
	2♦ ^A	Pass ²	2♠	1♦ ^{A1}
	3♥	3♠ ^A	Pass	3♦
	Pass	4♦	Pass	4♣ ³
	Pass			Pass

1 Precision

2 Before passing, N asked E the meaning of 2♦, and was told that it was two-suited in the black suits

3 Not alerted

Result: 4♦+1 N/S +150***Tournament Director's statement of facts & ruling***

Despite the absence of any explanation of "CRO" (as the meaning of W's cuebid) on the convention card, I was satisfied that W's 2♦ did show the black suits, and while W's 3♥ is an on-going bid, the 3♠ by N permits E/W to withdraw from the auction.

I ruled that there was no misinformation. I ruled that the possible unauthorised information did not damage N/S. I instructed E/W to complete their convention card properly.

I allowed the result to stand.

Appeals Committee's decision

Subsequent to the facts being presented by the TD at the appeal, and subsequent to the facts upon which the TD's decision was made, the appellant made the Appeals Committee aware of additional facts. It is possible that, in the light of the additional facts, the TD may have come to a different decision. It is also possible that the Appeals Committee should not consider different facts in determining the appeal at this stage. The TD is requested to ascertain the totality of the facts and reconsider his decision without any further guidance from the Appeals Committee at this stage.

If it is necessary for the appeal still to be heard, it should be in front of this same constituted Appeals Committee.

Tournament Director's statement of additional facts & ruling

W was bidding under his own misunderstanding that S had opened 1♣ [strong]. By their agreed methods [his 2♦ bid] shows a weak jump overcall in ♥s.

Following E's 2♠ bid, W is not allowed to be aware of E's incorrect explanation of his supposed WJO. Consequently he would/should bid 3♠, being maximum for his WJO, with primary support for his partner and a singleton. If W were to [bid] 3♠, it is N/S's agreement that a double by N would be for penalties.

I adjusted the score to 3♠^X-5 by E, N/S +1100. There was no appeal.

L&E comment:

The L&E was surprised by the procedure adopted by the Appeals Committee, as it could not see why the Appeals Committee could not itself have investigated the facts and reached a decision. However, the procedure adopted seems to have worked well enough on this occasion.

6.3 04.63

The L&E deprecated the actions of a player who appeared to have deliberately used the appeals process as a means of drawing attention to his criticisms of the regulations. It decided to write to the player to express its displeasure.

6.4 04.66

The L&E considered a psyche report from the Brighton Summer Congress, which had been classified on site as Amber, and decided to write to the players to invite comments with a view to reclassifying it as Red.

6.5 04.70

Dealer N
E/W vul
Swiss Pairs

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

Bidding:	West	North	East	South
		1♥	2♠ ^{A1}	Pass
	4♦	Pass	4♠	Pass
	Pass	Dbl	Pass	Pass
	Pass			

1 Described as both minors – confirmed on system card

Result: 4♠^X= N/S -790

Tournament Director's statement of facts & ruling

I was called at the end of the hand. I asked E why he bid 4♠, and he said it was because his partner's answer (legal) to a legal question had caused him to realise he had mis-bid. I explained that he may not do that. I asked him to adopt a mind set in which he was unaware of his misbid and he then said 4♦ would have been a splinter. Given that the overcall was weak, and a splinter opposite his void was duplicated values, he would sign off in 4♠ anyway.

I ruled that passing 4♦ was not a logical alternative, and signing off in 4♠ was evident. I allowed the score to stand.

Appeals Committee's decision

E's 4♠ bid was influenced by the unauthorised information; 4♥ is certainly a logical alternative.

W has no reason to suspect partner does not have the minors other than the table action and so must bid 5♦.

E might decide partner in fact has a lot of ♦s (as he has none) and pass.

Although passing 4♦ was not a logical alternative, we do not see that W has any alternative to bidding 5♦ opposite a slam try with a ♠ control.

We adjusted the score to:-

25% of 5♦^X-7 (N/S +2000)
plus 75% of 5♠^X-1 (N/S +200)

L&E comment:

This is a fielded misbid, which is normally scored as average plus / average minus. The correct adjustment is whichever is more beneficial to the non-offenders of:-

- (a) the adjustment made by the Appeals Committee; and
- (b) average plus / average minus.

6.6 04.76

Dealer S
Game all
MP Pairs

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

Bidding:	West	North	East	South
	1♥	1NT ¹	2♥	Pass
	Pass	3♦	Pass	Pass ^H
	Pass			Pass

1 15-17

Result: 3♦+1 N/S +130

Tournament Director's statement of facts & ruling

E/W called me after N's 3♦ bid, claiming that S had hesitated for some time before passing over 2♥. N agreed. I was recalled at the end of the hand. E/W argued that it was not normal to bid 3♦ after overcalling 1NT. I asked N why he bid 3♦. He said that E/W had a ♥ fit. He wanted to push them to 3♥. They had stopped in 2♥. E was obviously weak.

While N had bridge reasons for his call, his action would not be chosen by the majority. It is not a 70% action. Pass is a logical alternative.

I adjusted the score to 2♥=, N/S -110.

When I gave the ruling, N said S was an inexperienced tournament player. She thought about many things. This does not change N's obligations in this matter.

Appeals Committee's decision

A TD's ruling is not an accusation of unethical conduct. The Law is quite clear that N cannot bid 3♦ here. The TD had this perfectly correct. The only discussion was over whether we should keep the deposit.

We upheld the TD's ruling and forfeited the deposit.

L&E comment:

This is an example of a deposit being quite correctly forfeited (N was not inexperienced).

6.7 04.83

Dealer S

E/W vul

Swiss Teams

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

Bidding:	West	North	East	South
			Pass ¹	2♦ ^{A2}
	Pass ³	2♥ ^A	Pass ⁴	Pass
	Dbf	Pass	2NT ⁵	Pass
	Pass	Pass		

- 1 Out of turn
- 2 Multi
- 3 Asked whether he had unauthorised information
- 4 Enforced
- 5 8-11 points (not playing Lebensohl)

Result: 2NT-2 N/S +200

Tournament Director's statement of facts & ruling

I was called to the table after E had passed out of turn before anyone had called. I read Law 30 to them and S decided not to accept the call. S opened 2♦ (Multi) and W asked me whether he had unauthorised information. I said that the information was authorised as the Law book did not refer to Law 16. I failed to apply Law 16C regarding information from a withdrawn call being unauthorised.

I was called back at the end of the hand, by which time I had consulted with my colleagues and become aware of my error. It was claimed that W had used unauthorised information when he had passed 2NT and suggested that he might have bid 3NT without it.

I ruled that although Director's error had occurred it had not affected the hand. W has 13 points and his partner has shown 8-11 points with 2NT. He also knows that the ♥ suit is in an unfavourable position and that what is likely to be the stronger opponent's hand is on his left. Result to stand as W did state that his hand was nearly good enough for 3NT but he would have passed.

Appeals Committee's decision

We have ruled on the basis that there was unauthorised information, although we have not decided that this was the case.

We feel that W would not have raised an 8-11 point 2NT to 3NT, so the table result stands.

Regarding the unauthorised information, we feel that the pass should give unauthorised information, but the Laws do not actually state this. We would like a clarification from the law-makers on this issue.

L&E comment:

The L&E understand that this matter was discussed at meetings of the WBF Laws Committee at the recent World Teams Olympiad in Istanbul. When the wording of the WBF minute is known the L&E will revisit the matter.

Due to a power failure the meeting had to terminate somewhat early, with consideration of the remaining reports being deferred.

*[Secretary's note – the outstanding reports **will** be re-circulated for the next meeting].*

7. Date of next meeting

Wednesday 13th April at 1.15 pm at 40 Bernard Street.

8. Any other business

None.



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 1 – January 2005. This reflects decisions made at the January 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:-
 - 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:-
 - strong and forcing
 - strong but 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.

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.

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.

2.3 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 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.

2.4 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.

2.5 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”.

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.