



**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE EBU LAWS & ETHICS COMMITTEE  
HELD AT 40 BERNARD STREET, LONDON WC1  
ON TUESDAY 26<sup>TH</sup> JULY 2005**

<b>Present:</b>	Martin Pool	Chairman
	Richard Fleet	Vice-Chairman
	Steve Barnfield	(for the latter part of the meeting)
	Max Bavin	Chief Tournament Director
	David Burn	
	Jeremy Dhondy	
	David Martin	
	David Stevenson	
	Nick Doe	Secretary

- 1. Apologies for Absence**
- |                  |                   |
|------------------|-------------------|
| Philip Mason     | EBU Vice-Chairman |
| Denis Robson     | EBU Chairman      |
| Grattan Endicott | Vice-President    |
| Gerard Faulkner  | Vice-President    |

**2. Minutes of the previous meeting (22<sup>nd</sup> June)**

**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 White Book – Index (item 2.2.2)**

Mr Doe tabled a revised list of index headings, which he hoped had addressed the principal concern previously expressed, namely that the index was far too long. Comments were invited.

**2.2.2 Appeals to the National Authority – procedures (item 2A.3)**

The L&E noted the revised statement produced by Mr Doe in consultation with Mr Pool, and decided on two amendments. The statement, incorporating those amendments, is attached as Appendix A to these minutes.

**2.2.3 Orange Book changes – omission from the EBU diary (item 2.2.1)**

Mr Fleet asked whether Mr Stevenson had had a response to his critical letter to the General Manager, and noted that the latter had asked Mr Pool to respond, which he had done.

### 3. Correspondence with players

#### 3.1 04.117

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

Dealer N  
E/W vul

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

<b>Bidding:</b>	<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>
	Pass	1♠	1NT	4♠
		Pass	Pass	

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

#### 3.2 05.13

The L&E considered an incident from the Tollemache Cup Final in the light of comments from the E/W pair.

The L&E noted that under the Disciplinary Rules it was not necessary for a matter to be subject to a formal complaint for it to consider disciplinary proceedings, as Rule 7.1 includes the phrase “or a matter otherwise comes to the attention of the Laws & Ethics Committee”. The L&E decided to consider the matter under the provisions of Rule 7.1 and concluded that whilst it fell within the scope of the Disciplinary Rules, formal disciplinary proceedings were not warranted.

It agreed, however, to write to the West player to draw his attention to the L&E’s view that a player who believes an opponent guilty of unfair play must use the proper channels to have his concern investigated, and must not accuse his opponent of cheating. It would be made clear to the player that any repetition of the language used would be likely to lead to formal disciplinary proceedings against him.

### 4. Appeal to the National Authority

*[item taken out of order; Messrs Burn and Dhondy withdrew; Mr Barnfield had not yet arrived; Mr Bavin participated as an expert witness only, and withdrew prior to discussion of the decision]*

The L&E considered an appeal to the National Authority from the 2004 Brighton Summer Congress. The appellant was heard in person.

The appeal concerned the meaning, and the legality, of the regulations in the *Orange Book* which restrict the distributions on which natural 1NT openings are permitted to the following:-

At Level 2:-

- balanced hands (4-3-3-3, 4-4-3-2 and 5-3-3-2 shapes)
- semi-balanced hands (5-4-2-2 and 6-3-2-2 shapes)

At Levels 3 and 4:-

- balanced or semi-balanced hands (as above)
- 4-4-4-1 hands (with a singleton of any rank)
- 5-4-3-1 hands (with a singleton honour only)

The L&E decided:-

- that the appeal raised a question of principle and that the deposit would therefore be returned;
- that the regulations are not ambiguous: they do prohibit the opening of 1NT by agreement on 5-4-3-1 hands with a low singleton;
- that the regulations are legal because:-
  - the L&E has the right to regulate conventions under Law 40D;
  - the wording of the definition of convention in the Laws, and in particular the use of the words “willingness to play”, provides sufficient latitude that an opening bid of 1NT, made by agreement on a hand which is neither balanced nor semi-balanced, may be judged to fall within the definition of a conventional call; and
  - the L&E has so judged;
- the appeal would therefore be dismissed.

The L&E decided that the implications of this appeal should be placed on the agenda for the next meeting, to allow all L&E members to contribute to the discussion. In particular the following propositions should be discussed:-

- that players entering events submit themselves to the published regulations, and should be expected to comply with them even though there may be doubt as to their legality;
- that players seeking to challenge regulations should do so by approaching the L&E via correspondence, rather than via the appeals process; and
- that the L&E should encourage such approaches in cases of difficulty.

## **5. Disciplinary matters**

### **5.1 Reference from Sussex C.C.B.A. (“Aardvark”)**

The L&E noted that no response had been received to the request for comments, despite a reminder. As it was understood that the member (who had not rejoined as a member for 2005/06) was currently living abroad, it was agreed to take no further action unless or until she did rejoin.

## **6. Technical matters**

### **6.1 Weighted scores**

The L&E considered, with the aid of a paper from Mr Bavin, whether it was appropriate to issue guidance on the maximum number of different results which should be included in a weighting, or the minimum percentage that it was appropriate to allocate to any particular result. It concluded that such guidance was not necessary.

## **7. Orange Book changes**

### **7.1 Alerting – consistency of approach**

Mr Stevenson drew the L&E’s attention to what he considered to be an inconsistency of approach in a number of L&E decisions, which had been made at several different meetings during the course of the *Orange Book* review. The decisions concerned were as follows:-

- that there should be a limited number of exceptions to the basic alerting rules;
- that fourth suit forcing should not be alerted;
- that a strong 2NT enquiry in response to a natural weak two opening should not be alerted; and
- that the status quo should remain in respect of bids of suits shown by the opponents (i.e. that conventional meanings of such cue-bids should be alerted and natural meanings not alerted).

The L&E agreed that there appeared to be some inconsistency, particularly between the decisions in relation to fourth suit forcing and cue-bids. A proposal from Mr Burn, seconded by Mr Dhondy, that in the interests of consistency the previous decisions relating to fourth suit forcing and 2NT responses to weak twos should be reversed, was carried by four votes to one.

### **7.2 Permitted methods – minimum strength for one-level openings**

A proposal by Mr Fleet, seconded by Mr Burn, that the blanket ban on opening at the one-level by agreement on hands of 7HCP or less should be abandoned at Level 4 only, was carried by four votes to one.

Note – no change is proposed to the other provisions relating to minimum strength, i.e. at Level 4:-

- it is not permitted to open a conventional one of a suit by agreement on less than Rule of 18;
- opening a natural one of a suit by agreement on less than Rule of 18 is subject to the no conventions rule; and
- opening a natural 1NT by agreement on less than 9 HCP is subject to the no conventions rule.

### **7.3 Permitted methods – nomenclature (Multi 2♦)**

The L&E agreed that a reference to a Multi 2♦, without qualification, means a traditional Multi in the sense that:-

- there is ambiguity as to the major suit held if the hand is weak; and
- there is at least one strong option of reasonable frequency.

Although the word “Multi” may be used as part of the description of a “♥s only” or a “weak only” Multi, it is incumbent on players to disclose the full range of options. Although a short description may sometimes be appropriate, a suitable qualification must be included in any short description of a non-standard Multi.

### **7.4 Permitted methods – application (M. Bennett)**

The L&E considered an application for a scheme of two-suited overcalls after the opponents have responded 1NT to an opening bid of one of a suit. Mr Stevenson proposed that the provisions for defence by fourth hand at Level 2 should be extended to permit any overcall to show a two-suiter including the bid suit. The proposal was seconded by Mr Burn and carried nem con.

### **7.5 Permitted methods – consistency**

Mr Doe drew attention to an apparent inconsistency in a decision made at the last meeting. It was agreed to remove the requirement of a 6-card suit from the specification of the Mollo 1NT overcall.

### **7.6 Psyches and “forgets”**

The L&E agreed to abandon the prohibition on references to psychic habits on WBF-style convention cards.

Following a discussion on the subject of disclosure of psychic tendencies generally, it was agreed to revisit the matter when the provisions of the 2006/07 Laws were known.

The L&E considered comments from a member on a number of aspects of the regulations concerning psyching. It thought the comments helpful, but did not consider any changes to the regulations necessary. In particular it did not consider the suggested guidance on when a psyche has been exposed to be sufficiently robust.

The L&E considered the case of a pair who have agreed to play a convention, but one of the players has difficulty remembering it. When the forgetful player uses the convention, his partner qualifies his explanation with a reference to his partner's tendency to forget the convention. The L&E decided that such an explanation is not illegal as such, but:-

- the explanation must not be misleading, in particular with regard to any implications concerning the subsequent action of the player giving the explanation; and
- it is open to a TD to rule that the pair are effectively playing a two-way method, so that:-
  - depending on the precise circumstances, the method may be illegal; and/or
  - the TD may conclude that both members of the pair are not playing the same method.

### **7.7 Asking questions during the auction**

A discussion took place on possible changes to the provision which recommends that players defer questions if their action at that turn does not depend upon the answer. The L&E noted the view expressed by Mr Burn, that this places players in an invidious position if they may or may not wish to take action depending on the answer, as they are forced to risk transmitting unauthorised information to partner, if they ask and receive an answer which indicates that they should pass. Mr Burn considered that these problems will be worse when the decision to abandon most alerts over the level of 3NT comes into effect. The L&E noted, however, that the regulation seemed successfully to have tackled what had previously been a problem, namely the tendency of players routinely to ask questions when holding values but not otherwise. No specific proposal for changes was put, and the status quo will therefore remain at least for the moment.

### **7.8 Random bids**

Mr Stevenson drew the L&E's attention to the fact that it had been suggested that some clarification of the ban on random calls should be introduced. As Editor of the *Orange Book* he had found himself unable to devise anything suitable.

Following a discussion in which it was suggested that the ban be abandoned, Mr Stevenson proposed that removal of the ban should be accompanied by a robust regulation on disclosure, under which it would be made clear that:-

- players adopting an agreement to make calls which had no specified meaning would be under an obligation to take great care over disclosure, particularly of negative inferences; and
- such players would be ruled against unless a TD was completely satisfied that they had given full disclosure.

The abandonment of the ban on random calls was agreed on this basis without a vote.

Note – such agreements remain subject to the generality of the *Orange Book* provisions concerning permitted methods: in effect, random calls will only be permitted in situations where the *Orange Book* provides that any defence (continuation etc.) is allowed.

### **7.9 Stop procedure**

Mr Barnfield suggested that it was wrong to oblige players whose opponents had not used the Stop procedure properly to pause as if the procedure had been used correctly. A discussion of various aspects ensued, including the question of tempo-sensitive situations where the Stop procedure does not currently apply because there has been no jump bid. The L&E accepted with thanks Mr Burn's offer to give the matter further consideration and bring forward specific options for consideration at the next meeting.

### **7.10 Convention card design**

### **7.11 Any other issues**

Due to lack of time these items were deferred.

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

**8. Reports from Tournament Directors**

Due to lack of time this item was deferred.

**9. Date of next meeting**

Wednesday 21<sup>st</sup> September at 1.15 pm at 40 Bernard Street.

**10. Any other business**

None.

*[Secretary's note – L&E members were asked to retain the papers relating to Reports from Tournament Directors, which will not be re-circulated for the September meeting. Other papers relating to matters deferred will be re-circulated as appropriate.]*



## **APPEALS TO THE NATIONAL AUTHORITY**

1 These are settled by the Laws & Ethics Committee and must be submitted in writing to the Secretary to the Committee, enclosing a deposit – currently – of £75.

2 No Appeal to the National Authority will be allowed if there was not a request for an appeal against the TD's ruling under Law 92A. (Law 93C).

3 Appeals to the National Authority must be submitted promptly. There is no specific time limit of general application, although a deadline may be imposed in a particular case. If the Laws & Ethics Committee decides that an appeal has not been submitted within a reasonable time, it will be dismissed.

4 If a copy of the original appeal form is required in order to decide whether to appeal, or to aid prepare of the case, one may be requested from the Secretary to the Laws & Ethics Committee.

5 An Appeal to the National Authority is heard on its merits, and the deposit normally returned, only if the Laws & Ethics Committee considers the appeal to involve one or more of the following:-

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

If none of these factors is present the appeal will be dismissed and the deposit forfeited. Note that a request to revise a value judgement which falls short of being grossly inappropriate is not a sound basis for an appeal to the National Authority.

6 If one of the specified factors is found to be present, the Laws & Ethics Committee will consider the matter afresh in the light of the submissions made, and it may revise a value judgement even if it does not consider it to have been grossly inappropriate.

7 Appeals to the National Authority are almost invariably dealt with by correspondence. Only in exceptional circumstances will the Laws & Ethics Committee allow a personal attendance by a party to the appeal.

8 The outcome of an appeal to the National Authority, or some other intervention by the Laws & Ethics Committee, will affect the result of a match in a knock-out competition only if the decision is made in time for the result to be included in the draw for the next round without undue disruption to the progress of the competition. The same principles apply, with any necessary modifications, to any competition which involves qualification for a subsequent round or stage of the competition.

*[Please see notes overleaf]*

*[This statement in its original form was published in the Orange Book 1998. A number of amendments have been made, to reflect subsequent decisions of the EBU Laws & Ethics and Tournament Committees – the statement was last revised in July 2005.]*

*Any queries should be addressed to the Secretary to the Laws & Ethics Committee*

Nick Doe  
Secretary to the Laws & Ethics Committee  
English Bridge Union  
Broadfields  
Bicester Road  
Aylesbury HP19 8AZ

Tel: 01296-317208  
Fax: 01296-317220  
email: [nick@ebu.co.uk](mailto:nick@ebu.co.uk)



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

The current Orange Book was published in 1988, although a number of amendments have been brought into force since then, details of which are contained in the current cumulative update booklet (yellow, dated January 2005, incorporating changes coming into force on 1<sup>st</sup> April 2005). The EBU Laws & Ethics Committee (“L&E”) is currently undertaking a complete review of the *Orange Book* with a view to publication of a new edition which is likely to come into force some time in 2006. This paper sets out the current state of the proposals, and is updated on a meeting by meeting basis. It was originally based on the digest of *Orange Book* decisions prepared for Council following the L&E meetings in November and December 2004.

In two respects the wording in this paper does not necessarily represent the precise wording which will be included in the 2006 *Orange Book*:-

- to some extent the decisions of the L&E are paraphrased in this paper – the actual minutes should be referred to for detailed wording if necessary; and
- in a number of cases the wording of the minutes themselves will not necessarily be included verbatim in the new *Orange Book*, the precise wording of which will be a matter for the detailed drafting, some of which remains to be done.

Some sections of the original Council paper are not included in this paper, notably details of the changes coming into force on 1<sup>st</sup> April 2005, which can be found in the cumulative update booklet.

***Revision 4 – July 2005. This reflects decisions made at the July 2005 L&E meeting, and changes since the previous version are underlined. There are a number of numbering changes, as the paper has been re-ordered to put it into a more logical order (rather than the previous order which was largely chronological within each section).***

### **SECTION 1 – ALERTING (including ANNOUNCEMENTS)**

#### **1.1 Basic alerting rules**

##### **1.1.1 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.

##### **1.1.2 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”))

### **1.1.3 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 Alerting rules – Exceptions**

### **1.2.1 Announceable bids**

Bids should not be alerted if an announcement is required instead (see section 1.4)

### **1.2.2 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).

### **1.2.3 Exceptions**

The following will not require an alert:-

- a 2♦ response to an **announceable** 2♣ Stayman enquiry

## **1.3 Alerting rules – Specific instances**

### **1.3.1 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).

### **1.3.2 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.

### **1.3.3 Completion of transfers**

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

### **1.3.4 Rescue sequences when 1NT is doubled**

No change.

### **1.3.5 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)).

### **1.3.6 Very common alerts**

Proposals were made to eliminate alerts of artificial bids in certain very common situations, namely:-

- fourth suit forcing;
- a 2NT strong enquiry response to a natural weak two opening.
- bids of opponents suits

These new proposals have been rejected. There will be no change – the bids concerned will remain alertable (and a bid of an opponent's suit which is used in a natural sense will remain non-alertable).

## **1.4 Announcements**

### **1.4.1 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.

### **1.4.2 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.

### **1.4.3 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).

## **SECTION 2 – PERMITTED METHODS**

### **2.1 General**

#### **2.1.1 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.
- Nomenclature remains to be addressed.

#### **2.1.2 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.

#### **2.1.3 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) to be moved to the section dealing with the Level 3 Multi.

#### **2.1.4 Random calls**

The prohibition on agreements to make random calls to be removed, subject to a new regulation on disclosure (see section 3.1.2)

Note – any such agreements will remain subject to the generality of the permitted methods regulations, so that, in effect, random calls will only be permitted in situations where any defence (continuation etc.) is allowed.

#### **2.1.5 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.

### **2.1.6 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.

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

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

### **2.1.7 Nomenclature – Multi 2♦**

References to a Multi 2♦, without qualification, mean a traditional Multi where:-

- there is ambiguity as to the major suit held if the hand is weak; and
- there is at least one strong option of reasonable frequency.

Although the word “Multi” may be used as part of the description of a “♥s only” or a “weak only” Multi, players must disclose the full range of options. If a short description is used, a suitable qualification must be included in the case of any non-standard Multi.

## **2.2 New Level 2 provisions**

### **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 2NT opening as minor two-suiter**

No longer to be permitted at Level 2.

### **2.2.4 Strong two-suited 2NT overcall**

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.

### **2.2.5 Defence by fourth hand**

The provisions to be extended to permit any overcall to show a two-suiter including the bid suit.

### **2.2.6 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.

### **2.2.7 Cotterill semi-positive 1NT**

No longer to be permitted at Level 2.

### **2.2.8 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.

### **2.2.9 Dual meaning signals**

The reference to suit preference to be removed.

## **2.3 New Level 3 provisions**

### **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.

### **2.3.3 “Either-or” 1♣ openings**

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

### **2.3.4 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 in a 5-4-3-1 hand 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).

### **2.3.5 Strong artificial 1NT openings**

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

### **2.3.6 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 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.

### **2.3.8 2NT opening as minor two-suiter**

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

### **2.3.9 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.

**2.3.10 Cotterill semi-positive 1NT**

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

**2.3.11 Canapé overcalls**

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

**2.3.12 Transfer overcalls**

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

**2.3.13 Defence to 1NT**

Any defence to be permitted.

**2.4 New Level 4 provisions**

**2.4.1 Minimum strength for one-level openings**

The overriding ban on openings at the one level by agreement on 7 HCP or less to be abandoned.

Note – no change is proposed to the other provisions relating to minimum strength, i.e.:-

- it is not permitted to open a conventional one of a suit by agreement on less than Rule of 18;
- opening a natural one of a suit by agreement on less than Rule of 18 is subject to the no conventions rule; and
- opening a natural 1NT by agreement on less than 9 HCP is subject to the no conventions rule.

**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 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.

**2.4.4 1♠ opening**

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

**2.4.5 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).

**2.4.6 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.

### **2.4.7      *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.

### **2.4.8      *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.

### **2.4.9      *Mollo and Gardener 1NT overcalls***

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

## **SECTION 3 – OTHER REGULATIONS**

### **3.1            *Disclosure of system***

#### **3.1.1        *Questions during the auction***

No change to the present advice to defer questions if the action at that turn does not depend on the answer.

#### **3.1.2        *Random calls***

A new regulation to be introduced concerning disclosure of agreements to make random calls, including:-

- that players adopting an agreement to make calls which had no specified meaning would be under an obligation to take great care over disclosure, particularly of negative inferences; and
- that such players would be ruled against unless a TD was completely satisfied that they had given full disclosure.

### **3.2            *Convention card design***

#### **3.2.1        *EBU 20***

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

#### **3.2.2        *EBU 20A***

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

### **3.3            *Psyches***

#### **3.3.1        *Classification***

Minor amendments to the regulations to improve clarity.

#### **3.3.2        *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.

**3.3.3**      **WBF convention cards**

The prohibition on references to psychic habits on such convention cards to be removed.

**3.4**            **Procedures**

**3.4.1**          **Stop procedure**

Consideration to be given to amending the regulations:-

- to apply the procedure to tempo-sensitive situations where it does not currently apply because there has been no jump bid;
- to change the obligations of the opponents when the procedure is not correctly followed by the side which makes the jump bid.