



**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE EBU LAWS & ETHICS COMMITTEE  
HELD AT THE 40 BERNARD STREET, RUSSELL SQUARE, LONDON WC1  
ON TUESDAY 6<sup>TH</sup> JUNE 2006**

<b>Present:</b>	Martin Pool	Chairman
	Steve Barnfield	
	Max Bavin	Chief Tournament Director
	David Burn	
	Jeremy Dhondy	
	David Stevenson	
	Gerard Faulkner	Vice-President
	John Pain	Secretary

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

The Chairman opened the meeting by welcoming John Pain as the new Secretary to the Laws and Ethics Committee and paid tribute to Nick Doe as the outgoing secretary. The secretary was asked to write to Nick thanking him for his years of service.

**2. Minutes of Previous Meeting (24<sup>th</sup> March 2006)**

**2.1 Accuracy**

The minutes of the meeting of March 24<sup>th</sup> 2006 were read and approved as a true record. They were signed by the Chairman.

**2.2 Matters arising**

**2.2.1 White Book – index (item 2.2.1)**

Mr Bavin had had an offer from Chris Barrable to complete the already started index and Mr Stevenson also offered to help complete the job. Mr Dhondy said it was an embarrassment that after nearly two years the index remained unfinished and all agreed. Mr Pool undertook to speak to the Treasurer suggesting a budget of £500 to complete the job. Both Mr Bavin and Mr Stevenson suggested that while the indexing was being completed there was an opportunity to make amendment to the Victory Point Scale for Swiss Pairs events. There had been criticism that it was now too easy to win 20-0. Correspondence from John Armstrong and others suggested an arithmetical error in the calculation of the percentages and Mr Bavin undertook to speak to Mr Martin to clarify the matter.

**2.2.2 Reports from Tournament Directors – 05.43 (item 4.4)**

Correspondence had been received from one of the pair concerned. The action was confirmed as 'green'. The secretary to write to the pair concerned thanking them for their comments.

**2.2.3 Reports from Tournament Directors – 05.70/71 (item 4.9)**

Correspondence had been received from the pair concerned. The committee decided no further action was necessary. The secretary to write to the pair concerned thanking them for their comments.

**2.2.4 'Hippopotamus' case (item 5.1)**

Mr Doe had written, with Mr Pool's approval, to the players concerned.

**2.2.5 EBU20B – final changes**

After discussion a few minor changes were made to the new EBU 20B convention card. However under any other business Mr Dhondy reopened the discussion. He was unhappy that the new *Orange Book* was only now being distributed to members and changes to the published example were already being discussed before members had had a chance to use it. Others agreed and it was AGREED that changes discussed earlier in the meeting would be put on hold until after a trial period of, say, six months. Changes could then be incorporated with any other suggestions from members.

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

Item 6.1 was taken at this point. There had been correspondence on the attitude of the committee to announcements and the hard of hearing. Mr Faulkner reminded the committee that clubs have complete discretion as to whether to introduce the new methods (including announcements) or not. Mr Stevenson suggested that the new methods should be given a try and any problems considered once they had been identified. This was AGREED.

**3. Resignation of Vice Chairman**

The Chairman outlined the reasons for Mr Fleet's resignation. The Chairman had e mailed the committee to see if there was a consensus to have a meeting to reconsider a decision of the previous meeting. This action was taken as having a meeting would mean missing the deadline for distribution of the new OB. There was no consensus and therefore no meeting. Mr Fleet objected to this and resigned from the committee.

Mr Burn wished to offer his thanks to Richard for his time on the committee both as Vice Chairman and committee member. All agreed and the secretary was asked to write thanking him for his years of service.

Mr Faulkner asked about the appointment of a new Vice Chairman, who could prove to be a useful advice point. Whilst it was agreed that a new Vice Chairman could be appointed or another member co-opted for the rest of the year Mr Pool did not wish for either.

**4. Orange Book report**

**4.1 Easy guide**

The secretary distributed a suggested Easy Guide to the new *Orange Book*. The committee suggested a number of improvements. The guide would be available from the website as soon as possible and distributed as an A5 card in the August *English Bridge* to all members. Additional copies would be available at EBU events. A copy is attached to these minutes.

#### **4.2        *Printing and distribution***

The book had been delayed by a week because of a printing problem, but was now available in hard copy and from the website. Members who had played in an EBU event within the last two years, all clubs and county officials were receiving a copy with the June *English Bridge*. Other members could request a copy.

#### **5.         *Appeal to the National Authority***

##### **5.1        *Herefordshire Pairs event***

The committee considered a request to the National Authority from Herefordshire. It was agreed by 3 votes to 2 to hear the appeal and refund the deposit on the grounds that the original process may have been flawed. The correspondence seemed to suggest that not all parties had been invited to the appeal.

Having decided to hear the appeal the committee considered the case. The committee found that neither the Tournament Director nor the Appeals Committee had addressed the question of whether there had or had not been a hesitation. Regardless of whether there had been a hesitation the 3♦ bid was clear cut. The table result of 3♦ - 1 was reinstated.

The secretary was asked to remind anyone thinking of appealing to the National Authority to read section 8B4 in the *Orange Book*.

#### **6.         *Technical matters***

##### **6.1        *Announcing and the hard of hearing***

Taken under agenda item 2.2.6

#### **7.         *Disciplinary matters***

##### **7.1        *Complaint from a member 'Elephant'***

The secretary reported that a hearing would be held on July 21<sup>st</sup>. A member of the committee was appointed to prosecute the case.

Appointment of Pro Bono advisor – it was confirmed that Mr Faulkner had been invited by the Chairman of the Union to act as Pro Bono advisor for the year until October 2006. The secretary was asked to obtain conformation of the appointment in writing from the Chairman of the Union.

##### **7.2        *Complaint from a member 'Iguana'***

Mr Faulkner considered that publication of material on BLML (or equivalent) could count as conduct or behaviour which falls below accepted standards as allowed by 3.2(v) of the Disciplinary rules of EBU Ltd. However Mr Barnfield felt that there was more 'rough and tumble' language used on the internet than might be accepted in face to face encounters.

It was the decision of the committee that 'While we may disagree with the comments used, the nature of language used by the internet community meant that the comment was not so far in breach of 3.2(v) of the Disciplinary code to merit any further action by the committee'.

The secretary was asked to write to both parties with the decision.

##### **7.3        *Complaint from a County Association 'Jackal'***

The papers for the case had not been received so no discussion was possible.

**8. Reports from Tournament Directors**

**8.1 Composition of the review panel**

Mr Fleet had indicated his willingness to continue as a reviewer for TD reports. So the reviewing panel remained unchanged – Mr Barnfield, Mr Fleet and Mr Stevenson.

**8.1 06.22**

Dealer S  
NS Vulnerable  
Scoring: VPs

**North**

♠ K 8 5 2  
♥ K 10 7 3  
♦ Q 5 4  
♣ J 10

**West**

♠ A 9 3  
♥ A Q 9 6 2  
♦ 7  
♣ K Q 5 2

**East**

♠ J 10 6  
♥ None  
♦ J 10 8 6 3 2  
♣ 9 8 7 6

**South**

♠ Q 7 4  
♥ J 8 5 4  
♦ A K 9  
♣ A 4 3

<b>Bidding:</b>	<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>
	Pass	2♣(A)	2♦	1NT
	Pass	3♥	Pass	2♥
	Pass	Pass	Pass	4♥

**Result:** 4♥ - 3 by North = -300

**TD first called:** at end of match

**Tournament Director's statement of facts & ruling**

I totally believe and accept that West did not intend to field the psyche however her actions are consistent with a red psyche. Intent is not required to justify a red psyche, but the actions involved. Thus ruled.

**Appeals Committee's decision**

Director's decision upheld. Deposit returned.

**L&E comment:**

The L&E decided to reclassify the psyche as green. It is hard to identify West's action as a psyche at all – was there any agreement as to the 2♦ bid. West has a routine double of 4♥ but didn't do that either.

**8.2 06.23**

Dealer S  
Game all  
Scoring: VPs

	<b>North</b>	
	♠ K 6	
	♥ Q 6	
	♦ 7 6 3 2	
	♣ K Q J 5 3	
<b>West</b>		<b>East</b>
♠ 10 9		♠ A J 8 7 3 2
♥ A 9 3		♥ K 10 5 4 2
♦ A K Q J		♦ 8 4
♣ A 10 6 4		♣ None
	<b>South</b>	
	♠ Q 5 4	
	♥ J 8 7	
	♦ 10 9 5	
	♣ 9 8 7 2	

<b>Bidding:</b>	<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>
				Pass
	1♣(A)(1)	2♣	2♠	Pass
	2NT	Pass	3♥	Pass
	3NT	Pass	4♥	Pass
	4NT(A)	Pass	5♥	Pass
	6♠	End		

(1) 'Strong' club

**Result:** 6♠ ✓ by East = -1430

**TD first called:** at end of hand

***Tournament Director's statement of facts & ruling***

NS called me as they felt that EW had reached a contract based of extraneous information (viz the previous table discussing the hand). N & S both overheard a player state that 'should have bid 6' and also '..shape was 6/5'. N felt that the 6♠ contract was achieved as a result of that. Both E and W stated that they did not hear the detail of the conversation and ignored the conversation anyway. At table, when I was asking West (only) about the auction, he did say that he knew E was at least 5/5 – East now stated without being asked that it was showing 6/5. West confirmed that was why he bid 6♠ to pitch (word unclear) of the D suit. A player at the other table admitted he had discussed the hand and apologised).

I felt there are two separate problems 1) Did EW overhear the conversation at the other table and 2) Did EW act upon it. In answer to 1) I think it probable that they did hear what was said, but cannot prove this. 2) EW (esp.W) has declared that his bidding was NOT influenced by any E.I. (because he didn't have any E.I.), thus he bid the contract on its own merits. Table result stands.

***Appeals Committee's decision***

Committee were satisfied. Auction seemed consistent with no overheard conversation.

***L&E comment:***

The committee were unhappy that North/South had not called the TD to report that *they* had overheard matters at the other table. Law 16B refers. The secretary was asked to write to North/South pointing this out.

**8.3 06.27**

The committee considered a misbid from the London Easter festival where the TD classified it as green.

Dealer N  
NS vulnerable

Scoring: IMPs  
to VPs

**North**  
♠ K  
♥ 10 9 6 3  
♦ Q 3 2  
♣ A Q 10 8 6

**West**  
♠ Q 9 5  
♥ Q J 7 5  
♦ A K 7 6 5  
♣ 7

**East**  
♠ J 10 8 7 4  
♥ K 2  
♦ 4  
♣ K 5 4 3 2

**South**  
♠ A 6 3 2  
♥ A 8 4  
♦ J 10 9 8  
♣ J 9

<b>Bidding:</b>	<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>
		Pass	2NT(A)(1)	Pass
	3♦(A)	Pass	3♠	Pass
	4♠	End		

(1) 5-5 diamonds and another, 6 to 9 HCP

**Result: 4♠ - 1 by East = +50**

***Tournament Director's statement of facts & ruling***

East said he had misbid, thinking it was any 2 suits. Green psyche.

***Appeals Committee's decision***

No appeal

***L&E comment:***

The committee decided to reclassify West's action as an Amber misbid. The secretary was instructed to write to EW to inform them of the change.

**8.4      06.30**

Dealer W  
Love all  
Scoring: MP  
Pairs

**North**

♠ A 9 4 3  
♥ K Q 5 2  
♦ A 9 7 6  
♣ 8

**West**

♠ K Q 7 5  
♥ 10 9 8  
♦ 2  
♣ K 10 9 7 5

**East**

♠ 6  
♥ A 3  
♦ K Q 10 8 3  
♣ Q J 6 4 2

**South**

♠ J 10 8 2  
♥ J 7 6 4  
♦ J 5 4  
♣ A 3

<b>Bidding:</b>	<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>
	Pass	1♦(1)	2♦(2)	Pass
	2♠	Pass	3♣	Pass
	4♣	End		

(1) – may be 2 diamonds

(2) – any two suits (strong)

**Result:** 4♣ ✓ by East = -130

***Tournament Director's statement of facts & ruling***

At the end of the auction South questioned the 2♦ bid and was told two suited majors by West. East did not correct to any two suits. Defence now failed to take their four tricks. If they had known 2♦ was any two suits the defence would again lead a spade, North switch to ♥K and when East wins and leads a low club South would rise with the ace and take a heart for one down. Result changed to 4♣ - 1 = +50.

E/W were going to appeal but withdrew. With 15 minutes of lunch remaining N/S wished to appeal. With few people about an appeal committee was set up from available players.

***Appeals Committee's decision***

We think North should have figured out a misbid when 4♣ was passed. Cashing ♦A does not seem correct defence. The diamond has nowhere to go when N holds a heart stop. EW are an inexperienced pair. Table result reinstated.

*(Secretary's note: North had sent a letter subsequent to the appeal, which the committee considered)*

***L&E comment:***

The committee noted that East should have volunteered a correct explanation of the method before the opening lead was faced and they considered the TD's ruling to be reasonable. However, the appeals committee was incorrect in its judgement of North/South subsequent actions. North/South could not be expected to figure out that there had been a misbid. West's 2♠ was reclassified as an amber misbid. The secretary was instructed to write to parties concerned.

**9. Any other business**

9.1 EBU 20B. See minute 2.2.5

9.2 Letter from the Vice Chairman of the Union

A letter from Philip Mason on behalf of the Membership Development Action Group (MDAG) was considered. Mr Pool considered it to be factually incorrect. The sentence 'The report received the formal endorsement of both the Board and the Standing Committees' implied that the Laws Ethics Committee has approved it. This was not the case as the L&E had not met to discuss it. Mr Faulkner suggested that the penalties of the Zero Tolerance approach may be illegal under current law.

Some of the suggestions had been considered before – colour coded convention cards were thought too expensive. Guidance on recommended simple defences to uncommon systems could be provided; simple guides to common infractions and correct procedure for Stop, Alerts and Announcements could be provided on the website. The secretary was asked to find earlier correspondence on the 'friendly' club.

The item as a whole would be an agenda item for the next meeting.

**10. Date of next meeting**

Wednesday 13<sup>th</sup> September at 40 Bernard Street, London WC1 at 12.15pm

*(Secretary's note: The Tournament Committee had already booked this date and venue. A new date is being considered.)*

ANNOUNCING AND ALERTING SUMMARY				
Opening Bid	Description	Announce	Alert	No Action
1♣ And 1♦	Could be on fewer than 3 cards		✓	
	Could be as few as 3 cards			✓
	Other (strong, artificial)		✓	
1NT	Balanced	“12 to 14” (or appropriate range) and, if relevant, “may contain a singleton”		
2♣	Strong, Acol, Benji Acol, etc		✓	
	Precision	“Intermediate”		
2♦	Weak with diamonds	“Weak”		
	Strong with diamonds	“Strong, forcing” or “Strong non-forcing”		
	Other (Benji, Multi, etc)		✓	
2♥/♠	Weak with hearts/ spades	“Weak”		
	Strong with hearts/ spades	“Strong, forcing” or “Strong non-forcing”		
	Other (Lucas, Flannery, etc)		✓	
Responses to 1NT				
1NT - 2♣	Simple Stayman (promissory or not)	“Stayman”		
1NT - 2♣ - 2♦	Denies 4 card major			✓
1NT - 2♦	Transfer	“Hearts”		
1NT - 2♦ - 2♥	Completion of transfer			✓
1NT - 2♥	Transfer	“Spades”		
1NT - 2♥ - 2♠	Completion of transfer			✓
Bids above 3NT				
Bids above 3NT	artificial opening bids		✓	
	Other bids			✓

<b>Action over Opponents' calls</b>				
<b>Opponents Call ...</b>	<b>Meaning of their call ...</b>	<b>If your Double is ...</b>	<b>Alert</b>	<b>No Action</b>
A suit at any level	Natural	Take-out		✓
		Anything else	✓	
	Does not show the suit (i.e. conventional or not natural)	Showing the suit doubled		✓
		Anything else	✓	
A suit opening	Prepared, Phoney, Short or Nebulous opening	Take-out		✓
		Anything else	✓	
No trumps at any level	Natural or conventional	Penalty		✓
		Anything else	✓	
<b>Opponents Call ...</b>	<b>Meaning of their call ...</b>	<b>If your Redouble is ...</b>	<b>Alert</b>	<b>No Action</b>
Double	Any meaning	for business, shows strength: partner is expected to pass		✓
		Partner is expected to remove	✓	
<b>Opponents Call ...</b>	<b>Meaning of their call ...</b>	<b>Other actions ...</b>	<b>Alert</b>	<b>No Action</b>
Above 3NT	Any meaning	Lead directing pass	✓	
		Lead directing double for a different suit to the one doubled	✓	
		Lead directing redouble for a different suit to the one redoubled	✓	
		Any other pass, double or redouble		✓

