



A₁

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE EBU LAWS & ETHICS COMMITTEE
HELD AT IMPERIAL HOTEL, RUSSELL SQUARE, LONDON WC1
ON THURSDAY 12TH FEBRUARY 2009**

Present:	Jeremy Dhondy	Chairman and Elected Member
	Max Bavin	Chief Tournament Director
	Sally Bugden	EBU Chairman
	David Burn	Elected Member
	Barry Capal	EBU General Manager
	Frances Hinden	Elected Member
	Neil Morley	Elected Member
	Andrew Petrie	EBU Vice Chairman
	Martin Pool	Vice Chairman and Elected Member
	David Stevenson	Elected Member
	Grattan Endicott	Vice-President
	Gerard Faulkner	Vice-President
	John Pain	Secretary

1. Apologies for Absence Mike Amos Elected Member

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting, including Mr Petrie who was attending for the first time. He also said that certain items would be taken out of order as Mrs Bugden, Mr Capal and Mr Petrie had to leave early to attend another meeting.

(Secretary's note: These minutes reflect the scheduled order rather than the actual order.)

2

2.1/2 Minutes of the previous meeting

There were no corrections.

The minutes of the meeting of November 11th 2008 were approved and signed.

2.3 Matters arising

2.3.1 Disciplinary Case 'Vesuvius'

The Secretary reported that the appeal was ongoing.

2.3.2 Disciplinary Case 'Blackfriars'

The Secretary reported that the appeal was ongoing.

2.3.3 Calls considered made with bidding boxes

This item had been deferred from the November meeting. Mr Bavin had considered whether the 2007 Laws meant that it was necessary to revise the bidding box regulations. He had concluded

that there was no reason to change the current regulations. The Committee agreed. It was noted that separate screen regulations were in place when screens were being used.

It was confirmed that OB7B2 remained valid for non-screen tournaments:

'A call is considered to have been made when the call is removed from the bidding box with apparent intent (but the TD may apply Law 25).'

2.3.4 *Psyches in EBU tournaments*

This item had been deferred from the November meeting. There was discussion over how to apply Law 86D in teams play where there had been a fielded psyche at one table. The current procedure was to throw out the result if the offending side had gained on the board by awarding +/- 3 IMPs and to allow the score to stand if the non-offending side had gained more than 3 IMPs on the board. In both cases a standard fine of either 3 IMPs or ½ VP was additionally applied to the offending side. Miss Hinden offered the following extreme example for consideration:

Table 1 – the non offending side scored 7NTxx making 13 tricks.

Table 2 – the offending side fielded a psyche and went down 1100, whereas if there had been no fielded psyche they would have gone down 1700. Was it right to allow the score to stand based on the 1100? It was agreed that such an occurrence was very unlikely to happen.

Mr Dhondy expressed the view that the perception that the non-offending side might lose a good score would be a significant worry.

The Committee agreed that the current practice had worked well for many years and saw no reason to change it. Mr Bavin agreed that keeping the status quo was the best option.

2.3.5 *Reply to a member whose Appeal to the National Authority had been rejected*

The Chairman had replied to the member and the matter was considered closed.

2.3.6 *8 clear-cut tricks*

See item 5.1(b)

2.3.7 *White Book*

Mr Pool reported back. It was too expensive to go for a full reprint in the current form. He suggested the only realistic alternative was to revert to a loose-leaf A4 format where pages could be removed and inserted as required when updates were done. It was not intended to be pocket size.

Mr Stevenson reported back that it was undesirable to produce a new hard copy version only two years after the current edition, which although dated 2004 was actually revised in 2006. In his opinion there were about 70 pages which needed attention. Citing particular laws – law 27 needed explanation and examples.

Committee members were not keen on the loose-leaf format. Experience showed that although a good idea in principle people did not update their copies. It was suggested that many clubs had not updated the 2006 Orange Books.

It was agreed not to produce a hard copy revised White Book nor to produce it in A4 loose-leaf format. Instead it would be produced in electronic form only. It was noted that many clubs now score on site and that a downloaded copy of the White Book (and also Orange Book) could reside on the scoring computer so clubs would have easy access to both books. It was also noted that searching the book in this form for keywords was much easier than using the index.

There was special plea for those who had no internet access and it was agreed that printed copies could be obtained from Aylesbury or to have it available on CD.

The Chairman asked about a timescale for producing a revised edition. Mr Stevenson agreed to produce revised copy for the new edition, but that an August deadline might be difficult. It was left to the Chairman and Mr Stevenson to sort out the details. **Action JD and DWS.**

2.3.8 Response from a pair 08.058

The Committee considered a response from the pair and agreed no further action was necessary.

2.3.9 Response from a TD 08.046

The Committee considered the reply from a TD whose form-filling had been commented upon. It was decided to take no further action and the Committee awaited the next form to see whether things would improve.

2.3.10 Logical Alternatives

Some slight amendments were made to the wording. A revised copy is attached to these minutes. A final version would also go on the website. See Appendix A

2.3.11 Report from the Club Committee

a) Alerting of doubles

Mrs Bugden reported that the Club Committee had indicated a wish to retain the current system of alerting of doubles, but to offer members more help by way of explanation and simplification. The Chairman noted the response and asked the Committee for its views. It was agreed to accept to the Club Committee's view and to make no changes to the current OB regulation 5E2 on the alerting of doubles. It was also agreed to provide clearer explanations. The Chairman would liaise with the Editorial Board (of which he is a member) on how best to cover the topic in *English Bridge*.

b) Simplified laws

Mrs Bugden also said that the Club Committee had considered a set of loose-leaf laminated cards which covered many of the main book rulings. In the form showed to the committee they referred to the old laws but there was scope to produce something that clubs would find useful. The Secretary mentioned that there was a flow-chart approach offered in the booklet '*How to run a duplicate event*' used on the Club TD courses; Mr Stevenson mentioned the simplified law book he had compiled for Mr Bridge and Mr Endicott said he was looking at the possibility of producing a simplified law book, and any suggestions to him would be appreciated. Mrs Bugden said it was important that the EBU produced such help for clubs.

Mrs Bugden informed him that this was not the case and that the club committee representatives had sent information about the proposed doubling changes to all of the clubs in its regions.

His concern about involvement was not shared by the committee as a whole and the L&E valued the constructive input from the club committee.

2.3.12 Simple system arrangements

The Committee approved some changes to the recommended Simple System arrangements – mainly the introduction of opening Weak 2 bids and allowing Benjaminised Acol 2 openings. A copy is attached to these minutes. The revised schedule would replace section 9D9 in the Orange Book. See Appendix B.

3 Appeals to the National Authority

3.1 Appeal from Tollemache Qualifying Round

The committee considered an appeal to the National Authority arising from the Tollemache qualifying round in November.

The Committee considered the four grounds for hearing an appeal to the national authority. The Committee voted 2 votes to 1 that it did not meet at least one of the requirements. Committee members with first-hand knowledge of the case abstained. Consequently the appeal was dismissed and the deposit forfeited.

4 Disciplinary Cases

4.1 No new cases this time

5 Technical Matters

5.1 Correspondence

a) The committee considered correspondence from a member who had objected to the admitted behaviour of another member in a letter in *English Bridge*. The Chairman had written to the member to explain L&E procedure in this respect and the committee had no wish to add to this.

b) *8 clear-cut tricks (deferred from 2.3.6)*

The committee considered correspondence from a member concerning the hand from the November minutes which had been ruled as not suitable to open a strong artificial two, but reaffirmed its decision that AQJ9874 + an outside AK did not meet any of the three criteria.

Mr Stevenson presented his thoughts on how best to identify what clear-cut tricks really were. He said that Quick Tricks, Honour Tricks, Playing Tricks and Sure Tricks were all well defined but Clear-cut tricks had no formal definition – being an L&E invention. He said that Clear-cut tricks were not meant to be the same as Sure tricks but tricks that could be confidently expected to be made barring really wild distribution. He suggested that Clear-cut tricks *‘are tricks opposite a void in partner’s hand and the second-best suit break’*.

Some examples:

		Suit length	Quick Tricks	Honour Tricks	Playing Tricks	Sure Tricks	Clear-cut Tricks
1	AKQxxxxx	8	2	2.5	8	6	7
2	KQJxxxx	7	1	1+	6	3	5
3	AQJ98xx	7	1.5	1.5+	6.5	4	5
4	KQJT _x	5	1	1+	4	3	3
5	KQJTxxx	7	1	1+	6	4	6
6	AKT9xxxxx	9	2	2	9	7	8
7	KJTxxx	6	0.5	1+	4+	1	2

Mr Stevenson also suggested that ‘the normal 1-bid opening value’ part of the definition was unworkable. Some people thought it meant 12 HCP, some 11, 10 or even 8. 8 HCP is what the Orange Book says is the lowest permitted count for a 1-level opening bid (OB11C1).

It was agreed that the prime consideration was to stop people opening distributional (i.e. preemptive type) hands using a strong artificial bid (such as Benjaminised Acol 2♣). It was further agreed that this was usually only a problem with single suited hands – two-suited hands usually conformed to the Rule of 25 or had 16 HCPs.

After discussion the committee voted by 5 to 1 in favour of the clarification that Clear-cut tricks *‘are tricks opposite a void in partner’s hand and the second-best suit break’*.

After discussion the committee voted 3 to 3 to attach a specific point count for a 1-level opening. The Chairman used his casting vote to maintain the status quo i.e. no specific point count.

c) Mr Burn had written to all EBU committees suggesting that while dealing with business by email was a good thing, there was no formality to the way in which official business was identified. He mentioned that it was preferable to use just one email address and preferably not a work one to minimise the chance of the work spam filters stopping emails. He had suggested that all emails on L&E business were prefixed by a descriptor such as EBULE. The committee agreed to try where possible to follow this.

5.2 Tangerine Book

The committee considered a first draft of the simplified Orange Book – to be known as the Tangerine Book. Miss Hinden introduced the book. Her brief was to write something that was readable and of use to club members. She had produced the first part on permitted methods; the second part on procedures, alerting, bidding boxes was still to be done. Mrs Bugden congratulated her on how readable and well written it was, although she felt there was no need to have the appendices which were covered in detail in the Orange Book. The Chairman thought a final booklet of about 12 pages would be about right, but it needed to be set out in a way that was not a turn-off.

Mr Faulkner said that Miss Hinden had done a good job on what he thought would be a difficult task. He still found it hard going. It was suggested that all members really wanted to know was what they could play at each level and if it was possible to keep each level to a single page which could be photocopied that would benefit members who currently found the whole thing beyond them.

A possible timeline was suggested with August being possible but April 2010 more likely to coincide with the introduction of pay-2-play.

Miss Hinden noted that whilst drafting the Tangerine Book she had come across a few commonly used methods that seemed to have slipped through the net of permitted agreements – see 6.1.

The Chairman would talk to Mr Amos about the second half of the book.

Committee members were asked to report any suggestions for amendments to the Tangerine Book to the Secretary.

Mr. Faulkner suggested that the final draft should be given to the Club Committee for consultation and this agreed.

5.3 WBF matters

a) The committee considered Ton Kooijman's commentary on the 2007 laws. Mr Endicott stressed that while most of the paper had good material in it, it was Ton's own work and not an official document from the WBF Laws Committee. Some of the content would be considered when that committee next met in São Paulo. It was agreed to link Ton's paper from the EBU website.

b) Law 27B

The committee considered the minute from the WBF Laws Committee relating to Law 27B.

Law 27B – Mr. Endicott's statement on interpretation was adopted and agreed viz:– The Committee has noted an increasing inclination among a number of Regulating Authorities to allow artificial correction of some insufficient bids even in cases where the set of possible hands is not a strict subset of the set of hands consistent with the insufficient bid. The Committee favours this approach and recommends to Regulating Authorities that, insofar as they wish, mildly liberal interpretations of Law 27B be permitted with play then being allowed to continue. At the end of the hand Law 27D may then be applied if the Director judges that the outcome could well have been different without assistance gained through the insufficient bid (and in consequence the non-offending side has been damaged).

Mr Bavin recommended that the EBU adopt this approach and it was agreed. Mr Bavin would produce some examples where this approach would lead to a different decision to allow the auction to continue than if the law was strictly interpreted.

6. Applications for new permitted methods

There were no new applications this time, but Miss Hinden said she would be making a few suggestions to cover those omissions identified in her compilation of the Tangerine Book.

7. Reports from Tournament Directors

7.1.1 08.074

Event: Bournemouth 2* Pairs Qualifying Round

Dealer S

All Vulnerable

MPs Only unplayed cards remain.

North
♠ 8 5
♥ Q 10 7 3 2
♦ Q 8
♣ K 5

West

♠ A K
♥ J
♦ 10 5 4 3
♣ 10 8 7 6

East

♠ J 9 4
♥ A 8 6 4
♦ 9 7
♣ 9 4

South

♠ 7 3
♥ K 9 5
♦ A K J 6 2
♣ Q

Bidding: West North East South
not recorded

Result: 2NT - 1 by South = -100

Tournament Director's statement of facts & ruling

I was first called at trick 3 before East played to the trick after the card had been played from dummy.

I was called by South (declarer) who told me that although he had already called for the ♣K in dummy, he wanted to play ♣5 instead. After speaking to all people at the table I was satisfied that there was pause of about 2 seconds after the ♣K had been called, when he stated that he wanted the ♣5. I read L45C4. In my view a delay of 1-2 seconds is not 'instant pause for thought' – indeed I explained that if I did so, does 3 or 4 seconds then become allowable.

Ruling:

I ruled the ♣K to be the played card. (L45C4)

North/South appealed on the grounds that the designation was inadvertent and had been made without 'pause for thought' – L45C4b.

Appeals Committee's decision

Ruling upheld. Deposit returned.

The committee found as fact that the ♣K was designated; there was a pause for thought so it must be played.

Law 45a applies

Law 45C4b – although the pause was agreed to be brief nonetheless the designation was not changed quickly enough.

The deposit was returned because we thought this relatively close and discussed it for some time.

L&E comment:

There are two questions: has the law been interpreted correctly? Have the TD and the AC considered the correct question?

When considering whether a card from a bidding box may be changed, it is clear that the pause for thought applies from the realisation of the wrong card. The same applies to cards called from dummy, so it is not a question of whether one or two seconds is a pause, but whether it is a pause for thought, i.e. whether it was after the realisation of the mistake. We believe that the change would have been in time.

But was the card called for inadvertent? Neither the TD nor the AC seems to have considered this, but it is likely that declarer asked for the king, then realised he had the singleton queen, then tried to change his play of the king. In this case the card was not called for inadvertently, and may not be changed even if in time.

7.1.2

Dealer W
NS Vulnerable

North

♠ A Q 9 8
♥ 6 4
♦ A K 4 3
♣ Q 8 5

West

♠ 4 3
♥ A 9 5 3 2
♦ Q 7
♣ K 10 3 2

East

♠ J 10 6 5
♥ J
♦ 10 9 5 2
♣ J 9 6 4

South

♠ K 7 2
♥ K Q 10 8 7
♦ J 8 6
♣ A 7

Bidding:	West	North	East	South
	pass	1♠	1NT*(1)	2♥
	dblr	pass	2♠	dblr
	pass	pass	2NT(2)	pass
	3♣	dblr	pass	pass
	pass			

1 15-17

2 Asked about and told 'I suppose he wants me to bid something'

Result: 3♣x -2 by West = +300

Tournament Director's statement of facts & ruling

The TD ruled this to be a Amber psyche. I told NS that perhaps they had enough information to deduce that someone (East) had psyched but told EW I was not entirely satisfied and would classify as Amber.

L&E comment:

The committee downgraded this amber psyche to be in the green category. However the committee thought that it might have been appropriate to look at North/South's actions – a so called 'blue psyche' because the normal expected action over the 1NT overcall would have been to double. (A 'blue psyche' is an unofficial term for an action that appears to be trying to cater for partner's psyche when in fact it is an opponent who has psyched.)

Action: Secretary to write to East, West and the Td informing of the decision.

7.2 *Make up of reviewers panel*

Miss Hinden was invited to join the reviewers' panel. The Chairman undertook to thank Mr Barnfield for his good service and to stand him down from the reviewers' panel. **Action JD**

8A *Any other business*

Mr Faulkner produced a draft of a letter he had compiled to be sent to Hammonds – the solicitors who had drawn up the current bye-laws regarding cautions and admonishments. The Chairman agreed to investigate the matter further. **Action JD**

9 *Date of next meeting*

Tuesday May 19th 2009 at 1.15pm. Imperial Hotel, Russell Square, London, London W1.

The meeting closed at 4.50pm

Advice to Appeals Committees and Tournament Directors on the impact of the 2007 Laws regarding logical alternatives

Revised February 2009

Abbreviations

AC	Appeals Committee
LA	Logical Alternative
TD	Tournament Director

Is an action a logical alternative?

Law 16B1(b)

A logical alternative action is one that, among the class of players in question and using the methods of the partnership, would be given serious consideration by a significant proportion of such players, of whom it is judged some might select it.

When deciding whether an action constitutes an LA under the 2007 Laws, the TD should decide two things.

1. He should decide whether a significant proportion of the player's peers, playing the same system as the player, would consider the action.

What is a "significant proportion"? The Laws do not specify a figure, but the TD should assume that it means at least one player in five.

If a significant proportion of the player's peers would not consider the action, it is not an LA.

2. If a significant proportion would consider the action, then the TD should next decide whether some would actually choose it.

Again the Laws do not specify a figure for "some", and the TD should assume that it means more than just an isolated exception.

If no one or almost no one would choose the action having considered it, the action is not an LA.

Method

Asking players for opinions is helpful in deciding whether an action would be considered and chosen, but the questions should be carefully presented.

For example, in a hesitation case players should be given the problem without reference to the hesitation. The TD should ask them what they would call after the given sequence, telling them the methods employed. If their answer is not the action under consideration, they should be asked what alternatives they considered.

Such polls will help to give the TD an idea of whether an action is an LA.

What should an AC do if the ruling is appealed?

- They may ask the TD for details of any poll he took.
- They could consider their own poll, but this will not usually be practical.
- They should be aware that the old “70% rule” is not in force now.
- They should be aware that this is a judgment area, and may take into account the experience of the players.

9D9 Re-draft. This will replace section 9D9 in the Orange Book 2006.

Appendix B

The following list approximates to the EBU Simple System convention card:

(a) Basic system

Natural:

1♣ either natural or prepared

1NT limited to a 3-point range between 12 and 18 HCP: its strength may vary according to the vulnerability

2♣ either Acol or Benjamin: 2♦ negative response

Any one of:

(a) 2♦ Strong (Acol): 2NT negative response

(b) 2♦ Weak with a defined range: 2NT enquiry response

(c) 2♦ Benjamin: 2♥ negative response

Either:

(a) 2♥, 2♠ Strong (Acol): 2NT negative response

(b) 2♥, 2♠ Weak with a defined range: 2NT enquiry response

(b) Bidding Agreements

Responses to 1NT: Stayman 2♣; Either 2♦, 2♥, 2♠ Weak or 2♦, 2♥ Transfers

Responses to 2NT: Either Stayman 3♣ or Baron 3♣;

Either 3♦, 3♥, 3♠ Natural or 3♦, 3♥ Transfers

Take-out doubles of an opponent's suit, before partner has bid or doubled

Any defence to pre-empts

Slam bidding: Blackwood, Gerber, and 5NT Grand Slam Force

(c) Leads, signals and discards

Honour card leads:

A or K from AKx

The highest from touching honours

Small card leads from an honour:

Lowest from three

4th highest from four or more

Small card leads from suits not headed by an honour

Any one of:

(a) The highest card

(b) The 2nd highest card from 3 or more

(c) The 4th highest card from 4 or more, MUD or top from three small

Signals on partner's lead, signals on declarer's lead and discards:

High-low shows either an even number of cards or encouragement

Low-high shows either an odd number of cards or discouragement

When a card would be generally understood to have a suit preference meaning, such as when it is led for partner to ruff, then this is allowed