



**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE EBU LAWS & ETHICS COMMITTEE  
HELD AT 2 BLOOMSBURY STREET, LONDON WC1B 3ST ON  
WEDNESDAY SEPTEMBER 19<sup>TH</sup> 2012**

<b>Present:</b>	Jeremy Dhondy (JD)	Chairman and Elected Member
	Mike Amos (MA)	Elected Member
	David Burn (DB)	Elected Member
	Barry Capal (BC)	EBU General Manager
	Frances Hinden (FH)	Vice Chairman and Elected Member
	Neil Morley (NM)	Elected Member
	Gordon Rainsford (GR)	Co-opted. Assistant Chief TD.
	Tim Rees (TR)	Elected Member
	Grattan Endicott (GE)	Vice-President
	Gerard Faulkner (GF)	Vice-President
	John Pain (JP)	Secretary

<b>1</b>	<b>Apologies for Absence</b>	Sally Bugden (SB)	EBU Chairman
		Max Bavin (MB)	Chief Tournament Director
		Andrew Petrie (AP)	EBU Vice Chairman
		Martin Pool (MP)	Elected Member

**2**

**2.1/2 Minutes of the previous meeting**

There was one correction. The minutes of the meeting of May 16<sup>th</sup> 2012 were approved and signed.

**2.3 Matters arising**

**2.3.1. Other scoring methods (5.4)**

FH introduced a paper on methods used for scoring EBU events. She noted that under Law 78D the Regulating Authority could approve other methods than those listed in Law 78A – matchpoint scoring, 78B IMPs and 78C total point scoring. The committee formally approved the methods in use. It was agreed to put the final list on the website and is attached to these minutes (**Appendix A**).

GR explained the Teams of 8 IMP scale, which was, in his opinion, a better scale to use for Teams of 8 contests than the method of adding all four scores together and using the standard IMP scale. The Teams of 8 scale was obtained by multiplying the original scale by  $\sqrt{2}$  and rounding. Similar scales could be obtained for Teams of 12 events by multiplying by  $\sqrt{3}$  and Teams of 16 events by multiplying by  $\sqrt{4} = 2$ .

The committee recognised that many county leagues are run by the inferior method. The best method for teams of 8 events is cross-imping (as used in the Tollemache Cup).

### 2.3.2 Appeals booklets for 2010 and 2011

FH had sent out the material prepared by NM to the reviewers. A deadline for replies was set at December 1<sup>st</sup>, with a view to having them ready by the middle of January 2013.

**Action: FH**

### 2.3.3 Other matters arising

The schedule for standard penalties had been published and had been in use at Brighton. MA said a problem had arisen at Brighton which was not covered – the penalty for discussing boards which meant they were unplayable at another table. It was agreed to add this at the next revision.

## 3 Appeals to the National Authority

None this time

## 4 Disciplinary Cases

### 4.1 Wroxall

The secretary reported that the matter was still ongoing and that the Club had not completed its own procedures. Consequently the Laws and Ethics committee would take no action at this stage.

### 4.2 Doors

The Chairman reported that the matter had been concluded by the officers of the L&E committee following continued delay by the county association. The General Manager had received a complaint from the defendant that the L&E Committee had not dealt with the matter correctly. The matter had been referred to the officers of the Board of Directors who decided that the officers of the L&E had handled the matter properly and that no further action was needed. The defendant had been sent a letter advising him of the fact.

The case was closed and the papers put to file.

### 4.3 Genesis

A complaint from the Manchester League had been made to the L&E. This had been referred back to MCBA who had dealt with it. One of the complainants had asked the L&E to review the procedure used by Manchester to deal with the case. The officers of the L&E reviewed all the paperwork in the case and concluded that it had been handled in a satisfactory way.

The case was closed and the papers put to file.

It was again stressed that both clubs and counties should have appropriate procedures for dealing with disciplinary cases. Clubs were encouraged to make use of the EBU Draft Club constitution. Counties were reminded that their constitutions have to be approved by the Board of Directors and than from the October AGM a new method of self-certification would be in place (if approved by that meeting).

## 5 Technical Matters

### 5.1 2012 edition of OB, TB and WB

The secretary said that all three were now available from the website.

### 5.2 Wide ranging NT response

There was discussion about whether a wide ranging but non forcing NT response was alertable or not, eg. 3-card support and 11+HCP. The OB was currently not clear and in the interim GR had given advice to TDs that such a wide-range bid should be alerted. GR was advised to continue with this advice for the time being. It would be included in the full review.

### 5.3 Changes to VP scales.

A paper from the WBF on the changes to VP scales is attached to these minutes (**Appendix B**). JD agreed to talk to the chairman of the Tournament and Selection Committees about implementation for EBU events.

**Action: JD**

### 5.4 Correspondence from a member of an affiliated club

FH left the meeting for this item.

The committee discussed a letter from a member concerning a simple system evening and the application of regulations to that event. They resolved to write to the club requesting further information.

**Action: JD/JP**

### 5.5 OB, TB and WB rewrites for August 2013

The committee considered how best to embark on a major rewrite of the Orange Book, given that the last edition was produced in 2006 and all subsequent editions have been based on amendments. The chairman offered some suggestions as to how to do the work, but he hoped that the new Orange Book would be no more than half the size of the present one.

MA considered that a rewrite of the OB/TB could not be done without a major review of the White Book as well. FH said that the intention had been that the OB had been for tournament players, the TB for club players and the WB for TDs but people from other groups used them, so it was an artificial division. There was much duplication, material was just in the wrong place and some L&E decisions were not in either.

It was agreed to proceed as follows:

White Book: All regulations to be included. The new edition would be divided into (possibly three) sections (Laws commentaries, guidance, regulations). It was also suggested that it be formulated so that pages could be changed easily without the need to completely publish a new edition each year.

Orange Book / Tangerine Book: the ideal solution will be to merge the OB and TB back into one book by removing regulations to the WB, but with references as to where to find them. Principally the OB would just contain agreements and disclosure.

It was agreed that in time for the January L&E meeting that:

NM and JD – to look at the WB / OB split, removing unnecessary duplications

FH and DB – to look at the bidding regulations

JD – to look at suggested changes to alerting and announcing

MA and GE – to look at the WB law commentaries

JP – to check through L&E minutes for regulations changed and amended not incorporated in either the WB or OB.

FH – offered to do the final editing when all the preparation work had been completed.

It was agreed that the Chairman would remind the Club Committee of the work in progress and invite comments by the end of the year.

**Action: ALL**

### 5.6 eBooks

DB said that he had finished preparing the current OB, but that work on the WB was proving much more time consuming. The numbering structure of the WB was making it hard going.

The OB will be made available in e-format from the website after final testing.

**Action: DB**

### 5.7 Removal of boards from tables for slow play

There was discussion on two cases where boards had been removed for slow play and an adjusted score given. GR asked that any guidance should be just that – the TD always has judgement as to whether to allow a board to be played. It was suggested that now that time-clocks were regularly in use at EBU events that a rule of thumb should be that no new boards should be started once the time shown on the clock for the round falls below 3-minutes. It was suggested that this could be included in congress programmes, but was a matter for the Tournament Committee to decide on.

Regarding the adjusted score to be given, it was agreed that giving more than 100% on a board (e.g. 60%/50%) should be rare as it appeared to reward a table that was slow. However it was agreed that when one pair was clearly not at fault and the other pair partly at fault (perhaps from an earlier table) for the slowness then it was permitted.

### 5.8 Alerting a non-strong reverse

The secretary asked whether a sequence such as 1♦ - 1♠ - 2♥, where the 2♥ was bid to show a 5-4 hand in diamonds and hearts but only on a minimum opening hand, was alertable. It was agreed that it was not, although players should be encouraged to disclose that their method was unusual (although it was recognised that many may not know, if that is how they have been taught).

### 5.9 L&E submission for the news laws

Members were reminded that they had until the end of December to submit any suggestions for consideration in the 2017 laws to GE. He said he had received some suggestions directly.

## 6. Applications for new permitted methods

None this time.

## 7. Reports from Tournament Directors

### 12.022 Spring 4s / 12.031 Spring BH Congress

The committee considered these forms where the deposit had been returned in what were considered to be very flimsy circumstances. Appeals Committee chairmen were asked to ensure that when a TDs ruling was upheld it was appropriate to give reasons as to why the deposit should be retained or returned.

The committee wished to remind AC Chairmen that the criteria for retaining deposits included consideration of whether the decision to uphold a TDs ruling had been reached quickly and unanimously. If the answer was that it had been, then the deposit should normally be forfeited; although AC Chairmen should retain the right to return deposits where they felt there was a good case for doing so.

This might improve the situation where certain AC Chairmen were known not to favour retaining deposits in any circumstances. The L&E deprecated such an approach. It was agreed to amend the appeal form to include a question for the Committee to answer on page four.

There was also discussion about whether players should be *required* to complete page three of the appeal form. It was normal practice for those attending the appeal not to have to complete the boxes on page three, although it was recognised that some players might like to put their thoughts down on paper in advance. The boxes were normally used when players wanted to state their case when a telephone referee was being used, for example.

It was acknowledged that all those involved in an appeal (players, appeal committee and TD) were often pressed for time and forms were not always completed as well as they might be.

The tick boxes at the foot of page three (indicating that players had been given the chance to complete the box and also to indicate that they concurred in the appeal) were rarely filled in. It was agreed to tidy up page three.

**Action: JP and JD**

### 12.025 Crockfords Final

The chief TD had to intervene in a case where the Appeal Committee were on the verge of giving an illegal (Reveley) ruling. It was confirmed that chief TDs could do this if they became aware. Appeal Committees are encouraged to check points of law with the Chief TD in case of doubt.

It was agreed that new referees and Appeal Chairmen should be offered some training in what their roles and permitted courses of action should be. Discussion would take place at a future meeting on the format of this.

### 12.037 Spring Bank Holiday Congress

The committee considered an appeal from the SBH congress where, after West had opened a multi 2♦ which East had alerted, South had picked up the convention card to look at it.

The TD had ruled that a player should only look at the card when it was his turn to call. Whilst it is true that a player can only ask questions when it is his turn to call (Law 20B, 20F1) there is no such restriction for looking at an opponent's convention card.

When the 2007 laws came into force the EBU, as Regulating Authority, decided that the option in Law 40B(c)(iii) would not apply in England. A player is entitled to look at his opponent's convention card at any time. This is confirmed in the current OB7D1(e). It is recognised that in doing so when it is not his turn that unauthorised information may well result.

### 12.041 Scarborough Multiple Teams Final

<p>♠ A ♥ KQ1092 ♦ QJ985 ♣ 98</p> <p>♠ K4                      ♠ QJ987 ♥ 74                      ♥ J85 ♦ 106                     ♦ AK7 ♣ AKQJ752          ♣ 103</p> <p>♠ 106532 ♥ A63 ♦ 432 ♣ 64</p>	<p><b>Board 24 : Dealer West : Love all</b></p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;"><i>West</i></th> <th style="text-align: left;"><i>North</i></th> <th style="text-align: left;"><i>East</i></th> <th style="text-align: left;"><i>South</i></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1♣(1)</td> <td>2♣(2)</td> <td>2♠</td> <td>Pass</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3♣</td> <td>3♥</td> <td>(3♦(3))</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>(4♠)</td> <td>All Pass</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>(1) Can be short</p> <p>(2) Explained as natural as system card – either a psyche or misbid</p> <p>(3) Insufficient bid. No replacement call available, so 4♠ chosen as the correction (which silences partner)</p>	<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>	1♣(1)	2♣(2)	2♠	Pass	3♣	3♥	(3♦(3))				(4♠)	All Pass
<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>														
1♣(1)	2♣(2)	2♠	Pass														
3♣	3♥	(3♦(3))															
		(4♠)	All Pass														

The TD was called to rule on the insufficient bid, which he did. The TD was not asked to investigate the possible use of unauthorised information by North when he bid 3♥, nor did he do so on his own volition.

L&E Comment: The TD should have considered the UI issue even though he became aware of it while attending the table for another matter. (Law 81C3: to rectify any error or irregularity of which he becomes aware in any manner, within the correction period). The committee expressed some surprise at North's reported comment that this was a deliberate psyche rather than a misbid.

### 12.050 Brighton Mixed Pivot Teams

The appeals committee had changed its mind after making the ruling regarding the number of tricks a contract was likely to make.

It was confirmed that appeals committees had all the powers conferred by the laws on a TD and if they made a ruling they realised was incorrect they were empowered to change it.

12.052 Brighton Bowl Swiss teams

<p>♠ 9 ♥ AK976 ♦ A9 ♣ AJ762</p> <p>♠ AK6                      ♠ 10542 ♥ Q42                        ♥ 108 ♦ K1074                     ♦ J6532 ♣ 954                         ♣ K3</p> <p>♠ QJ873 ♥ J53 ♦ Q8 ♣ Q108</p>	<p><b>Board 18 : Dealer East : NS vulnerable</b></p> <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;"><b>West</b></th> <th style="text-align: left;"><b>North</b></th> <th style="text-align: left;"><b>East</b></th> <th style="text-align: left;"><b>South</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Pass</td> <td>Pass</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1NT(1)</td> <td>Dbl(2)</td> <td>Pass(3)</td> <td>Pass</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rdbl(4)</td> <td>Pass</td> <td>2♦(5)</td> <td>2♠</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pass</td> <td>3♣</td> <td>Pass</td> <td>3♦(6)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pass</td> <td>3NT</td> <td>All Pass</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) 11-14</td> <td>(2) penalties</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) alerted, forces XX</td> <td>(4) forced</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(5) alerted ♦ &amp; ♠ (not asked)</td> <td>(6) assumed by S to be a cue bid, by N to be natural.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>			Pass	Pass	1NT(1)	Dbl(2)	Pass(3)	Pass	Rdbl(4)	Pass	2♦(5)	2♠	Pass	3♣	Pass	3♦(6)	Pass	3NT	All Pass		(1) 11-14			(2) penalties	(3) alerted, forces XX			(4) forced	(5) alerted ♦ & ♠ (not asked)			(6) assumed by S to be a cue bid, by N to be natural.
<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>																																		
		Pass	Pass																																		
1NT(1)	Dbl(2)	Pass(3)	Pass																																		
Rdbl(4)	Pass	2♦(5)	2♠																																		
Pass	3♣	Pass	3♦(6)																																		
Pass	3NT	All Pass																																			
(1) 11-14			(2) penalties																																		
(3) alerted, forces XX			(4) forced																																		
(5) alerted ♦ & ♠ (not asked)			(6) assumed by S to be a cue bid, by N to be natural.																																		

Table result: 3NT + 1 by N.

TD's weighted ruling: 50% 3NT-3 by N, 25% 4♥-1 by N, 25% 4♥✓ by N

ACs ruling: 20% 3NT+1, 20% 3NT-3, 20% 4♥✓, 20% 4♥-1, 20% 4♣-1

East asked before leading whether all suits bid by NS were natural and was told by North that they were. West claimed he might have doubled 3♦ had he known it was artificial. East said she was going to lead a diamond until told South had shown the suit.

The TD ruled that West will still pass an alerted 3♦ some of the time. East would lead a diamond and 3NT would go three down. If W doubles 3♦, North will bid hearts and reach game which may make and may go off. (Laws 12B, 12C1(a) and (c), 40A1(b), 21B3).

The appeals committee considered the ruling to be slightly generous to EW and amended the weightings as above. They believed that despite the failure to alert that 3NT will make some of the time and also that 4♥ would make slightly less often.

There had also been correspondence from the Captain of the team representing the EW players, although it is not an appeal to the national authority.

The committee noted comments from the letter:

- a) Players cannot demand a change in personnel chosen for an appeals committee, but a request can be made to the chief TD. The chief TD does not have to accede to the request but may do so if he considers the request to be reasonable.
- b) The AC has all the rights of a TD, so the committee can give the appellants a worse score than that obtained at the table. However, they would not do so simply because of the behaviour of the appellant at the appeal (a disciplinary penalty could be appropriate) or if the appellant had a history of lodging appeals without merit. Appeals should not be seen as a 'no risk' option.
- c) In coming to the decision to award a weighted ruling including a percentage of 3NT making there was suggestion that East was being accused of lying when the committee said that East would always lead a diamond with the correct explanation. The committee deprecated the use of the term. In coming to a weighted ruling the TDs and committee must weigh up the probabilities of a likely course of action before all four hands became known and form a judgement.
- d) There was a suggestion that the AC had looked at the actual results obtained by other tables in coming to its decision on the weightings. The L&E considered it unlikely to have happened and would, in any case, be a bad way of deciding the weightings.

- e) It was suggested the process of the appeal had been incorrect. That the TDs statement had not been read out and that neither side had been given the opportunity to write on the appeals form. It is normal for the TD to make a verbal statement, rather than read out what he may have written (he may refer to it, of course). The question of players writing on the form has been addressed in the first report in this section.

L&E Comment: Neither the TD nor the AC had addressed the question at the heart of the matter. They concentrated on whether West would have doubled an alerted 3♦, and what might have happened after that. But there was a second infraction: South should have corrected the MI before the opening lead (as required by Law 20F5b). The correction should probably have been to 'no agreement'. If South had volunteered a correction, then East would have been very likely to lead a diamond, leading to 3NT-1.

It was confirmed that EW were not entitled to know that a mix up had occurred, but they might be able to work that out. It was also confirmed that this should be taken into account when assigning a score, to ensure that NS do not gain from failing to meet their Law 20 responsibilities.

A reply to the complainant would be made.

**Action JD/JP**

7.2 The committee considered a letter and response from the Pachabo Cup, where a player had tried to lodge an appeal which had been declared by the chief TD to be out of time. The player now wished to appeal to the national authority. The response advised him that it was not possible as there had been no original appeal and had it been allowable none of the four criteria would be achieved.

### **Any other business**

#### *Change of Honorary Counsel*

The chairman advised the meeting that David Ewart had been appointed as the new EBU Honorary Counsel, replacing David Harris who had stood down from the post.

### **8 Date of next meeting**

Wednesday January 23<sup>rd</sup> 2013 at 1pm.

Agenda: This will primarily be concerned with the OB.

Venue is Baker Tilly offices, 2 Bloomsbury Street (nearest tube station is Tottenham Court Road).

The meeting closed at 5.45pm.

## Appendix A

### Methods of Scoring

Law 78 section A, B and C define match point scoring, IMPs and total point scoring. These definitions incorporate point-a-board (board-a-match) scoring and cross-imps for teams or pairs.

Section D states that “If approved by the Regulating Authority other scoring methods (for example conversions to Victory Points) may be adopted. The EBU, as the Regulating Authority in England, has approved the following additional scoring methods. Details are published in the White Book for those used frequently (such as VP scales for teams of four) and in the conditions of contest for specific methods used only rarely.

#### **Methods of Scoring Approved and Recommended by the EBU**

##### **“Original” Forms of scoring**

- Total points, with honours counting (“Hubert Phillips Bowl” scoring)
- Point a Board, but with a difference of 10 points not counting
- “Pachabo” scoring (where total points scored in a match are divided by the aggregate swing)
- “Instant” scoring, where a score in IMPs or match points is calculated by comparison with a published scorecard rather than with the results from other competitors (e.g. “Play with the Experts”, “Instant match points”)
- Teams-of-8 IMPs IMPs, where all four table results are added up and the result converted to MIMPs (modified IMPs) using an adjusted conversion table (see Suggested Teams of 8 IMP table).

##### **Conversion of the Original form of scoring to a final ranking**

- Carry-forwards: multiple session events with a carry-forward counting towards the final ranking (with any original form of scoring).
- Victory Points, where the margin in any original form of scoring is converted into VPs using a defined scale, for matches with any number of boards from 5 upwards. (VP scales other than those published in the White Book may also be used, e.g. the WBF scale is used in the Premier League.)
- IMP scoring across multiple matches with a cap on the total winning margin.
- “Hybrid” scoring: a VP scale using a combination of multiple original forms of scoring such as both point-a-board and IMPs (e.g. Patton, Pachabo VP scale).
- “Play with the Experts” scoring: the winning score is the one with the highest positive deviation from the average score in the same direction.

#### **Methods of Scoring Approved but not Recommended by the EBU**

- “Add up & IMP”: teams of 8 scoring where all four table results are added together and the result converted to IMPs using the standard IMP conversion table. (Either cross-imps or a modified IMP table is preferable).
- Butler IMPS: a form of scoring for Pairs events where each result is IMPed against the average result for all tables, sometimes with one or more extreme results removed. (Cross imps is preferable).
- VP Scales for matches of four boards or fewer (total IMPs is preferable).
- Win-Loss scoring (a form of VPs where a win is scored as 1, a loss as 0 and a tie as ½)



**Suggested Teams of 8 IMP Table**

Tables for teams of 12, 16 etc may also be calculated

IMP table for Teams of Eight  
scored by summing all results

0	0 - 10
1	20 - 60
2	70 - 110
3	120 - 170
4	180 - 230
5	240 - 300
6	310 - 370
7	380 - 440
8	450 - 510
9	520 - 590
10	600 - 690
11	700 - 830
12	840 - 1050
13	1060 - 1260
14	1270 - 1540
15	1550 - 1820
16	1830 - 2110
17	2120 - 2460
18	2470 - 2810
19	2820 - 3170
20	3180 - 3520
21	3530 - 4230
22	4240 - 4940
23	4950 - 5640
24	5650 - +

The table is created by taking the appropriate end point in the standard IMP table, multiplying by  $\sqrt{2}$  and rounding to the nearest 10.

Eg In the standard IMP table the range for 3IMPs is 90 – 120. Multiplying the end point 120 by  $\sqrt{2} = 169.7$  which rounds to 170, hence the end point in the To8 scale becomes 170. In turn the starting point for the To8 4IMPs then becomes 180.

## Appendix B

### Change in the victory points scales

**A Scoring Committee set up by the WBF President in January of this year. The committee was chaired by Ernesto d’Orsi of Brazil and co-chaired by Max Bavin (UK).**

Other Committee members are Henry Bethe (USA), Bart Bramley (USA), Peter Buchen (Aus) and Maurizio de Sacco (IT).

After deep and long analysis, the committee proposed — and the WBF Executive Committee accepted — the following:

1. The adoption of a 20-point victory point scale with the following features:
  - The scales are continuous and given to two decimal places
  - Subject to a cap, each IMP margin translates to a specific VP award
  - Each additional IMP in the winner’s margin is worth no more than the previous one
  - Relative to the current WBF scales, the “blitz” margins in the new scale will be approximately equivalent to the 25-2 in the old scales. There is no reduction of VPs for the loser when the margin exceeds the blitz margin.
2. It is recommended that the new scales be used in the next World Bridge Championship (including Youth tournaments) and be available to all NBOs by the end of 2012.
3. Also, the Committee will prepare new “discrete” scales (whole numbers) to be used by NBOs if they wish to during the transition from the old to the new VP scales.
4. On the World Bridge Federation website ([www.worldbridge.org](http://www.worldbridge.org)), the Committee will publish the “continuous” and “discrete” scales for the most-used number of boards per match and will publish them together with instructions on how to determine VP scales for other sizes of matches. Also on the website, using the actual algorithm, users will be able to enter the number of boards and the preferred scale type to read, print or download the result.
5. Future work by the Committee will include consideration of aggregate score, the IMP scale and match-point scoring, although not necessarily with a view to suggest changes.