



**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE EBU LAWS & ETHICS COMMITTEE
HELD AT YOUNG CHELSEA BRIDGE CLUB, GOLDHAWK ROAD
ON WEDNESDAY MAY 22ND 2019**

Present:	Heather Dhondy (HD)	Chairman and Elected Member
	Robin Barker (RB)	Deputy Chief Tournament Director
	Sarah Bell (SB)	Elected member
	David Burn (DB)	Elected member
	Jeremy Dhondy (JD)	EBU Chairman
	Frances Hinden (FH)	Vice Chairman and Elected Member
	Gordon Rainsford (GR)	EBU Chief Executive
	Tim Rees (TR)	Elected Member
	Alan Wilson (AW)	Elected Member
	Ian Mitchell (IM)	Secretary
Apologies:	Martin Pool (MP)	Elected member
	Ian Payn (IP)	EBU Vice Chairman

2 Minutes of the previous meeting

2.2 Accuracy

4.4 AW observed that the complaint had been received “from” a member, not “by” a member.

5.1 The committee thought that they had not suggested that this should be discussed at the “next” meeting, but at a later date.

Subject to these changes, the minutes of the meeting of 20th February 2019 were approved and signed.

2.3 Matters arising

The secretary reported that the 2016 Appeals Booklet was ready to be published, subject to some proof-reading

He asked the committee whether there should be any other commentators invited to contribute. They agreed that Jacob Duschek should be retained, and suggested that additional foreign contributors could be invited. The current list was quite heavily weighted towards L&E committee members. Two other Europeans were suggested.

ACTION: IM

3 Appeals to the National Authority

None this time

4 Disciplinary Cases

4.1 Leibnitz

MP had examined the case. He concluded that the County Association had not acted improperly, and that therefore there was no case to answer. HD had reported this back to both the county chairman and the complainant.

4.2 Mandelbrot

IM reported that there was as yet no news from our statistical expert

4.3 Napier

A sub-committee of the Prosecution Panel had considered the case, and concluded that charges should be brought. HD thanked the leader of the subcommittee for a very thorough and professional report.

ACTION: IM

4.4

The committee considered a case in which a player had been found guilty by a club's Disciplinary Committee, and had been banned, initially, for the period of a year. The Club Committee subsequently amended the sanction to a revocation of membership.

The L&E Committee noted that the Disciplinary Committee's decision was subject to ratification by the Club Committee, and concluded that the latter had not acted outside of their constitution.

It was also noted that the correct route for an appeal was through the County Bridge Association, a route which the complainant had declined to pursue.

ACTION: IM

5 Technical Matters

5.1 Announcements

The committee considered correspondence from a member regarding the announcing of natural 2NT openings. The committee agreed that the risks of Unauthorised Information arising from such announcements were high, and the benefits low. They noted that announcements were brought in, for 2NT openings and their responses, a few years after the initial introduction of announcements, principally because many players were already routinely announcing "transfers", and similar, in these circumstances (& also over 1NT overcalls).

The committee repeated its reluctance to make minor changes to alerting and announcing regulations, but agreed that this should be reviewed as part of wholesale changes.

Having made similar statements in recent years, in respect of other potential changes, they concluded that wholesale changes should be due soon. It was too late for this to be considered for this year, but this should be raised, along with other suggestions raised and deferred at previous meetings, with a view to possible implementation next year.

5.2

In a previous meeting, questions had been raised about the alertability of certain 'take-out' doubles that carried additional information about suit holdings, or otherwise did not conform to the 'usual' expectations of a take-out.

DB presented a paper in which he classified doubles in three categories: Take-out, with no additional information conveyed; Penalties; and all others, being "Special" doubles. He

recommended that the latter be alerted, that penalty doubles be announced, and that the former should be neither announced nor alerted.

GR suggested that this would mean alerts would be required in several 'standard' sequences where currently no alerts are required.

The committee considered the system, used in Scotland and elsewhere abroad, whereby no doubles are alerted regardless of meaning. Whereas TR considered this system unworkable, JD suggested that, through ignorance rather than design, this is probably what actually happens at most clubs. The committee considered whether it would be feasible to have different regulations at club and tournament level. One issue would be where the line would be drawn between the two levels of events (a club's open blue-pointed event being cited as doubtful).

The committee observed that clubs are entitled to draw up their own regulations with regard to alerting and announcing, as well as permitted systems, but that the EBU recommends adopting standard regulations. They considered publishing an alternative method for clubs, but suggested that the default should be the 'national' regulations unless the club specified otherwise.

As with 5.1, the committee concluded that no changes would be made immediately, but that they should give this, and other potential Blue Book changes, serious consideration at the next meeting, with a view to possible implementation in August 2020.

5.3

RB had circulated some suggested changes to the White Book.

GR expressed some concern that players were expected to be polite to opponents, etc., but that partner was specifically excluded. RB confirmed that the intention was that any private arguments between partners was a matter of their own concern, unless one of them made a complaint to the TD. Nevertheless, if their arguments caused discomfort to third parties, then this should be addressed.

RB agreed to make corrections, and circulate to the committee.

ACTION: RB

5.4

FH raised some issues about discrepancies between distributional constraints on 1NT opening bids, and those for minor suit openings with the intention to rebid 1NT to show the equivalent.

She noted that 1NT could be opened on hands with 5-4-3-1, 6-3-3-1, or even 7-2-2-2 shapes, but that (where the long suit is a major) these were not permitted as part of a 1-of-a-minor opening.

IM also reminded the committee about a previous enquiry about the legality of a "Vienna" 1NT overcall, and suggested that, to avoid any doubt, permissions for a 1NT overcall should include any meaning permitted for a 1NT opening (in addition to other specified meanings).

The committee agreed that the distributional constraints should be the same in each case. They also confirmed that there needed to be clear disclosure on point range and (in the case of No Trump overcalls) the expectation of whether or not there is a stop in the suit opened.

ACTION: FH

5.5

FH brought up the subject of some recent rulings concerning hesitations from partner exposing the fact that you have misbid, for example in the case of giving an incorrect response to Blackwood. There might be some conflict between the UI from partner's hesitation, and the Authorised Information about what you hold in your hand.

DB suggested that the over-riding issue is that there is Unauthorised Information that your unexpected response has caused partner a problem, and this is not very different to hearing an explanation of your call that is inconsistent.

FH agreed to discuss with RB about adding something to the White Book.

ACTION: FH / RB

6. Applications for new permitted methods

None this time

7. Reports from Tournament Directors 19.001 to 19.006

7.1 Report of Hand 19.006

The committee considered a report, in which all the evidence suggested that a player had misbid, but the TD had recorded it as a psyche. In subsequent correspondence, the TD had told the secretary that the player concerned had told the TD that they had deliberately departed from system.

The Committee considered, first, that this should have been recorded by the TD on the form, to justify the classification as a psyche. They also wondered whether it was incumbent on the TD to believe the player in such circumstances. Players have been suspected to volunteer that they have departed from system, in order to avoid rulings based on mis-information.

RB agreed to speak to the TD.

ACTION: RB

8 Other Business

8.1 Club Constitutions

DB reported that he had made some minor amendments to the Model Club Constitution, clarifying that the club is expected to uphold the decision of any appeal to the County Association.

He wondered whether there should be a further line of Appeal, to the EBU, after an appeal to the County, since the Model Constitution for Counties suggested that this might be the case.

The Committee suggested that the distinction should be clear that decisions by the County's own Disciplinary Committee could be appealed to the EBU, but where the County is holding an appeal for a club, that should be final. Nevertheless, the parties involved could make a complaint to the EBU about the procedures involved.

8.2 Code of Conduct for Committee Members

A revision of the Code was circulated. The committee agreed that the content was greatly improved, although there were minor grammatical issues.

9 Date of next meeting

The Doodle Poll was ongoing. IM had initially suggested dates from mid-September to mid-October, but it emerged that many committee members would be unavailable throughout the second half of September. IM agreed to extend the dates through the second half of October.

[Provisional venue is Young Chelsea Bridge Club, Goldhawk Rd, Shepherds Bush.]

The meeting closed at 3.30pm.