



**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE EBU LAWS & ETHICS COMMITTEE  
HELD ONLINE (BY ZOOM)  
ON WEDNESDAY 3<sup>RD</sup> MAY 2023**

Present:	David Burn (DBu)	Chairman & Elected Member
	Steve Green (SG)	Vice Chairman & Elected Member
	David Bakhshi (DBa)	Elected Member
	Robin Barker (RB)	Deputy Chief TD
	Peter Grice (PG)	Elected Member
	Peter Hasenson (PH)	Elected Member
	Jane Jensen (JJ)	Elected Member
	Ian Payn (IP)	EBU Chairman
	Gordon Rainsford (GR)	EBU Chief Executive
	Tim Rees (TR)	Elected Member
	Gayle Webb (GW)	Appointed Member
	Heather Sanderson (HS)	Secretary

**1. PROCEDURAL MATTERS**

Apologies for absence  
None

**2. MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING**

2.1 The minutes of the meeting of the 1<sup>st</sup> February 2023 were approved.

**3. APPEAL TO THE NATIONAL AUTHORITY**

*None*

**4. DISCIPLINARY MATTERS**

The status of one ongoing case was noted. It was also noted that a case had concluded.

## **5. DISCIPLINARY PROCEDURES**

### **5.1 Pursuing Cases where no Complaint has been received**

It was agreed that the committee would further investigate a case which arose from a review of deals in a different case rather than from a complaint.

GR offered an analogy from directing. TDs are required to investigate matters however they become aware of them. TDs do not actively look for people breaching the rules but if they become aware of it, they are meant to address it. If something suspicious comes to light, then the L&EC should investigate even if a complaint has not been lodged.

SG stated that the L&EC does not look at a list of top NGS increases and initiate an investigation. TR noted that NGS data was circumstantial evidence whilst the hands themselves were direct evidence.

With reference to the 7<sup>th</sup> December 2022 minutes, it was further agreed to clarify the L&EC normal investigatory process. DBu to submit a draft for approval.

**Action: DBu**

### **5.2 Updating Prosecution Guidance for Behavioural Cases**

Dbu noted that he and SG met with JJ prior to the Meeting to discuss her recommendations for updating prosecution guidance for behavioural cases. JJ spoke at length about her experiences and suggestions for the future. She noted that many online games and matches do not have TDs and thus complaints are sent the L&EC.

JJ stated that currently when a complaint is received, the L&EC officers look at the complaint and decide if it is above or below the threshold for the full disciplinary process. If it is below the threshold, then it comes within the scope of GR's work. If above the threshold, it was suggested for future that the key points be highlighted by the officers for the Prosecution Committee to consider. Moreover, at each point in the process, the L&EC Secretary would check to see that those key points had been addressed.

JJ plans to draft guidance for prosecutors and circulate it.

**Action: JJ**

## 6 TECHNICAL MATTERS

### 6.1 Blue Book

It was noted that the subcommittee met regularly and was responsible for the updates. SG drew attention to major changes to 4B2 alerting doubles and 7C permitted agreements for two level openings. The addition of a glossary was noted, which includes the term **proxy**, being defined as *a call which shows a specified suit which is not the suit bid*.

It was agreed that the current document would be adopted subject to the subcommittee addressing outstanding issues.

Outstanding issues discussed included various typos, clarifying that unconditionally forcing openings are alertable without reference to any system and announcing natural jump shifts (Natural and invitational vs Natural and forcing).

The aim is to finalise a draft after the next subcommittee meeting. To publish the changes, IP recommended that it be included in tournament focus, club focus and posted on the EBU website with comments invited from the members.

### 6.2 White Book

RB said that complaints had been received from players who felt bullied by players insisting on not inputting the scores until the end of the round and/or match. The proposed change allows East/West the right to review the scores as they go along.

The L&EC agreed that an explanation that differs from your partnership methods is misinformation whether or not it describes your actual hand and may lead to adjustments. It was noted that online players alert their own bids so their opponents receive the same information but there may still be misinformation. Behind screens the problem is different information received on either side of the screen

The committee approved the changes and RB agreed to submit a draft incorporated them.

**Action: RB**

### 6.3 **Considering the future of the Stop Card**

DBu said that he saw writings by two eminent English internationals who stated that they never use the stop card. He also said that there are English clubs who do not use the stop card. He noted that stop cards have been abolished in the ACBL without removing the requirement to pause.

PH reasoned that the Stop Card has had its day because there are many situations which require no thought after a jump bid and it is open to abuse.

A discussion ensued regarding the use of the stop card in Norway in competitive auctions. DBu previously reviewed Norwegian pauses which applied to all the players at the table, not just the left hand opponent.

GW reported that there were no stop cards in the bidding boxes in Australia. Furthermore, after online bridge she and her husband no longer use the stop card in their local club, and no one has commented on it.

DBa was asked about his experience playing in the States. He reported that players tended to pause and that there were few issues arising from the lack of the stop card. DBa raised a point about teaching bridge in England. He thought that teachers may not employ the stop card in lessons and thus students may feel intimidated when they play in a tournament with stop cards.

IP expressed concern about what the opinion of the wider membership might be. It was agreed that Board member, Tony Russ, would be asked to research what the wider membership think about the stop card. DBu volunteered to get in touch with Mr Russ.

**Action: DBu**

## 7. **APPLICATION FOR NEW PERMITTED METHODS**

Michael Brunt requested the following method be permitted.

Allow Two Spade “Multi” opening:

- a) 4441 21+ singleton not Spades
- b) Weak in Diamonds
- c) Weak 5-5 in Hearts+Clubs

Not currently allowed because 2 weak options

SG stated that the approved changes to 7C of the Blue Book allow for this method.

## 8. REPORTS FROM TOURNAMENT DIRECTORS

### 8.1 TD forms and comments

*M Kaltz v N Smith*, appeal from a privately played Crockfords match played on RealBridge.

<p>                 ♠ Q 3                  ♥ K 7 5 4 3 2                  ♦ K J                  ♣ A 10 7                    ♠ 7 5 4 2                  ♥ A                  ♦ 9 8 6 5 4                  ♣ 9 8 3                    ♠ A K 10 9 8 6                  ♥ Q 9 8 6                  ♦ 10                  ♣ 5 2             </p>	<table border="1"> <tr><td></td><td>N</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>W</td><td></td><td>E</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>S</td><td></td></tr> </table>		N		W		E		S		<p>                 ♠ J                  ♥ J 10                  ♦ A Q 7 3 2                  ♣ K Q J 6 4             </p>	<p>                 Dealer: East                  N-S Vulnerable                  West    North    East    South                  Pass    2 ♦<sup>NA2</sup>    Pass    1 ♦<sup>A1</sup> 1 ♠                  Pass    Pass<sup>3</sup>    Pass<sup>4</sup>    4 ♠             </p>
	N											
W		E										
	S											

Printed by Dealmaster Pro

Opening Lead: ♥ A

1. Self-alerted with proper explanation
2. No self-alert/explanation
3. Late self-explanation of 2D as UCB
4. Reserves rights

RB was the TD and ruled that there was misinformation but no damage. He polled ten people without an annotation about the 2D bid and they all said that they would bid 3C anyway. RB said he hoped that people would ask about 2D, but they all assumed it was artificial. TR was concerned about a double shot but ruled according to the rules. If East had been told 2D was artificial, then he would have bid 3C. The weighting applied to what would have happened after 3C.

DBu argued that two questions should be asked. 1. Should the player have known what was going on anyway? 2. If no, then would he have done better? It is a judgement call which can vary depending on the director and the people hearing the appeal.

TR said that it would be useful to have some sort of threshold. In this case, he thought that there was 80% chance that East should have known it was artificial. Is that enough to stop him from redress?

SG reasoned that not self-alerting online is more serious than partner not alerting. TR felt that the tipping point in this case was that North had failed to self-alert.

It was agreed that there were issues to follow up on after the meeting. DBu agreed that he would draft guidance for rulings and circulate it.

**Action DBu**

**9. DATE AND VENUE OF NEXT MEETING**

It was decided that the next Blue Book subcommittee meeting would be held on Zoom as soon as possible. [Update – scheduled for 8<sup>th</sup> June 2023] And the next meeting of the L&EC would be held in mid-September with venue to be determined.

Heather Sanderson  
Secretary to the L&E Committee  
17 May 2023