



**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE EBU LAWS & ETHICS COMMITTEE
HELD AT CHARTERED INSTITUTE OF ARBITRATORS, WC1A 2LP
ON WEDNESDAY OCTOBER 14TH 2015**

Present:	Tim Rees (TR)	Chairman and Elected Member
	Mike Amos (MA)	Elected Member
	Robin Barker (RB)	Elected Member
	David Burn (DB)	Elected Member
	Jeremy Dhondy (JD)	EBU Chairman
	Frances Hinden (FH)	Vice Chairman and Elected Member
	Martin Pool (MP)	Elected Member
	Gordon Rainsford (GR)	Chief Tournament Director

John Pain (JP) Secretary

1	<i>Apologies for Absence</i>	Barry Capal (BC)	EBU General Manager
		Ian Payn (IP)	EBU Vice Chairman
		Neil Morley (NM)	Elected Member

2

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

The minutes of the meeting of May 27th were approved and signed.

2.3 ***Matters arising***

2.3.1 League Competitions: Template Regulations

FH introduced her paper on a template of regulations to be used in League Competitions. FH reminded members that the EBU does not run any league competitions, so these regulations can be used by any bridge organisation that will find them of use.

The committee thanked FH for her hard work in producing the document, which was seen as a useful resource.

FH needs to add a section for leagues involving teams of more than 4 players.

The finished document will be available on the EBU website and promulgated by Peter Stockdale and Andrew Urbanski.

2.3.2 The 2015 versions of the Blue and White Books had been published on the website in time for implementation on August 1st.

2.3.3 *Appeal 15.010*: Alan Mould had provided additional information as Chairman of the Appeal. TR was to write to thank him for his contribution.

[Action: TR]

2.3.4 Appeals Booklets

The secretary reported that work was now in progress on the 2012 Appeals Booklet. He had contacted a number of new and previous contributors who had agreed to help and had asked for a deadline of November 30th for submissions.

[Action: JP]

2.3.5 Future of L&E Committee

JD gave an update regarding the Board's proposal to revise the Standing Committees. The Officers and the Board would be meeting shortly to finalise the proposals which would then be put to the AGM in November.

Subject to AGM approval it was likely that all three standing committees (Laws and Ethics, Selection and Tournament) would become sub-committees of the Board, with the L&E splitting into two committees (Regulation and Disciplinary) during the first half of 2016.

Other details would be made clear at the AGM.

If the proposal does not gain AGM support then the usual elections will be held. JD said a 'next meeting' should still be arranged as the committee would still exist in one form or another.

3 Appeals to the National Authority

None this time

4 Disciplinary Cases

4.1 Wroxall

The secretary reported that the matter was 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 Hubert Phillips Plate

The Officers had considered a complaint from a member concerning a Hubert Phillips Plate match played privately. Information was asked of both sides. The officers considered the responses and decided there was no case to answer. The case was closed and the papers put to file.

4.3 Complaint from a Member regarding a League matter

A member had asked the L&E to investigate the delay in responding to a complaint made to the league officials. Despite several emails to the league secretary and the league chairman a satisfactory response to the delay had not been received. TR was to write to the league secretary to try to move matters along.

[Action: TR]

4.4 Complaint from Brighton

The committee considered an appeal from Brighton together with a written complaint from a member regarding the behaviour of a participant during the Brighton Summer Meeting. It was alleged that the participant had been rude to both his opponents and the TD at the table and subsequently at the appeal. However the Appeal Committee did not impose a disciplinary penalty.

The L&E Committee reminds Appeal Committee chairmen that they have all the rights and powers of a TD to assess disciplinary and procedural penalties under Law 90/91. They are encouraged to use the power when members, for example, display bad behaviour during appeals.

The secretary is to write to the member concerned and ask for his comments on the alleged bad behaviour.

[Action: JP]

4.5 New Case: Ultravox

The committee considered correspondence where a member had allegedly used dishonest means to improve their score at club duplicate sessions. Further information is being sought from the member before a decision is taken whether or not to charge the member with an offence under the disciplinary rules.

4.6 New Case: dispute between a member and his club committee

A member has asked the L&E Committee to intervene in a dispute between himself and the local club. The Committee does not become involved in internal matters between members and their club until all the local procedure has been exhausted, and then the normal recourse is to the County.

In this case the secretary has asked the member to provide full details of the grievance so that a decision on the way forward can be agreed.

The EBU Mediation Service has been suggested, but has been rejected by one of the parties. (Both have to agree to use the service).

5 Technical Matters

5.1 Law 50E

There was discussion about the interpretation of Law 50E.

50E. Information from a Penalty Card

1. Knowledge of the requirements for playing a penalty card is authorized information for all players.
2. Other information derived from sight of a penalty card is unauthorized for the partner of the player who has the penalty card (but authorized for declarer).
3. If the Director judges that the exposed card conveyed such information as to damage the non-offending side he shall award an adjusted score.

The Committee considered two examples.

- a) A player is on lead with K Q J x while his partner has the ace as a major penalty card. Are you entitled to lead the small card, in the knowledge that partner must play the ace?

b) The suit position is as follows:

Q x
K x A (penalty card)
x (small card led from South)

When South leads a low card, is West entitled to play low, knowing that partner must play the ace?

The committee decided that under 50E1, the player was entitled to play the low card in both cases, but under 50E3 the TD could consider that the knowledge damaged the non-offending side and award an adjusted score.

5.2 Fielded Misbids – feedback from events held since August 1st.

15.044 – GR gave the following example of a hand from the Brighton Summer Meeting where the new regulation on fielded misbids had been used.

<p>♠QJ43 ♥J1092 ♦72 ♣J103</p> <p>♠K952 ♠10876 ♥75 ♥Q6 ♦A10 ♦K53 ♣K9754 ♣AQ62</p> <p>♠A ♥AK843 ♦QJ9864 ♣8</p>		<p>Board 24 : Dealer West : Love all</p> <table><tr><th><i>West</i></th><th><i>North</i></th><th><i>East</i></th><th><i>South</i></th></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>Pass</td><td>1♣ (1)</td><td>2NT (A2)</td></tr><tr><td>Dbl</td><td>Pass</td><td>Pass</td><td>3♦</td></tr><tr><td>4♣</td><td>Pass</td><td>Pass</td><td>4♥</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>Pass</td><td>5♣</td><td>Dbl</td></tr><tr><td>All Pass</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></table> <p>(1) Could be 2 (2) Explained as spades and either minor – agrees with system card/notes</p> <p>Table result 5♣x – 2 by East, NS + 300</p>				<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>	Pass	Pass	1♣ (1)	2NT (A2)	Dbl	Pass	Pass	3♦	4♣	Pass	Pass	4♥	Pass	Pass	5♣	Dbl	All Pass			
<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>																										
Pass	Pass	1♣ (1)	2NT (A2)																										
Dbl	Pass	Pass	3♦																										
4♣	Pass	Pass	4♥																										
Pass	Pass	5♣	Dbl																										
All Pass																													

TD statement and ruling:

North was unable to explain 4♥ despite the fact that he passed it. South was asked the meaning of 4♥ with North away from the table and said it did not exist, although she intended it as natural; she intended 2NT as hearts+diamonds. I was prepared to rule misinformation but bidding 5♣ over the making 4♥ was good for East/West. North has repeatedly fielded by not bidding spades, but there did not seem to be any unauthorised information for him. South had UI from the explanation that suggested bidding hearts, and I ruled Pass was a logical alternative and adjusted to 4♣ - 1by East; NS +50.

L&E Comment: There was some evidence that NS have a different agreement about the 2NT bid than that on the card, but without talking to North about why he never bid spades, it is difficult to tell. The adjustment is fine.

5.3 Correspondence from Paul Barden re: changing scores and knowledge of hands

Paul Barden had shown interest in an automated method for checking for players using dishonest methods to improve their score (e.g. by having prior knowledge of the hands) by looking at results of slams. This would involve calculating by simulation the probability that the slam is makeable double-dummy and whether the slam was actually makeable double-dummy given the lie of the cards.

FH said she would speak to Paul at a convenient time to look at his proposal with a view to moving matters forward.

[Action: FH]

5.4 FH enquired about the EBU's response to recent allegations of cheating at top international level. JD said he had written letters to the several federations. He had also written to the Israeli Federation regarding one of its pairs.

5.5 Entry to EBU events from members of other bridge federations

While there are some EBU events restricted to members of the home unions, many EBU events are open to members of other federations and participation by their members is welcome. There was concern that members who had been banned by other federations were not automatically banned from EBU events and the entry condition was not sufficiently specific. It was recommended to the Board and/or Tournament Committee that entry to EBU events should include a statement that members entering EBU events needed to be in good standing with their home federation. It was also recommended that the conditions of contest should be explicit about entry being welcomed from members of other NBOs (currently they specify that entrants have to be a member of the EBU).

[Action: GR and TC]

5.6 Item withdrawn

5.7 WB8.22.2

GR was concerned that WB8.22.2 did not reflect the intention of people misusing pass cards in positions other than the pass-out seat. He and RB would draft a wording revision.

[Action: RB, GR]

5.8 BB5C3(c) 'at least the normal high-card strength associated with a one-level opening'

The committee admitted that they had shied away from defining a minimum point count for a one-level opening bid on several occasions, fearing they may become hostages to fortune.

However it was proposed and seconded that an average hand of 10 HCPs should become the defining feature. Carried *nem con*.

GR would alert all TD and members of the Referees panel to implement the change immediately, with the wording in the Blue Book altered for next August.

[Action: GR, FH (Blue Book)]

6. Applications for new permitted methods

None this time. Applications are considered at the first committee meeting after the end of February.

7. Reports from Tournament Directors

7.1 Psyche and appeal forms

15.014 / 15.016

There were two appeals from the same match at the Quarter Finals of the Spring 4s. The appeals were from different tables. In reality appeal 15.016 was held first.

15.014

<p>♠ 7 ♥ 1053 ♦ KQJ64 ♣ J984</p> <p>♠ K1092 ♠ J83 ♥ 74 ♥ AKQJ82 ♦ A108 ♦ 95 ♣ A1052 ♣ Q3</p> <p>♠ AQ654 ♥ 96 ♦ 732 ♣ K76</p>		<p>Board 2 : Dealer East : NS vulnerable</p> <table><tr><th><i>West</i></th><th><i>North</i></th><th><i>East</i></th><th><i>South</i></th></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td>1 ♥</td><td>1 ♠</td></tr><tr><td>2NT</td><td>Pass</td><td>3NT</td><td>All Pass</td></tr></table> <p>Opening lead: ♦ K TD first called at the end of the hand.</p> <p>Table result: 3NT – 1 by West; NS +50</p>				<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>			1 ♥	1 ♠	2NT	Pass	3NT	All Pass
<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>														
		1 ♥	1 ♠														
2NT	Pass	3NT	All Pass														

TD's statement: ♦ K ducked, ♦ Q: South played ♦ 7 then ♦ x. Declarer asked and was told on king lead they unblock an honour or give standard count. South thought the agreement was reverse attitude.

Declarer won the second diamond and went off. The system card and system notes were not conclusive about the explanation of the signals on the king lead.

TD ruling: adjusted to 3NT =.

Not enough evidence to decide the explanation of the ♦ 7 signal was correct. With different information, declarer would duck trick two. (Law 21B1(b), 47E2(b), 12C1)

East/West appealed.

Appeal Committee ruling: The committee gave a split score.

For NS 3NT+1: NS -430. For EW 3NT – 1: NS +50

L&E Comment:

The TD has determined MI of N/S signalling methods and the AC's adjustment to NS -430 is clear (the table TD agreed that if he had considered the play in more detail he would also have adjusted to 430 rather than 400). However the AC did not explain the legal basis for splitting the score. 12C1b allows this if an action is wild, gambling or a serious error unrelated to the infraction. We don't think any of these apply here; even if winning the second diamond is classed as a serious error, the AC has effectively ignored the "unrelated to the infraction" phrase.

Chief TD's Comment:

This appeal was heard late at night and the result had no effect on the match result. In other circumstances I would have discussed further the legal basis of the AC's ruling at the time with the AC chair.

15.016

<p>♠ Q98 ♥ QJ4 ♦ Q76532 ♣ 8</p> <p>♠ J642 ♠ 7 ♥ 6 ♥ 1098732 ♦ 9 ♦ 108 ♣ AQJ7632 ♣ K954</p> <p>♠ AK1053 ♥ AK5 ♦ AKJ4 ♣ 10</p>		<p>Board 32 : Dealer West : EW vulnerable</p> <table><tr><th><i>West</i></th><th><i>North</i></th><th><i>East</i></th><th><i>South</i></th></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>Pass</td><td>Pass</td><td>2 ♣ (1)</td></tr><tr><td>3 ♣</td><td>3 ♦ (2)</td><td>Pass</td><td>3 ♥</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>4 ♦</td><td>Pass</td><td>6 ♦</td></tr><tr><td colspan="4">All Pass</td></tr></table> <p>(1) Alerted. 18 to 21 balanced or stronger unbalanced. (2) (uncertain) transfer</p> <p>TD first called: before the start of the next round Table result: 6 ♦ + 1 by North: NS + 940</p>				<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>	Pass	Pass	Pass	2 ♣ (1)	3 ♣	3 ♦ (2)	Pass	3 ♥	Pass	4 ♦	Pass	6 ♦	All Pass			
<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>																						
Pass	Pass	Pass	2 ♣ (1)																						
3 ♣	3 ♦ (2)	Pass	3 ♥																						
Pass	4 ♦	Pass	6 ♦																						
All Pass																									

TD's statement: before bidding 3♥, South had said something like 'I suppose I should alert' and then 'transfer'. At the end of the hand North said he intended 3♦ as natural.

At this point the TD was called: East/West were concerned about potential use of UI.

TD's ruling: weighted ruling. 25% each of -150, -200, -250, -300 (from a final contract of either 4♥ or 6♥, making 6 or 7 tricks).

Appeal Committee ruling: much discussion with the players, in particular to determine North/South understandings on the auction; much further discussion as committee.

The alerts and non-alerts (of 3♦ and 3♥ in particular) did not allow North/South a way to escape. Ultimately no reason to change the TD's ruling.

Deposit returned.

L&E Comment: No reason to return the deposit. NS should know better, and we would also have given them a penalty for misuse of UI. Simply adjusting the score afterwards is not a disincentive for illegally using UI.

8 End of Year and Date of next meeting

As this was the final meeting of the current year, TR thanked all members of the committee for their support and hard work during the year. He thanked Neil Morley who was retiring from the Committee at the forthcoming AGM for his years of service.

Wednesday January 20th 2016 at 1.15pm.

Venue is Young Chelsea Bridge Club, Brooklyn House, Goldhawk Road, London W12 8HA

The meeting closed at 5.00pm.