

Canterbury Director's Seminar, April 2014 – Additional Notes

Director's duties and powers – Law 81C3

*“To rectify an error or irregularity of which he becomes aware **in any manner...**”*

- If you become aware of an irregularity, e.g. if you overhear a conversation at supper, if you see it in passing a table, even if no one else notices and you are not called, Law 81C3 says you **must** correct it.
- If you become aware of a revoke before it becomes established, you must step in and stop it becoming established. (However you cannot stop the player revoking; you can only act on the irregularity.)

Active Ethics – to be encouraged amongst players

(Emphasis on these earlier in their careers might have pre-empted the incident in which two older German doctors won the world bridge champs in 2013 by using a system of coughing to exchange info about their hands, thus breaking law 73B.)

1. Law 81C5: Waiving rectification for cause. If non-offending side believes an action on their part has caused their opponents to commit an irregularity (e.g. non-offenders spill their coffee and in all the fuss of cleaning up, opp leads out of turn), they can ask the Director to waive rectification.
2. Announcing promptly
3. Full disclosure when alerting or pre-alerting.
4. Acknowledging when partner has hesitated.
5. Taking care not to act on UI.

Pre-alerting compulsory

- As well as noted on system card, must be verbal
- Should be brief and concise – 10-20 seconds
- Any unusual features about bidding and play agreements
- E.g. Acol, 5-card spade, 12-14 NT, reverse signalling
OR Standard American, 5-card majors, 16-18 NT, Lavinthal discard

Announcing 1C and 1NT

- Must be announced **every hand** as meaning of bid may change with VUL or position
- More importantly, it removes any reason for opponents to ask about it at any time (and risk transferring UI)

Alert

- Conventional (artificial) bids and artificial passes up to and including 3NT
- Includes 'waiting' responses (relay bid to get more info about partner's hand), and bids like 2C opening that is game force but may not have 23 points
- Conventional opening bids above 3NT (new regulation introduced 2 years ago)
- Alert your partner's call by audibly saying "Alert" as well as circling it, and be ready to explain meaning of this call if asked.

Play of Dummy's cards

Declarer should **call** for a card in Dummy, not play the card himself. According to the law, Declarer is only allowed to touch Dummy's cards **if necessary**; e.g. if Dummy absent or infirm. (And Dummy's cards should be placed in their half of the table.)

UI – Unauthorised Information – Law 16

Active ethics is avoiding acting on UI.

E.g. Info from a withdrawn call: Opener bids 4S. Opposition doubles. Opener gasps and calls Director (Unintended/inadvertent Bid). He meant to open 4H and a change of call is allowed. The double of 4S is withdrawn. Because the player who doubled is non-offending, his partner can use this info. However, it is unauthorised to the offending side (Law 16D2) and they may not act on any knowledge (spade strength) conveyed by the double. (Note: no info has been conveyed by the unintended call, so there are no lead restrictions when it is withdrawn.)

UI Law has changed (not incl in 2013 amendments)

- The old interpretation of Law 16 was that if more than 75% of players choose an action, there is no logical alternative. This is (logically) incorrect because of the 25% of players who have obviously chosen different alternatives.
- The law uses rather vague terms to be interpreted at the director's and appeals committee's best discretion considering each case.

- This figure has now been changed to 90%. (If 25% of players of equal standard, and using the same methods as the partnership in question, **seriously** consider a particular action, among others, and 20% of those choose that particular action, it is considered to be a logical alternative. This means a call that 25 players in 100 would have considered and that 5 of those players would have chosen, i.e. that 5 players in 100 would have made.)
- So a **logical alternative is now considered to be a call that 5% or 10% of players of equal standard would have made.**
- Alternatively, if 90% of players choose a particular action, there is no logical alternative.
- After receiving UI a player should not choose a logical alternative that could **demonstrably** have been suggested by the hesitation.
- In some cases, hesitation could suggest taking **any** positive action, which covers all alternative bids, and this means partner must pass **unless** his/her hand justifies the bid on its own, without partner's action (hesitation).
- Director also needs to take into account that if majority of room bids in this position (any positive bid, allowing for different auctions), a bid is allowed.

Insufficient Bid – Law 27

See Allan's "Quick procedure for Director to follow" in Commentary on the Laws (green pages) of *Club Directors Manual*. (Correction from info given at Timaru workshop, 2013.)

Revoke – Law 67B1

If a player doesn't play a card to a trick and a player on each side has played to the following trick (or at some stage of the game a player finds he has too many cards in his hand), this player is deemed to have revoked and is subject to a one trick transfer to opposition.

Revoke fallacies – all of these are untrue

- Dummy can't revoke
- Everyone is responsible for Dummy's hand
- You cannot claim a revoke after the end of the round
- If a player wins a trick later with the card he should have played to the revoke trick, he loses an extra trick.

Successful tournaments

- Discuss format and session times with match committee
- Discuss your needs and requirements – e.g. dealing hands, bridge pads, whiteboard or screen, caddy, assistant
- Check available equipment
- Arrange dealing and printing of hand records
- Be aware of MP allocation and prizes
- Check on website posting
- Discuss your fees and expenses – should be reasonable to cover prep, time, additional study and travel. Minimum \$60/session + \$10-\$20 travel

Supplementary regulations (to supply to match committee) for players. These must comply with NZB *Manual*. Keep a template on your computer.

- Format
- Session times
- Scoring methods
- System card requirements
- Allowable systems (there are restrictions in pairs tournaments)
- Correction period – 30 mins after results posted or after players receive personal score sheets. After final session, correction period only 10 mins in order to get results out quickly
- Penalties for late arrivals
- Substitution regulations, tie-break procedure
- Match committee
- Appeal committee
- Recorder, tournament secretary, Director

Repeat important instructions 3 times.

See Australian Bridge Directors Forum – <http://www.abda.org.au/forum/>

Ranking field

- Quantitative (use rating points)
- Qualitative (consult)
- Pairs – take average of total rating points of each pair (top rank is #1)

Seeding

- Divide field into groups of equal strength. E.g. in a Mitchell, the NS field should be as strong as EW and each section should be as strong as each other.

E.g. 4 groups:	A	B	C	D	Seed according to rankings
Seed:	1	2	3	4	
	8	7	6	5	
	9	10	11	12	
	<u>16</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>13</u>	
	<u>34</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>34</u>	Totals for each group equal

- If there is an additional pair or a sitting pair, they should be from the **middle ranking** as that will least effect the balance of the movement. Place the sitting pair at a separate table and send opponents to them.

E.g. Seeding 22 pairs:	A	B	C	D
	1	2	3	22 (sitting pair)
	6	5	4	
	
	19	20	21	

- Session 1: AvB + stationary pair – 8 pairs, 3 boards/ table, 21 boards
2: CvA + stationary pair
3: BvC + stationary pair

All pairs play each other, all play NS once, all play EW once

Balanced movement

- All opponents must play:
 - Same boards
 - Same number of boards
 - Against the same opponents the same number of times
 - In the same direction the same number. of times as each other opponent. (This is why in Howells a sitting pair will switch direction half way through)
- Movement should not be curtailed
- Fields should also be equally weighted re rankings (same seeding totals, see e.g. above)
- The better the seeding, the less the effect of imbalances
- The longer a match, the fairer it is – minimum 10 boards (60 bds = 6 rounds)
- Combination Mitchell and Howell movements can be very useful in achieving a balanced format over a number of sessions.

Weighting

- Put number of boards in the appropriate weighting box in computer (e.g. if you play 32 boards in the morning session and 28 in the afternoon)

Arrow switch

- Players stay in same seats, but board turned 90 degrees. This is usually done to achieve a better balance in the movement.
- Often done accidentally; edit pairs in scoring program

Swiss Pairs Tournament

E.g. 18 tables, 2 boards/table = 36 boards

8 boards/match = 4.5 sets of boards. Therefore get 5 sets dealt, and if possible a spare set (which can be used by the caddy or to replace a fouled board).

Play boards in pods of 4 (see diagram below), i.e. one set of boards per 4 tables.

(In a teams match, put both sides of matching teams in each pod so that both sides play the same set of boards. (If a board is fouled, both sides still play same board.)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10

- Ask players to check on first board of each match to check traveller after playing to make sure cards match traveller
- Play boards in order so they are entered in order on the bridgepad
- Ask players to enter scores progressively as they play, NOT wait until the end of the match to enter them all
- According to NZB regulations, N or S must enter data and E or W must OK it – NOT Dummy

Carry over = credit from good scores in qualifying rounds

- Set before start of event
- No carry over in plate
- Top 2 teams and bottom 2 teams do not draw each other in the first 2 rounds (to avoid top two teams having to play each other twice – as presumably they will meet in finals; and to avoid one of the top teams getting a very good score by playing a bottom team in the first round)
- Random first draw (and keep pressing ‘Draw’ button until you get a draw where the top and bottom teams do not meet)
- Confer with Patrick Carter re your movement format if doubtful

Awarding an adjusted score – Law 12C

- In pairs (MPs) a 60/40 adj score would result in 12/8 MPs awarded if total MPs = 20
- In teams (Imps), when there is a fouled board (e.g. one side picks the wrong hand from the board), the bd cannot be played, so there is an adjusted score of 3 Imps awarded to the non-offending side. I.e. the board is not played nor scored; director just gives non-offending team 3 Imps for that board.

Damage

4 things to consider:

1. Was there an infraction? If not, result stands. (Note: a mistake is not an infraction)
2. Were no-offenders damaged? If not, result stands

3. Was the damage caused by the infraction (consequent damage)? If not, result stands
If yes to ALL of the above, score adjustment.
4. Was any damage self-inflicted (subsequent damage)?

Serious error – needs to be considered in assessing self-inflicted damage

- Blatantly ridiculous call or play, e.g. leading from tenace (AQ)
- Revoke or play out of turn
- Not cashing a setting trick (Ace)
- Not calling Director after an infraction, or reserving your rights e.g. hesitation, and then trying to claim damage
- Players of same calibre say “How silly”
- Player regrets action
- It is costly

Wild action

- A deliberate action other would not understand
- Maverick action
- Not taking advantage of privileges of law, e.g. not asking about an alert

Gambling action

- Deliberate action in which chance of success is slim
- A double shot

Awarding an adjusted score

Order of consideration

1. An equitable assigned score (score for result that would have happened without the infraction)
2. A single weighted score
 - Consider probable outcomes of hand without infraction
 - Assign percent probability of each outcomes – consult with senior players
 - Go to board printout for matchpoints
3. An artificial score (percentages)

Note: scores for each side don't have to balance.

E.g. S bid 4S, long pause and pass by W, N passes, E bids 5C, S bids 5S, E sacrifices in 6C, S goes mad and bids 6S going 3 light. How do you assess damage?
 If bidding ends at 5C (going 1 light, NV), there is an infraction due to hesitation and possible UI. Score reverts to NS 420 (4S making 4); EW-420
 If bidding ends at 5S, score reverts to 420, but damage is reduced by self-inflicted bidding over 5C. Score to NS 420-50=370; score to EW -420
 If bidding ends at 6S, score to NS is 420-500 = -80; EW-420