Minutes of the Meeting of the WBF Laws Committee
Lille, Flanders
30 August 1998

Present:         Chairman
                Ton Kooijman
                Grattan Endicott
                Virgil Anderson
                Joan Gerard
                Santanu Ghosh
                Becky Rogers
                William Schoder
                John Wignall
                Chip Martell
                Chris Compton
                Robert Wolff

                Secretary
                (for part of the Meeting)

                (for part of the Meeting)

                (for part of the Meeting, guest)

                (for part of the Meeting, guest)

1. The Term ‘Average Minus’

Consideration was given to the meaning of ‘average minus’ where used in Law 12C1. Having debated the options, the Committee held that ‘average minus’ means the player’s session percentage or 40% whichever is the lower.

2. Procedure for awarding assigned adjusted scores

There was discussion of the procedure in awarding assigned adjusted scores following an irregularity. A change was made by the Committee in the interpretation of the law. Henceforward the law is to be applied so that advantage gained by an offender (see Law 72B1), provided it is related to the infraction and not obtained solely by the good play of the offenders, shall be construed as an advantage in the table score whether consequent or subsequent to the infraction. Damage to a non-offending side shall be a consequence of the infraction if redress is to be given in an adjusted score.

The Committee remarked that the right to redress for a non-offending side is not annulled by a normal error or misjudgement in the subsequent action but only by an action that is evidently irrational, wild or gambling (which would include the type of action commonly referred to as a ‘double shot’).

3. Laws 20F1 and 20F2

In relation to the phrase “a full explanation of the opponents’ auction” in Laws 20F1 and 20F2, it was agreed this refers to an explanation of the whole auction. However, it is recognised that in practical play players would frequently ask about the significance of one particular call; this marginal infringement of the laws should not normally attract a penalty but players must be aware of the increased risk of the creation of
unauthorised information that it entails and the relevance of Law 16 to such circumstances.

4. **Regulations when Screens are in use.**

The Committee noted an aspect of the WBF regulations applying when screens are in use. This states that it is acceptable for a player to delay the return of the tray for the purpose of restoring the tempo of the transfer of the tray to ‘normal’. It was held this means the normal tempo of play generally and not the tempo of play at that particular table nor the (slow) tempo of a prior movement of the tray on the hand in question. (Players who deliberately retard the return of the board beyond the acceptable norm may be in breach of Law 73D2 and 73F2 may apply).

5. **Psychic Bids and Plays**

Guidance on psychics issued by the WBF with its Conditions of Contest was studied. The Committee held that the statement in its first paragraph represented the law inaccurately.

The Committee draws attention to the manner in which the laws deal with psychic calls and plays. These are entirely legal so long as they are not based on a partnership understanding. A so-say “psychic call” (or play) which is based on a partnership understanding is not properly called “psychic” – it is a part of the methods of the partnership in question and subject to the regulations of the sponsoring organisation authorised by Laws 40D and 40E.

The committee affirms that a psychic call or play which is evidently identified by the course of the auction or play, as a matter of general bridge knowledge, is not the subject of an understanding peculiar to that partnership and is a legitimate ploy. Other than this an understanding may be created in the partnership by explicit discussion or by the implicit learning from repeated partnership experience out of which it may reasonably be thought the partner will recall and be influenced by earlier occurrences.

The Meeting adjourned to a later date.

Finally agreed text