

World Bridge Federation

**Minutes of a meeting of the WBF Laws Committee held in
Montreal, Canada, on 27th August 2002.**

Present:	T. Kooijman,	<i>Chairman</i>
	R. Cohen,	<i>Co Vice-Chairman</i>
	G. Endicott,	<i>Secretary</i>
	J. Wignall,	<i>Drafting Sub-committee Chairman</i>
	J. Gerard	
	A. Riccardi	
	W. Schoder	<i>WBF Chief Tournament Director</i>

Mr. Robert S. Wolff attended briefly.

Apologies: C. Martel, *Co Vice-Chairman*; J. Ortiz-Patino; S. Ghose,
J. Polisner; D. Morse.

Guests: R. Colker; A. Wildavsky (for items 1 and 2).

1. (i) The Committee reviewed the interpretation of Law 27B1. It was agreed that in 27B1(b) the word 'assign' shall be interpreted as 'award'; the effect is that the adjusted score may be artificial or assigned as circumstances require. The Chief Director drew it to attention that Law 12C1 only applies when no result has been obtained on the board. Mr. Wolff suggested that eventually the provision should perhaps be encompassed in a 'catch-all equity clause'; the Chief Director said that the interpretation of the word 'assign' as 'award' achieves this objective since it allows of the application of Law 12C3.
- (ii) The Committee determined that an adjusted score is awarded under Law 27B1(b) when it is probable that the contract played on the board would not have been reached if the insufficient bid had not occurred and the non-offending side is consequently damaged.

[Secretary's note: revised in the minutes of 30th August 2002]

2. The interpretation of Law 12C2 was discussed. Mr. Wildavsky put his view that this law should be interpreted as though it read “for a non-offending side the most favourable result that was likely had the irregularity not occurred or, for an offending side, the most unfavourable result that was at all probable *had the irregularity not occurred*”. It was drawn to the attention of the Committee that on a previous occasion the subject had been discussed and the Committee had agreed that the law does not attach this limitation to the adjustment for the offending side. The Committee found no reason to reconsider that decision.
3. Mr. Schoder presented his draft proposals for a revision of WBF Screen Procedures. It was agreed this should be forwarded to the Rules & Regulations Committee for its consideration.
4. (i) The Committee spent some time considering a summary of WBF Laws Committee decisions 1997-2001, prepared at the Chairman’s invitation by Mr. D W Stevenson. The Committee had a difficulty with certain of the statements and it was agreed that, whilst the purpose of the exercise is a desirable one, the discussion of this document should continue via the internet. Meanwhile any publication of the document is not approved. It was noted that the minutes of the Laws Committee remain the definitive source of information as to its decisions.
(ii) In the course of its discussion of the Summary the Committee found certain examples unsuitable.
(iii) One specific decision of the Committee, recorded in the minutes of 30th August, 2000, section 8, was reconsidered. It was noted that there is an obligation on players to make a proper disclosure of their understandings as to potentially psychic situations. Until a further review of the policy in the matter has taken place, and a new statement is issued, the said minute is withdrawn.
5. The Secretary presented an interim report of the progress being made by the Laws Drafting Sub-committee. In particular he wished to record that at its most recent meeting all the submissions he had received from Zones, NBOs and individuals, had been examined. Whilst many of the points submitted were found to overlap, a number of fresh suggestions had interested the subcommittee.

There being no other business the meeting then concluded. No further

meeting was planned during the duration of the Championships in Montreal.