

**Minutes of the WBF Laws Committee Meeting
Held in Lyon, France on Friday 18th August 2017**

Present:

Ton Kooijman (in the Chair)

Laurie Kelso (Secretary)

Maurizio Di Sacco (left before the completion of item 7, due to operational requirements)

Al Levy

Chip Martel (left before the completion of item 3, in order to resume play)

Howard Weinstein

Adam Wildavsky

1. The meeting opened at 2.00pm and the Committee returned to the listed items on the pre-circulated agenda.
2. In response to a series of questions relating to Law 68, the Committee made the following observations:
 - a) Law 68D2 permits play to continue after a claim but only if certain conditions have been fulfilled.
 - b) Once a claim or concession is contested, the players may either elect to play on or alternatively, summon the Director.
 - c) When the non-claiming side has (correctly) initiated the request to play on and the claiming side has concurred; all cards exposed at the time of the claim, or in the act of contesting the claim, are returned to hand prior to the resumption of play.
 - d) Once the Director has been summoned, the option to play on is no longer available.
 - e) If summoned, the Director should cancel any play that might have occurred after the claim and prior to his arrival. He then adjudicates the claim as per Law 70.
 - f) If the claiming side [in violation of Law 68D2(b)] initiated the request to play on, the Director cancels any subsequent play and adjudicates a result based solely upon the original statement of claim.
 - g) If a second claim or concession occurs subsequent to the (legal) recommencement of play, the Director only adjudicates the later claim (if contested).
3. The Committee returned to the subject of Law 23A1. Many of the examples that had been discussed during the first meeting were re-visited but no definitive consensus was reached. It was agreed that discussions would need to continue; at least in respect to the advice which the Committee would offer in the Commentary. The Committee were however in general agreement regarding the conclusions as they currently appear.
4. Returning to the agenda, the Committee now addressed various enquiries that it had received in respect to Law 86B. Mr Kelso suggested that Law 86B1 was only applicable in those situations where a score had been obtained at one table, with no corresponding score available from the other table. Typical examples where this might occur are when the

Director cancels a partially played board due to extraneous information received from an outside source (as per Law 16D); where a table plays a board to completion with one hand containing 14 cards and another containing only 12 cards; or when a table never commences a board due to slow play or misadventure.

5. The Committee noted that in the specific case of where a fouled board has been played to completion at both tables (in two different conditions), the board has by definition two separate, non-comparable results. The Committee also agreed that in such circumstances both the results obtained were of equal validity and/or importance.

Mr Kelso stated that since a fouled board consists of two very different results, the applicable Law was Law 86B2 and not Law 86B1. He further drew the Committee's attention to both Law 87C and Footnote 27. Both of which specifically reference Law 86B2.

6. The Committee confirmed that Law 86B2 applies whenever more than one non-comparable result occurs between the same contestants. It also noted that an NBO may exercise the RA powers conferred by Law 86B3 for all situations, save those which fall within the remit of Law 86B1. The Committee wishes to both encourage and recommend that each NBO regulate for what they consider to be the most appropriate approach within their geographic area of jurisdiction.
7. Mr Di Sacco relayed a request from the Rules and Regulations Committee who, during their deliberations regarding the WBF General Conditions of Contest, had formally requested that the Laws Committee provide a draft recommendation on how the WBF in its own competitions might best legislate (via Law 86B3) for multiple fouled boards and/or misduplication.

The Committee suggested a regulation based upon a procedure similar to that outlined in Law 86B1, but with the proviso that it should only apply in situations where there were not more than two fouled boards. The Committee favoured awarding an assigned adjusted score in lieu of each missing result and then averaging the consequent IMPs to produce a single result for each board, provided neither contestant was deemed to be at fault. The same procedure would also apply when one side was clearly responsible for the irregularity. However for the latter case, the score awarded on the board would then be whichever of the two results was considered to be more favourable to the non-offenders.

8. The Chairman thanked those present for their contributions during the meetings in Lyon and closed proceedings at 4.15pm.