



International Sport Federation (IF) recognized by the International Olympic Committee

## Summary of the reviews in Wroclaw

At the World Bridge Games, contested in the Polish city of Wroclaw in September 2016, seven cases were submitted for review.

The Reviewer was Ata Aydin, assisted by PO Sundelin and Herman De wael.

Most of the Reviews were treated by the three persons together, although the final judgment was always handed out by "the Reviewer". In one case, a single assistant heard the case. In two more, the two assistants acted together (the Chief not yet having arrived at the venue). In one case, the review form was examined by all three, the players were heard by the two assistants, and the final verdict decided by the chief.

In all cases, the players or captain of the side asking for the review were heard. In some cases, the opposing pair was also present at a "hearing", while in others the opponents chose not to attend.

All seven reviews were written up by the assistant (Herman De wael), but the write-ups are for internal use only.

### The cases:

One case was dismissed without problems: a claim ruling was handled correctly. The deposit was forfeited.

One other case had no problematic points, but the deposit was returned anyway.

In one case the Director had failed to mention a fact which he considered to be obvious. For this reason, the review was granted and the Director was asked to poll a number of experts to confirm this fact. The poll was 6-0 in favour of the fact being indeed true.

In another case, the Director had been unable to find more than two experts, so he consulted at length with his colleagues. It turned out, however, that the two experts had not been unanimous. For that reason, the Director was asked to poll an extra number of experts. After doing so, the Director changed his original ruling in one containing a weighting of different results.

Then there was a case concerning possibly illegal deception. The Director had presented the hand to two experts, who confirmed that the player really did have something to think about. The appellants argued that two experts was not enough, but the Reviewer agreed with the Director's point of view that even three opposite answers would not change the final decision. If two experts confirm that there is something to think about, then this must constitute a "valid bridge reason". However, the pause for thinking had been timed at 1 minute and 45 seconds, and the appellants felt this was a different "action", for which no real reason could be given. The Reviewer decided that it was





impossible to measure the length of a pause that turns a valid reflection into an illegal one and confirmed the Director's ruling.

One case centred around an interesting problem. There had been an agreed-upon delay in returning the tray to the other side, and a player had made a call which seemed to suggest use of unauthorized information. However, the Director discovered that the delay had not been caused by any hesitation, but by a prolonged questioning by the non-offending side. As a side issue, the length of that questioning was due to the offending side having inadequate disclosure on their System Card and in response to the first question. The Director ruled that since there was no hesitation, there was no ruling upon unauthorized information to be given. After due reflection, the Reviewer confirmed this principle.

A final case merits special mention. The appellants argued that the order in which the Director poses questions to the expert ought to be reversed. After considerable deliberations with the Directors, the Reviewer decided that the established standard procedure is indeed advisable. But it was felt that the appellants have the right to have procedures, even long established ones, scrutinised by the Reviewer. Consequently, the deposit was returned for this case. The Reviewer had the following text published in the Daily Bulletin:

On Monday, the Directors had to rule on a case of Unauthorized Information. A player had hesitated and his partner had bid on. The Director had polled a number of players, asking them two questions:

- 1) "What would you bid after the following auction" (without mentioning the hesitation).
- 2) "Partner hesitated at (position). What would that hesitation suggest?"

Having received enough answers, the Directors gave a ruling.

That ruling was then subject of a review.

During the review, the appellants argued that the order of the two questions should be reversed. They argued that the polled players generally realise that there is a problem, and by asking the second question first, it sometimes becomes unimportant to ask the first one.

In consultation with the Chief Tournament Director, the Reviewer finds that the order given above is indeed to be advised. Sometimes the answers that are received on one question render the other answers immaterial, but this can happen in either sequence, and one does not know during the beginning of the poll what the answers by later players will be.

Telling the pollees what the problem is (by asking the second question first) is more problematic than the reverse.

It is the duty of the Reviewer to check the procedures employed by the Directors, and this review was judged reasonable and the deposit returned. This procedure has now been checked and future similar reviews will be considered frivolous.

It is possible, in individual cases, that a different order is advisable. The Directors may act accordingly.

**Herman De Wael**  
**Assistant Reviewer**