

CONGRESS DIRECTOR COURSE
By REG BUSCH

LESSON 9B

My answers to the 1989 accreditation paper.

1989 ACCREDITATION EXAMINATION - CONGRESS DIRECTOR

1. You are asked to run a country congress. List what announcements you should make, either in writing or verbally, before start of play.

A: Depends a little on circumstances, but consider items such as: format, qualification, tiebreaking, appeals, alerting and systems, session times etc.

2. The event is of four sessions, two qualifying and two final. What movements would you use for

(a) 35 tables and

(b) 23 tables.

A: No "right" and "wrong" answers. General principles to follow: Minimum of 24 bds and maximum of 30 bds per session; preferable for all sections to finish close to the same time; play complete movements and avoid skips where time and size constraints allow; movements should be as close to perfectly balanced as possible; maximum of about 3 1/2 hrs per session; try to play different opponents in second qualifying. If comparing qualifying scores across fields, may need to factorise; players like at least three board rounds if possible; pleasing the players is perhaps more important than technically good but complex movements. Players like simple movements. Remember Murphy's law of bridge movements: if players can foul up a bridge movement, they will.

My preferences:

For 35 tables: 3 x 9 tables (27 bds) and 1 x 8 (28 bds with skip). Swap sections around for session 2: 2 x 9 and 2 x 8 1/2. Factoring necessary. For the finals: 3 x 9 Barometer Howells (3 bds per round) and 1 x 8 Barometer (4 bds per round stopping after 13 rds)

For 23 tables: 2 x 7 plus 1 x 9 would be nice, but that I think is too big a size difference. My preference: 2 x 8 plus 1 x 7 (28 bds) and for Q2 1 x 8 plus 2 x 7 1/2 (32 boards). Factoring needed.

3. What results would you need to collate for the state Masterpoint Secretary?

A: The top half of the field in each session and the top half of each final session. For outright final places, you should provide the full list of places in the championship as awards will probably go to all places. In other final sections, list the top half.

Rounding: in pairs events, round **down** where necessary. For example, for a 9 table Mitchell, awards go to the top 4 places NS and EW. Note that, in teams events, outright awards go only to the top third of the field, rounding **up** if necessary.

The MP sec. will also need to know details of the total entry and the type of movements. Details of all players' ABF numbers.

4. You finish with an entry of 23 1/2 tables, due to the non-arrival of a pair. You decide to have three qualifying sections, of 8, 8 and 7 1/2 tables, playing 4 boards per round. For qualification into the final, you need to find the best overall NS 3rd and EW 3rd., so you will need to factorise. Describe the factoring process for the 7 1/2 table section.

A: The 8 table sections play 32 bds with a top of 14. In the 7 1/2 section, NS play 32 bds with a top of 12 (only 7 scores per board). So that the NS will be factorised by 14/12. The EW's play 28 bds with a top of 12. As their scores are being compared with other EW's who played 32 bds with top of 14, then factorise by 14/12 x 32/28.

5. You are running a Swiss teams event. What would be the minimum number of rounds you would require for

- (a) 20 teams
- (b) 28 teams
- (c) 36 teams.

A: 7, 7, and 8. For the mathematicians, the formula for the minimum number of rounds is $\log_2 N + 2$ (rounded up).

6. You are running a championship teams event, using a round robin. Draw up the table for a round robin of 12 teams.

A: Essentially a Howell movement. Start your first round thus:

1 2 3 4 5 6

Then come back the other way:

12 v 1 11 v 2 10 v 3 9 v 4 8 v 5 7 v 6

Go down each column adding 1 to each team number, but omitting 12 which stays in the first column. After 11 rounds, you are finished, and the last figure should be one less than the top figure in the column.

12 v 1 11 v 2 10 v 3 9 v 4 8 v 5 7 v 6
 12 v 2 1 v 3 11 v 4 10 v 5 9 v 6 8 v 7

and so on.

7. Complete the table movement cards for a 5 table Howell using the movement specified in Appendix 3, filling in the appropriate data. (This page should be returned with your exam papers.)

A: Refer to standard references. Essentially, in Howell movements, players follow the pair numbered one below them (with the highest numbered pair stationary) and the boards move down one station towards table 1. You would fill out the starting pairs at each table, and then complete the rest of the rounds in the same way as you did the draw for the round robin in teams above. Boards are played in sequence at each table. On each round, the boards will move one station towards table 1 i.e. from table to table, or table to bystand, or bystand to table.

8. Describe briefly the Flower Howell. What are its advantages and disadvantages.

A: Players move in a circular fashion around the table. In e.g a 9 table Flower, pair 1 sit at EW1, 2 at EW2 etc down to EW9. Pair 18 sit at 1NS, 17 at 2NS and so on. Players as in all Howells follow the lower numbered pair. If not barometered, then the board movements are irregular and a lot more work for the Director (or the players can get their boards from a central table).

Other advantages: much simpler movement for the players, who merely move from one table to the next. Disadvantage: very unbalanced, unless you have arrowswitching of players or boards.

There are some Howell movements e.g. 10 tables, 14 tables where a modified type of Flower movement produces a properly balanced movement. Players move only to the next table, but will change direction.

9. Matchpoint the travelling score card containing a fouled board in Appendix 2. Return it with your paper. (TSC not available. But there were 5 scores in one group and 4 scores in the other).

A: The approved method is to separate for scoring purposes into two sections: one group where the board was played correctly and one where the board was played in the fouled state. Matchpoint each section separately. In this case, the five score section has a top of 8, and the four score section a top of 6. Then add to the scores in each section one matchpoint for each table in the other group. Thus, in the 4 table group, you would add 5 to each pair's matchpoints and to the 5 table group, add 4. Do this and you will find that your check total is correct (72). You will note that this result is similar to the one you would get by scoring each section separately and treating the scores in the other section as adjusted scores.

10. You are running a Barometer Howell final. You have collected the result slips and are scoring them when two pairs who played against each other in the last round

come to you. They had entered a score of 5H North for 9 tricks for -100. In actual fact, they now agree that North made 10 tricks, and that the score should have been -50. What do you do?

A: Read carefully Law 79. Tricks won must be agreed before the hands are returned to the board. Law 79B applies if you are asked to change the number of tricks after the round has ended. The 1987 Laws did not allow you to change the result to any side's advantage. So that you could not change the score to -50, because that would advantage NS. You would leave the score at -100 for NS, but could change it to 50 for EW because they are not being advantaged. That is, you would award a split score. The 1997 Laws have varied this to give you discretion i.e. you need not grant this increase in score. No guidelines are laid down and in Australia no guidelines have been suggested. But take this approach. The Law was designed to prevent players with much to gain from the score change e.g. prize money, placing etc cajoling, browbeating or perhaps even bribing a pair with nothing to lose into agreeing the change in score. The EBU have laid down guidelines: where one pair has much to gain and the other little to lose, then the TD will automatically disallow the change.

It is important to know what scores you may change legally. An error in calculating the score, such as an arithmetical error or a wrong vulnerability may be changed up to the expiry time, but an error such as agreeing an incorrect number of tricks can be changed only at the director's discretion.

11. East is to make the opening lead. He places a card face down on the table, then calls you, saying that he has changed his mind, and wishes to change his lead. What do you rule?

A: Covered in previous exam.

12. In what situations would you allow the opening leader to retract his face down lead?

A: Covered in previous exam.

13. Covered in previous exam.

14. Declarer is on lead. Dummy is high, but Declarer has no entry to dummy. Declarer leads incorrectly from dummy, covered by the defender next to play. You rule that because the incorrect play was condoned, the score must stand. True or false?

A: An interesting question! The laws do not specifically cover this situation, but there is a pervading principle of the laws that a player may not advantage his side by an infraction of the laws, if he could have known that such infraction might be to his advantage. See, for example, Law 23 and Law 72B. Read also Law 81C6 where the Director is charged with rectifying "any error or irregularity of which he becomes aware". As part of that rectification, he may (Law 82B1) award an adjusted score.

One can't know whether Declarer intentionally led from the wrong hand, and he is certainly not going to admit it! Clearly, he would have known that leading from the wrong hand (an infraction of Law 44G) would be to his advantage. The correct action here is to deprive declarer of his good score obtained by his infraction, and award an adjusted score according to the likely result without the infraction. However, defenders, who thoughtlessly played to the lead from the wrong hand, are not entitled to redress, so they should retain their poor score. Another situation for a split score.

15. Covered in previous exam.

16. On the last round of a major pairs event, you decide to award a 60% score to NS at table 1 after a difficult decision. The EW pair accept your ruling. However, the 60% score allows NS to win the event by one matchpoint.

The unlucky pair at table 6, who were thereby beaten into second place, advise that they wish to appeal against your ruling. Comment on this situation.

A: Law 92A allows a contestant to appeal against a ruling made at HIS OWN table. There is no provision for appealing against a decision at another table. Advise the unlucky pair that they have no right to appeal.

17.(a) South is declarer, West makes his opening lead face down, when suddenly South realises that he has given a wrong explanation of one of North's bids. You are called. What do you rule?

A: Law 75D1 obliges South to call the Director as soon as he realises that he has given a wrong explanation. (Interestingly, this is the only situation where the laws compel you to call attention to your own infraction). South will call you, and you will ask him to correct his explanation. Then you will give West the option of retracting his lead, and replacing it with another.

(b) Would your decision be any different if the misexplanation had been brought to light by a question from East after the face down lead?

A: Yes. Technically, whilst East has the right at this time to ask questions, there is no sound reason why he needs to, except perhaps for the benefit of West, which is improper. East's questions may well be unauthorised information to West, and his change of lead may be influenced by it. If there was misinformation EW are still protected. I would let the lead stand, but advise EW that they may be entitled still to an adjusted score if damaged.

18.

Bd.6, Dlr E, EW vul.

		AKJ97	
		8	
		J2	
		Q10652	
Q8			106432
KQ42			AJ
K1087			6543
A84			87
		5	
		1097653	
		AQ9	
		KJ3	

W	N	E	S
		P	P
1H	2H(1)	P	2NT
P	3S(2)	P	3NT passed out.

(1) Alerted by South as described as a forcing cue bid.

(2) After the 3S bid, South calls you, and explains that the first explanation was wrong. The 2H was a conventional bid showing at least 5-5 in spades and clubs.

Result: 3NT making 9 tricks on a diamond lead. A top score.

Comment on this situation, and what you would rule.

A: South's incorrect explanation of North's bid is unauthorised information to North. Assume that there had been no misexplanation. North bids 2H showing at least 5-5 in the black suits. Partner, knowing this, chooses to bid 2NT. What reason does North have to disturb that contract? He has no extra values, and the most minimal distribution for his bid. It seems probable that North in making his next bid, has acted because of having heard South's misexplanation.

I would adjust the score to NS +150 (the result of 2NT making 9 tricks).

19. What do you understand by the term "balance" in relation to pairs movements?

A: Essentially, a movement where each player in a field has his scores compared with each other player in that field the same number of times. For perfect balance, each player in a field should also meet the same opponents as the other players in that field. Thus a Mitchell movement is perfectly balanced. In say a 10T Mitchell (share and

byestand), each NS compares with every other NS nine times, and the same for EW. If you had a skip or curtailed movement, this would disturb the balance in one sense because not all pairs have played the same opponents. A Howell with even number of tables is balanced, but an odd number Howell is slightly unbalanced unless you arrowswitch at the stationary table. This would normally not be worth worrying about except in say Butler movements with long matches.

20. North
 S. 109632
 H. 2
 D. QJ432
 C. 32

 South
 S. AKJ74
 H. A5
 D. A75
 C. 754

The bidding:

W	N	E	S
		1H	1S
4H	4S	5H	X
P	?		

Whilst North is still contemplating his call, South leads the SK.

4H EW and 4S NS both make. 5H EW and 5S NS both go off one.

What is your ruling?

A: Discussed in previous exam, but worth returning to. Law 24. North must pass at his next turn. But there is much more than that. Read Law 23A. South's lead during the auction has effectively prevented North from making another bid, and he may well have gone on to make the "sacrifice" of 5S. South's action, intentional or not, has very likely damaged EW, and the Director should award an adjusted score of EW +100, the likely result in 5Sx by NS.

It is not necessary to decide that South knew his action could advantage their side, only that he COULD have known. One assumes that players have a general idea of the rules at least, and the sort of infractions that prevent partner from bidding.