



THE WORLD BRIDGE FEDERATION

Minutes of the meeting of the WBF Laws Committee in Philadelphia PA
on 12th October 2010.

Present:

Ton Kooijman in the chair
Chip Martel, Vice Chairman
Grattan Endicott, Secretary
John Wignall, Chairman of the Drafting Committee
Max Bavin
Maurizio Di Sacco
Joan Gerard
Jeffrey Polisner
William J. Schoder

Apologies:

The President Emeritus
Jeanne van den Meiracker
Bertrand Gignoux

Guests:

Peter Boyd, Herman De Wael, Adam Wildavsky.

.....

1. After slight amendment the minutes of the 8th October 2010 meeting were agreed.
2. The committee recorded that reference to 'any card' in Law 50D is subject to the provisions of Law 50E.
3. Referring to Ton Kooijman's Appendix conveying his opinions on matters of law on the WBF web site it was agreed that the mention of his title as chairman of the committee shall be removed.
4. There was a discussion of the treatment of a fouled board in a teams match. Opinions varied. It was agreed that such treatment was a subject for regulation and that the committee would not offer advice to Regulating Authorities on the matter. However, unless regulations state otherwise a Director may apply Law 86D as he thinks fit.
5. An ACBL example was cited of a contract of 6 Spades reached after a slow signoff by the partner. The contract should go one light but defender revokes allowing it to make, an example of a serious error unrelated to the infraction. It is decided to adjust the score. The defending side will bear the consequence of its serious error and be awarded -980. The declaring side will be put back to the five level and as to the number of tricks to be awarded the Director will assess what would have happened in that contract. (At the lower level it may be that declarer and/or defender would have reason to play differently.)

6. Further ideas about applications of Law 27 were discussed. It was decided not to add to the advice in the minutes of 10th October, 2008, which Regulating Authorities may apply as they think fit. It was noted, however, that efforts to allow calls that it is hoped will achieve normal bridge results are protected by the possibility of recourse to Law 27D at the end of the play.
7. The absence of the words “had the irregularity not occurred” from Law 12C1(c)(ii) rarely has consequences for the ruling and how this law is dealt with is in the hands of Regulating Authorities and Directors.
8. A so-called ‘Reveley’ score adjustment is one in which for equity a weighted score [see Law 12C1(c)] includes a percentage of results obtained via use of the call that was actually made at the table. There are anxieties that such adjustments may encourage players to infract the law by allowing them some proportion of their infractive result. For this reason such adjustments should in general be avoided.
9. A 2010 update of the WBF Code of Practice was presented and agreed after amendment.
10. It was reported that a draft revision of the laws of online bridge had been prepared. It was agreed to consult with interested parties on this and subsequently communicate again with the committee on the subject
11. The committee noted that the Portland Club continues to be Interested in updating the laws of rubber bridge and that Mr. Martel had agreed to nominate a person to work with the WBF and the Portland Club on the project.
12. On a motion by Mr Wignall the committee thanked the Chairman for his conduct of the meetings in Philadelphia and the Secretary for his preparation. The meeting then concluded.