

## Minutes of the meeting of the WBF Laws Committee in Koningshof

on 20<sup>th</sup> October 2011.

Present:

i. Ortiz-Patiño Chairman Emeritus

T. Kooijman Chairman

G. Endicott Secretary

M. Bavin

M. Di acco

i. Gerard

A. Levy

i. Polisner

W. Schodr

i. Wignall

Apology: C. Martel (M. Smith attending as his alternate).

Guests: Herman De Wael, Georgia Heth, Joannathan Steinberg

1. Draft minutes of the meeting of 18<sup>th</sup> October were tabled. It was agreed that certain changes would be made and the final minutes available for perusal and comment by members on the following day.

2. The Chairman invited Mr Wignall to bring a matter to attention. Mr Wignall informed the committee that it is possible a scheme would be introduced by which, for a fee, online bridge organizations would be licensed to issue WBF Masterpoints in certain competitions.

It was agreed that the Executive Council be informed of the committee's view that a condition of any such licence should be that the game is played in accordance with the WBF Laws of Online Bridge.

3. The Committee acknowledged that the WBF Laws of Online Bridge are due to be revisited and updated.

4. The committee continued its discussion of matters on the agenda of the previous meeting, including the items listed in paragraph 7 of the minutes of that meeting.

5. Returning to item 4 of the previous meeting's agenda, the Committee heard one member's opinion that the law is working well as it is and that on a rare occasion when circumstances arise that are not covered clearly in the law the Director may use his discretionary powers under Law 12A1 (and see Law 81C3).

6. The Committee noted for the next review of the Laws a request that the concept of an "offending" player or side be reconsidered where it occurs in the Laws.

7. When under Law 25A the Director allows a call to be changed the call withdrawn is deemed never to have happened. No unauthorized information is conveyed by it. Law 16D does not apply to the change of an unintended call. If the Director allows a call that should not be allowed under this Law it is a Director's error and Law 82C applies.

8. The law requires the Director at times to determine whether one action was or was not subsequent to another. For example, the question may be whether an action by the non-offending side was subsequent to the infraction so that the non-offending side caused damage to itself, in which case the non-offending side does not receive redress for that damage. The Director must determine the fact one way or the other. The timing of the action is a simple factual question, yes or no, and there can be no weighting in applying that law.

9. A determination as between the application of Law 25A and the application of Law 25B is a matter for the Director. The first condition for application of 25A is that partner must not have called subsequently; this is a question of fact for the Director. Where they apply, bidding box regulations may contain a relevant statement and should be read.

10. The committee discussed what is understood by a “mechanical error” in using a bidding box. The term applies to the case where the player intends to call ‘x’ and thinks ‘x’ but his fingers inadvertently pull out ‘y’ from the bidding box.

As an example:      North   East South West  
                                 1H   P      2C   P  
                                 P

where 2C shows Hearts support and is invitational. This Pass by North was most probably intentional (i.e. not mechanical) and so can not be changed.

11. In relation to Law 12C1(b) the Committee stated that it is in agreement with Ton Kooijman’s Commentary in its explanation of the method of calculating the consequent and the subsequent damage and thus the result on the board.

12. The committee acknowledged a need to redefine in the next review of the laws what it intends by the words “serious error” in Law 12C1(b).

13. The Secretary was requested to send out a worldwide invitation for anyone who wishes to suggest a change in the law in settling the 2017 Code to send to him details of the matter to be considered. The final date by which to submit such details to be 31<sup>st</sup> December 2012. The committee added that its present thinking is not to deviate too far from the effects of the laws as they are but to devote some effort to fresh wording where it is desirable and the setting of it.

Mr Wignall expressed the committee’s thanks to the Chairman for the way in which he had conducted the two meetings in Koningshof. In turn the Chairman thanked all present for their contributions to the meetings and then closed the meeting.